

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.¹ 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.² 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:

-- Σ νέρθεν | --

[νίκαις] | 'Ελλαδικῆσιν ἔην, μ[έγα κῦδος ἐνεγκών], |
αἰὲν δ' ἵπποβότων ἄστε' [ἰδὼν ξε|νικῶν.
5 Μυρ[α]μέν<η> δ' ἀλόχ[ω παρέθαψε || πολ]ύ<κ>ρα<γ>ον (?) ἦτορ
'Ιούνιος, εὐ[χαριν ὅς | δῶ]κεν ἐλευθερίην,
'Ιούνιος Ἡδα[- |ο]ς, πανυπέρτατος αὐτὸς ἔπαρχ[ος]
[Κελετῶν (?) | οὐε]τρ[α]νῶν, εἰλης δε<σ>πόσυνος,
10 [ὅς -| -]ΩΝ Φ[...έ]λέαιρε τεῆς ||[ἐπὶ μοίρας]
- α ἄμφω σει.|- -ΛΩΣ..|- -ΕΛΑ..

NOTES. Breccia reported that it was yellow limestone of very fine grain, broken and splintered, 0.41m. high and 0.44m. wide. 1 <ε>νερθεν Peek. 2 ἔην μ[έγα πατριδι κῦδος] Crönert. 3-4 Crönert suggested [ἰδ' Ἴταλικῶν. 4 ΜΥΙ[.]ΜΕΝΩ stone: μυρ[α]μέν<η> Peek. 5 YEPATON stone. 6-7 Peek hesitantly suggested Ἡ<λ>ά[σιο]ς and referred to P.Oxy. VI.926, line 7, but Crönert thought of <Σ>ηδά[τιο]ς. 8 ΔΕΕΠΟΣΥΝΟΣ stone: δε<σ>πόσυνος Crönert, δ'ε<ι>πόσυνος Peek.

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, "Alessandrie(?)." ² *Hermes* 66 (1931) 325-27, no. 9. He did not include it in his *Griechische Vers-Inschriften*, I: *Grab-Epigramme* (Berlin 1955).

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 pentameters 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 examined 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.³ In one of his notebooks (numbered 2c, page 71) there is a copy of our epitaph. It reads as follows:

	ΣΝΕΡΘΕΝ
	ΕΛΛΑΔΙΚΗΣΙΝΕΗΝΜ
	ΑΙΕΝΔΙΠΠΟΒΟΤΩΝΑΣΙΕ
	ΚΩΝ ΜΥΙ[.]ΜΕΝΩΔΑΛΟΧ
5	ΥΗΡΑΤΟΝΗΤΟΡ ΙΟΥΝΙΟΣΕΥ
	ΚΕΝΙΕΛΕΥΘΕΡΙΗΝ ΙΟΥΝΙΟΣΗΔΑ
	ΣΤΙΑΝΥΠΕΡΤΑΤΟΣΑΥΤΟΣΠΑΡΧ
	ΤΡΑΝΩΝΕΝΙ[.]ΛΗΣΔΕΣΠΟΣΥΝΟΣ
	ΩΝ ΑΛΛΑΜΦΩΕΛΕΑΙΡΕΤΕΗΣ
10	ΕΥΘΕΣΙΤΑΙΗΣ ΑΜΦΩΣΕΙ
	ΙΣΟΥΝΕΚΑΠΑΡΒΕΒΑΩΣ
	ΣΑΡΑΙΟΝΟΔΟΙΠΟΡΕΔΑ
	! ΗΘΕΜΙΣΕΥΣΕΒΙΗΣ
	ΝΟΙΣ ΚΕΙΡΑΣΘΑΙ
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 Capart, *Travels in Egypt: Letters of Charles Edwin Wilbour* (Brooklyn Museum 1936).

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.

