An Epitaph in the Museum at Alexandria

Robert K. Sherk

I

Among the texts from Egypt which Breccia published in 1911 is an inscription bearing the number 322 in his collection, its provenance unknown. Breccia gave only a transcription in capitals and made no attempt to restore it or explain its nature, but in 1931 Werner Peek included it in one of his many articles on metrical epitaphs and succeeded in presenting a fairly understandable text. It eventually appeared in *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* (VIII.375) with several new suggestions by W. Crönert. This is the latest text and is presented here for the sake of convenience:

---

\[
\text{Σ νέρθεν} \\
\]

\[
\begin{aligned}
\text{[νίκαις]} & | \text{Ελλαδικὴ σου ζην, μ[έγα κόδος ἔνειρόκων],} \\
\text{ἀλευ̃ δ’ ἵπποβότων ἀστέ} & | \text{[δούν ξε[ν]κόων].} \\
5 & \text{Μυρ[α]μέν<η> ἔλοχ[ω] παρέθαλψε || πολ[λ]ύ<κ>ρα<γ>ον (?)} \text{ ἢτορ} \\
& \text{Ἰούνιος, εὐ[χαριν ὅς | δῶ]κεν ἐλευθερήν,} \\
& \text{Ἰούνιος Ἡδο[- -ο]ς, πανυπέρτατος αὐτός ἐπαρχ[ος]} \\
& [Κῆπτων (?)] \text{ οὐε}π[α]ν[ών, εἴλης δε<σ>πόσνον} \\
10 & [ὅς - -] ῬΩΝ ⋮ ⋮ Φ[…]legate τεῆς || [ἐπι μοίρας] \\
& -α .... ἄμφω σει. |- -ΛΩΣ...| -ΕΛΑ... \\
\end{aligned}
\]

Notes. Breccia reported that it was yellow limestone of very fine grain, broken and splintered, 0.41m. high and 0.44m. wide. 1 <i>νέρθεν</i> Peck. 2 <i>εὺρ</i> <i>μέγα πατρίδα κόδος</i> Crönert. 3–4 Crönert suggested [θύ 'Ἰππολίκών. 4 ΜΥ[ι]ΜΕΝΩ stone: <i>μυρ[α]μέν<η></i> Peck. 5 ΥΕΡΑΤΩN stone. 6–7 Peck hesitantly suggested 'Η<λ>α<σ>ιος and referred to P.Oxy. VI.926, line 7, but Crönert thought of <i>Σ>γηδά[τιο].<sup>8</sup> 8 ΔΕΕΠΟΣΥΝΟΣ stone: δε<σ>πόσνον</i> Crönert, <i>θυ</i>τέονος Peck.

Peek believed that the first few lines contained a statement about the life of the deceased and that he was apparently a gladiator, soldier, charioteer or similar person who had travelled widely during

---

1 E. Breccia, *Iscrizioni greche e latine* [Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée d’Alexandrie] (Cairo 1911), p. 166. Of its provenance he says only, "Alexandria?".

his lifetime. He felt that Iunius, *praefectus alae veteranae Gallicae*, had
given the grieving wife of the deceased her freedom. Then, after the
usual appeal for pity, the stone breaks off.

Although no indications remain of the full width of the lines on the
stone, Peek observed that the division into hexameters and pentamers
was indicated by the use of empty spaces. Although one may
easily criticize a few of the restorations, especially in lines 3–5, the
intent of the epitaph appears to be as Peek has suggested.

There is, however, another chapter in the modern history of this
stone which antedates Breccia’s publication by some thirty years and
illustrates nicely the importance of examining old copies of known
inscriptions. The Greek and Latin epigraphical material in the
notebooks of Charles E. Wilbour (1833–1896) has only recently been ex-
amined as a whole, and, although it consists mainly of well-known
texts, there are a few *inedita* and dozens of copies made long before the
stones themselves had reached the museum. Wilbour was an indefatigable
traveler up and down the Nile during the last twenty years
of his life, and it was in keeping with his nature to keep records of
practically everything he saw. His copies of Egyptian, Coptic, Greek,
and Latin inscriptions are now a treasured possession of the Brooklyn
Museum. In one of his notebooks (numbered 2c, page 71) there is a
copy of our epitaph. It reads as follows:

ΣΝΕΡΘΕΝ
ΕΛΛΑΔΙΚΗΣΙΝΕΗΝΜ
ΑΙΕΝΔΙΠΠΟΒΟΤΩΝΑΣΙΕ
ΚΩΝ ΜΥΗ[.:]ΜΕΝΩΔΑΛΟΧ
5
ΥΠΡΑΤΟΝΗΤΟΡ ΙΟΥΝΙΟΣΕΥ
ΚΕΝΙΕΛΕΥΘΕΡΙΗΝ ΙΟΥΝΙΟΣΗΔΑ
ΣΤΙΑΝΥΠΕΡΤΑΤΟΣΑΥΤΟΣΠΙΑΡΧ
ΤΡΑΝΩΝΕΝΙ[.]ΙΛΗΣΕΙΣΠΟΥΝΟΣ
ΩΝ ΑΛΛΑΜΦΩΣΕΛΕΛΕΙΣΕΗΣ
10
ΕΥΘΕΣΙΑΗΣ ΑΜΦΩΣΕΙ
ΙΣΟΥΝΕΚΑΠΙΑΡΒΕΒΑΩΣ
ΣΑΡΑΙΝΟΣΟΙΠΙΟΡΕΔΑ
Ι ΘΕΜΙΣΕΥΣΕΒΙΗΣ
ΝΟΙΣ ΚΕΙΡΑΣΘΔΙ
15
ΑΠΟΔΑΚΡΥ
ΠΑΛΛΑΣ
ΚΔ

---

3 See my remarks in *TAPA* 93 (1962) 443–44. His private letters, providing a valuable
commentary on the material in his notebooks, have been edited and published by Jean
Wilbour identifies the material as limestone and gives its measurement as 0.44m. by 0.54m. Thus a piece had broken off from the lower half of the stone and had disappeared by the time it arrived in Alexandria. A rough outline of the stone itself accompanies the copy and shows the right edge beginning about line nine. On all other sides the stone was broken even when Wilbour saw it.

Unfortunately he says nothing about the location of the stone or where he copied it. However, all of his notebooks are carefully dated. Therefore, since it is possible from his correspondence to tell exactly where he was in Egypt on almost any given day between 1880 and 1891, the approximate origin of this epitaph can be discovered. The section of notebook 2c, page 71, on which his copy is found, is dated to March 19–29, 1882. Turning to these dates in his published letters (Travels In Egypt, see above, note 3) we find on page 153 a letter dated Tuesday, March 21, 1882, in which is a reference to the occasion on which he had seen and copied the epitaph. Here are the opening sentences of that letter:

Starting with the sun we landed at Qasr es-Sayad but with three hours journeying found not the sculptured tombs. Another hour would have taken us to them but only I had taken a donkey. Saïd bought a tablet with some Greek poetry and sundry other things. At How, nearby the birthplace of Nephthys, we stopped with similar success, seeing only some foundations of a temple of Roman time.

Wilbour, as a guest of Gaston Maspero, had started that morning "with the sun" from Kenah and traveled about 29 miles down the Nile to Qasr es-Sayad, which is in the Thebaid and probably the ancient site of Chenoboskion. He had not seen the stone in situ. His servant of old, Saïd Ismaeen of Kafr-el-Haram, had bought it from one of the inevitable dealers in antiquities who constantly tried to sell their wares to Wilbour at every settlement and city along the Nile. Saïd was his trusted and beloved factotum, one of whose duties was to locate and purchase antiquities for him along the route. The "tablet with some Greek poetry" must be our grave stele, and on the bottom of the page on which Wilbour copied the inscription are found drawings and descriptions of the "sundry other things" purchased by Saïd. Therefore our epitaph must have been set up originally in the vicinity of Qasr es-Sayad.

Using Breccia's transcription, Peek's restorations, and now Wilbour's
copy it is possible to correct a few lines and to present a fuller text.

\[ \ldots \]

\[ \ldots \] 'Ελλαδικήσαν ἐπὶ μ[\ldots]\]

αιὲν δ’ ἵπποβότων ἀστε’ [ἱδὼν ἤνε]κέν.

5 μυρ[α]μένο δ’ ἄλοχ[ον θάλψεν (?)] πολυήρατον ἔμορ

Ἰούνιος, εὐ[χαριστὶ δὲ | δῶ]κεν ἔλευθεριν,

Ἰούνιος ἸΔΑ[- | -]Σ, πανυψέρτατος αὐτὸς ἔπαρχ[ος]

[οὔε]τραύων ἐνὶς δεσπόσων | [Κέλτ.]όν.

10 ἀλλ’ ἀμφό ἐλέαρ’ ἐτεῆς | |[ὑπὸ κ]εύθεσιν (<γ>αῖῆς

ἀμφό ΣΈΙ[- | - | -]Σ οὐ[κεκα παρβεβαίοις |

[ - - - ]ΣΑΡΑΙΟΝ, ὀδοὺπόρε, δό[κρα λείβε],

ῄ[θεμ]ε εὔσεβής [[οὐ]κεκα ἄφοσομέ(?)]νοις

15 κείρασθαι ||[τε κόμην βαλλέων ῥ’] ἀπὸ δάκρυ [[παρειών]

[- - - - - ]ΠΑΛΛΑΣ[- - - - - ]

[- - - - - - - - - ]ΚΔ[- - - - - - - - - ]

Notes

Lines 1-3. I have omitted Peek’s restorations of lines 1-3 because they do not appear to me to be appropriate for a freedman. No formulaic expression decrees their presence here. The deceased seems to have been active in the horse trade rather than in athletic matches or military campaigns. For the possible interpretation of these lines I refer to Strabo (11.13.7): ἡ δ’, ὑπὸ ταῖς Κασπίοις πύλαις ἐν τασενοίς ἔδάφεσι καὶ κοίλοις ὀδὸν εὐδαίμων σφόδρα ἐστὶ καὶ πάμφορος πλὴν ἐλαίας· εἰ δὲ καὶ φύεται ποι, ἀλητής τῇ ἑστὶ καὶ ἑξάρα ἱππόβοτος δὲ καὶ αὐτὴ ἐστὶ διαφερόντως καὶ ἡ Ἀρμενία, καλεῖται δὲ τὰς καὶ λεμών Ἡπόμοντος, δὲν καὶ διεξίασιν οἱ ἕκ τῆς Περσῶν καὶ Βαβυλῶνος εἰς Κασπίους πύλας ὀδεύοντες, ἐν ἀπὸ πέντε μυριάδας ἱππῶν θηλείων νέμεσθοι φασιν ἐπὶ τῶν Περσῶν, εἰναι δὲ τὸς ἅγελας ταῦτας βασιλικάς. τοὺς [ἡπαίσιος ἱπποὺς, οἷς ἐ- χρῶντο οἱ βασιλεῖς ἄριστοι οὐ καὶ μεγάλοις, οἱ μὲν εὐθεῖα ἠγοιραὶ τὸ γένος, οἱ δὲ ἐξ Ἀρμενίας· ιδιόμορφοι δὲ εἶσον, ὁσπερ καὶ οἱ Παρθικοὶ λεγόμενοι τῶν παρὰ τοὺς Ἑλλάδικοι καὶ τοὺς ἄθλους τοὺς παρ’ ἡμῖν.

From this passage we see that the area below the Caspian Gates was good “horse pasturing” country and that the Nesaean and Parthian horses were different from the “Helladic” horses. Therefore, since the deceased speaks of his travels to the cities of horse pasturing lands, there is an excellent possibility that he had been active in some
capacity in the procurement of horses. The region below the Caspian Gates was only one of many famous countries that bred good mounts. Does our adjective Ἐλλαδική refer to "Helladic mares"?

This information about the activities of the deceased in the possible procurement of horses is most important. We shall return to it later.

LINES 4-5. The text presented in SEG implies that the woman's name is Ἐνηρατον ἴτορ. But the frequent use of μώρωμαι in epitaphs makes it much more likely that here too it is a case of the verb and not a name. Furthermore I believe that the woman died first and that it is a double grave. Thus there is no reason to change the gender of the aorist participle as Peek and Crönert have done, for Wilbour and Breccia are in agreement that it is masculine on the stone. Only compelling reasons should force one to change what the stone reads. Here I see none.

There is, nevertheless, a real possibility that the woman's name did appear in the text, in the lacuna after ἀλοχ[ov]. If true, these two lines might be restored in quite a different way:

\[
\text{ἴονιος} \epsilon\eta[γνωμών} \delta\alpha] \kappa\varepsilonν \varepsilon\lambdaυθερίην
\]

The phrase πόλυντατον ἴτορ would then be an Accusative of Respect with μωραμεν in the sense of "having grieved in his very dear heart." I prefer this latter interpretation, but I cannot cite an exact parallel. The distance between the two phrases would not be an obstacle, and the grammar of the sentence as a whole would be simpler and smoother than in Peek's restoration.

LINES 6-7. Breccia shows no bar or iota after –]KEN. After Ἰονιος one expects a cognomen, and therefore Σηδα[τι] is suspect. Its short alpha is also difficult to accept, despite the fact that names do not always fit into the meter. Professor James H. Oliver has suggested to me that the cognomen might be Ἡδα[τ] and argues

---

that because the Romans considered themselves to be Trojans by origin an “Idaeus” would not be unreasonable. Possibly. I prefer to leave the line unrestored. In line 7 Wilbur omitted the epsilon of \textit{EIPAPX} by mistake, for it is present in the transcription by Breccia and there is little reason to think of any other word in this place.

\textbf{Lines 8–9.} Peek was rightly dissatisfied with his metrical arrangement of this line.\textsuperscript{5} His mistake was in assuming that [\textit{Kleptov}] should come at the beginning of the line. It fits in very well at the end with the extant – – \textit{\textgamma\textomicron\textnu}. This allows the pause to fall after \textit{\textepsilon\textomicron\textnu\textomicron\textnu}\textit{\textomicron\textnu}.

Wilbour made several mistakes in copying at this particular section of the stone, for in two places he crossed out his first readings and then re-wrote them. The EN after – – \textit{\textgamma\textomicron\textnu\textomicron\textnu\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicron\textomicr
LINES 14–15. The phrase in our epitaph calling upon the wayfarer to cut his hair and to let his tears run down his cheeks has been borrowed from Homer (Odyssey 4.198). The importance of the hair in Greek religious ritual and belief has been thoroughly investigated and is well known. Nevertheless the pulling or the cutting of the hair as an act of mourning is not too common in the epitaphs. However, there was a guild in Egypt, whose name has not come down to us, which provided that upon the death of a member all his colleagues had to shave their heads in his honor.

II

The ala veterana Gallica may not have arrived in Egypt until the second century, perhaps being transferred there from the Syrian army. At any rate, the earliest datable document attests its presence in Egypt in A.D. 130, and many others mention it to the end of the Principate and beyond. Its main camp in the last quarter of the second century, and probably earlier as well, was in Alexandria. The date of our epitaph, therefore, would appear to be the second century or later.

Whether the epitaph may be used to suggest that all or part of the ala had been stationed at any time in the general area of Qasr es-

11 P.London 482 (=Lesquier, op.cit., App. II, pp. 503–504=–Cavenaile, op.cit., no. 114) is dated to the year A.D. 130 by the mention of the consuls for that year. Other important documents include: P.Mich. 6, 428, lines 3 and 18 (A.D. 154); CIL XVI, Suppl. no. 184 (A.D. 156/61); P.Hamb. 39, line 12 (=Select Papyri II.369, of A.D. 179); H. A. Sanders, Classical Studies in Honor of John C. Rolfe (Philadelphia 1931) 265–38 (=P.Mich. III.164, line 13=Cavenaile, op.cit., no. 143); P.Mich. VII.455, line 26 of frg. a, verso (=Cavenaile, op.cit., no. 133); CIL III.14 6581, and 15 6582. According to the Notitia Dig. [ed. Seeck], Or. 28.28, it was stationed at Rhinocorura near the Syrian border in the Late Empire.
12 CIL III.6581–82.
Sayad in the Thebaid is a difficult question to answer. It depends upon the activity of the deceased at the time of his death. If he had been actively engaged in work for the prefect or the cavalry unit at the time of his death, then certainly the place of his burial could indicate the location of the _ala_ or part of it at that time. But that is a point we do not know. And the apparent fact that it was a double grave does not alter the situation. In our opinion, therefore, it would be hazardous to draw any conclusions from the epitaph about the location of the military unit.

Let us turn to the matter of the relationship between the deceased and the _praefectus alae_. There can be little real doubt that the deceased was the freedman of the officer. The dative case of _μυρ[α]μένω_, the mention of _ελευθερία_ and the reasonable restoration of _[δω]κεν_ all within the short space of a few lines point irresistibly to that conclusion. And it is a well-known fact that soldiers, especially the officers, had slaves with them even on active duty. Julius Caesar dismissed a _tribunos militum_ not because he had slaves with him but because he had used a ship to transport them instead of his soldiers. In the first century Tacitus writes as if the presence of slaves in the army was very common. And for the Principate in general there are scores of examples, mostly epigraphical. Our epitaph must be added to the more important of those examples, for it adds precious information on matters not well illustrated elsewhere. Not only is it a good example of _contubernium_ but it is also of exceptional interest for the responsible position which this freedman must have held in the household of the prefect.

13 Bell. Afr. 54: Quibus legionibus expositis memori in Italia pristinae licentiae militaris ac rapinarum certorum hominum parvulam modo causulam nactus Caesar, quod C. Avienus, tribunus militum X. legionis, navem ex commemtu familia sua atque iumentis ocupavisset neque militem unum ab Sicilia sustulisset, etc.

14 Speaking of Vitellius in Hist. 2.87, Tacitus says: sexaginta milia armatorum sequabantur, licentia corrupta; callonum numeros amplior, procacissimis etiam inter servos lixarum ingenis.

15 C. G. Starr, _The Roman Imperial Navy_, 31 B.C.-A.D. 324, [Cornell Studies in Classical Philology XXVI] (Ithaca 1941) 82, with n.53; M. Durry, _Les cohortes prétoiriennes_ (Paris 1938) 281; R. MacMullen, _Soldier and Civilian in the Later Roman Empire_ (Cambridge [Mass.] 1963) 106. W. L. Westermann's work, _The Slave Systems of Greek and Roman Antiquity_ (Philadelphia 1955) is disappointing in this regard. There is room for a comprehensive treatment of slavery in the Roman army, for the material is now quite large, thanks to epigraphical and papyrological finds. To show the importance of the slave and freedman in the army a passage of Pliny (NH 7.39) is instructive, who, after giving some examples of very high prices paid for slaves, says, _nisi si quis in hoc loco desiderat Armeniaci belli paulo ante propter Tiritaten gesti dispensatorem, quem Nero II...creds...[XXX] manumisit. sed hoc pretium belli, non hominis, fuit..._. One would like to know more of this dispensator.

16 For the _contubernium_ see Westermann, op.cit. 81 and 119.
The fact that the deceased travelled widely in horse-breeding countries and was a freedman of a praefectus alae leads me to conclude that he was either a groom (strator) or an agent used for the selection and purchase of remounts for the Roman army in Egypt. This is a subject about which not very much is known, and further information, however small, is welcome. Among the military ranks, of course, we know of a strator attached to the officium of the governor, and another on duty with the legatus legionis. And in the alae themselves we have evidence of a strator on duty with the praefectus, but presumably he was drawn from the ranks. Besides these there were also present the calones, known to us from the time of the Republic, who were slaves of the soldiers who cared for the impedimenta and the transport in general. Grooms were an obvious necessity in cavalry units, and for a prefect to use a capable slave as groom is not at all surprising. And for faithful service manumission was the great reward. As a slave, therefore, and later freedman of the prefect it is conceivable that the deceased might have been a groom, an expert in horses to such a degree that he was recommended by his master to aid in the purchase of remounts for the Roman army in Egypt. In that capacity he could have been sent to “horse-pasturing” lands such as Bithynia, Cappadocia, or the area below the Caspian Gates.

Although the whole subject of remounts for the army is not well known, there seems to be some evidence to show that special parties were sent out by military units to procure horses. The evidence is found in P. Hunt, line 56 (= R. O. Fink, JRS 48 [1958] 102–16), where we

---

17 See the remarks of Gilliam, op.cit. 171 n.4 and 180–81.
18 In the officium of the governor: A. v. Domaszewski, Die Rangordnung im römischen Heere (Bonn 1908) 35. They were, of course, legionarii and according to the Digest (50.6.7) immunes. For examples see CIL III.5449 (=Dessau, ILS 2419A); CIL III.2067 (=Dessau, ILS 2587); Année ép. 1959, 12, and 316. In the officium of the legatus legionis see Domaszewski, op.cit. 39, and the example in CIL XIII.6745.
19 Domaszewski, op.cit. 55, and the example in IGRR III.1094. In the case of stratores attached to the alae and the legiones in general one scholar has expressed the possibility that in the period of the Principate as well as in the Late Empire they may have been concerned also with the function of remounts. See Gilliam, op.cit. 175 n.20. In the later Roman armies the evidence of Ammianus Marcellinus (29.3.5) is decisive: Constantianus strator paucos militares equos ex his ausus mutare, ad quos probandos missus est in Sardiniam, . . . (quoted by Gilliam). See A. H. M. Jones, The Later Roman Empire I (Norman [Okla.] 1964) 625–26 and II, p. 1259 n.37.
20 See the references collected in TLL s.v. Calo.
21 Closer to Egypt, of course, would have been the Libyan horses. And Oppian, Cyn. 2.253, speaks of Ἰππόβορος Αἰγίν. The horses from Cyrene, however, seem to have been used mainly for wagons and transport: Aristophanes Byz. 2.591.
hear of military personnel being sent \textit{trans erar\ldots m equatum}.

Then an inscription from Termessus in Pisidia of A.D. 140/45 (SEG VI.628 = TAM III.52) mentions an \textit{\textepsilon\rho\chi\iota\sigma\tau\rho\acute{a}t\omega\rho} attached to the staff of the \textit{praefectus Aegypti}. And from Dura a papyrus mentions the \textit{probatio} of a military horse by the governor of Coele Syria. A pattern emerges. There seems to have been an organized method of obtaining remounts in the various provinces. In Egypt the governor's chief consultant was the \textit{\textepsilon\rho\chi\iota\sigma\tau\rho\acute{a}t\omega\rho}. Under his direction purchasing parties may have been organized to go and buy the horses. It is only natural for the members of such parties to be the most capable men available. And a prefect of an \textit{ala} would almost certainly be consulted about any reliable men in his unit. May we assume that the deceased of our epitaph was one of the men recommended? I think so.

The epitaph, of course, does not tell us that the deceased was a groom, only that he was manumitted after the death of his concubine and that he had seen the “cities of horse-pasturing” countries. But when that information is coupled with the fact that his master was a \textit{praefectus alae veteranae Gallicae} in Egypt, the assumption that he was a groom or at least an expert in horses is well worth considering. The document is therefore of importance to the student of the Roman army.

\textbf{The State University of New York at Buffalo}

\textit{November, 1964}

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{22} Cf. G. Cantacuz\`ene in \textit{Aegyptus} 9 (1928) 72–3, 90–91, and 95.
\textsuperscript{23} Gilliam, \textit{op.cit.} 175–76 (\textit{=P.Dura 8a}).