[-----]
 [-----]s νέρθεν ε[-----]
 [-----]| 'Ελλαδικῆσιν ἔην μ[-----]
 αἰὲν δ' ἵπποβότων ἄστε' [ιδῶν ξε|νι]κῶν.
 5 μυρ[α]μένω δ' ἄλοχ[ον θάλπειν (?)]| πολ]υήρατον ἦτορ
 Ἴούνιος, εὖ[χαριν ὄς | δῶ]κεν ἐλευθερίην,
 Ἴούνιος ΗΔΑ[---|·]Σ, πανυπέρτατος αὐτὸς ἔπαρχ[ος]
 [οὐε]τρανῶν εἴλης δεσπόσυνος |[Κελτ]ῶν.
 10 ἀλλ' ἄμφω ἐλέαιρ' ἐτεῆς |[ὑπὸ κ]εύθεσι <γ>αίης
 ἄμφω ΣΕΙ[---|---]ΙΣ οὐνεκα παρβεβαῶς |
 [---]ΣΑΡΑΙΟΝ, ὁδοιπόρε, δά|[κρυα λείβε]ι,
 ἦ θέμις εὐσεβίης |[οὐνεκεν ἐσσομέ(?)]νοις
 15 κείρασθαί |[τε κόμη]ν βαλέειν τ' ἀπὸ δάκρυ |[παρειῶν]
 [-----]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 ταπεινοῖς ἐδάφεισι καὶ κοίλοις οὖσα εὐδαίμων σφόδρα ἐστὶ καὶ πάμφορος πλὴν ἐλαίας· εἰ δὲ καὶ φύεται που, ἀλιπῆς τέ ἐστὶ καὶ ξηρά· ἵππόβοτος δὲ καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶ διαφερόντως καὶ ἡ Ἀρμενία, καλεῖται δὲ τις καὶ λειμῶν Ἴππόβοτος, ὃν καὶ διεξίσαισι οἱ ἐκ τῆς Περσίδος καὶ Βαβυλῶνος εἰς Κασπίους πύλας ὁδεύοντες, ἐν ἣ ἑνὶ πεντέ μυριάδας ἵππων θηλείων νέμεσθαί φασιν ἐπὶ τῶν Περσῶν, εἶναι δὲ τὰς ἀγέλας ταύτας βασιλικὰς. τοὺς δὲ Νησαίους ἵππους, οἷς ἐχρῶντο οἱ βασιλεῖς ἀρίστοις οὖσι καὶ μεγίστοις, οἱ μὲν ἐνθένδε λέγουσι τὸ γένος, οἱ δ' ἐξ Ἀρμενίας· ἰδιόμορφοι δὲ εἰσιν, ὥσπερ καὶ οἱ Παρθικοὶ λεγόμενοι νῦν παρὰ τοὺς Ἑλλαδικούς καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους τοὺς παρ' ἡμῖν.

From this passage we see that the area below the Caspian Gates was good “horse pasturing” country and that the Nesaeian 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.⁴ Does our adjective *Ἑλλαδικῆσιν* 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 *Μυρ[α]μέν<η>*. But the frequent use of *μύρομαι* 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 *ἄλοχ[ον]*. If true, these two lines might be restored in quite a different way:

μυρ[α]μένω δ' ἄλοχ[ον] — τὴν δεῖνα — πολ]υήρατον ἦτορ
Ἰούνιος εὐ[γνώμων δῶ]κεν ἐλευθερίην
κτλ.

The phrase *πολ]υήρατον ἦτορ* would then be an Accusative of Respect with *μυρ[α]μένω* 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 *Ἰούνιος* one expects a *cognomen*, and therefore *<Σ>ηδά[τι|ο]ς* 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[ῖ|ο]ς* and argues

⁴ For a good orientation on horses and horse breeding in antiquity see Steier in *RE s.v. Pferd*, cols. 1430–44, especially cols. 1439–41 for the various types of horses and the countries that produce them. Cf. T. R. S. Broughton, *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome IV* (Baltimore 1938) Part IV, “Roman Asia,” pp. 617–18; M. I. Rostovtzeff, *SEHRE II*² (Oxford 1957) 704–705, n.40. For new papyrological texts relating to cavalry mounts see J. F. Gilliam in *Yale Classical Studies* 11 (1950) 171–209 (cf. *The Excavations at Dura-Europus, Final Report V, Part I: The Parchments and Papyri* [New Haven 1959] 217–21 and 296–302), whose text without commentary has been reproduced by R. Cavenaile, *Corpus Papyrorum Latinarum* (Wiesbaden 1958) nos. 325 and 330.

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 *ΕΠΑΡΧ*[- - 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.

LINES 8-9. Peek was rightly dissatisfied with his metrical arrangement of this line.⁵ His mistake was in assuming that [*Κελτῶν*] should come at the beginning of the line. It fits in very well at the end with the extant --]ΩΝ. This allows the pause to fall after *εἰλης*.

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 --]TPANΩΝ also appears to be his mistake, but uncorrected.

LINES 9-10. The restoration of the formulaic [*ὑπὸ κ*]εὔθεισι <*γ*>αίης was suggested to me by Professor James H. Oliver, who did not hesitate to change *ΤΑΙΗΣ* to *ΓΑΙΗΣ*. I am convinced that this is right despite the concomitant difficulty with *ΤΕΗΣ*. Oliver then suggested ἀλλ' ἄμφω ἐλέαυρ' ἐτεῆς [*ὑπὸ κ*]εὔθεισι <*γ*>αίης and translates, "But pity them both beneath the depths of the primeval earth." For support he compares Aeschylus, *Eumenides* 1036: γᾶς ὑπὸ κεύθεισιν ὠγγύιοισιν. It is a rather bold use of ἐτεός, but certainly possible. Since "in the depths of your earth" appears wrong, I accept Oliver's suggestion.

The second word of the phrase ἄμφω σει[- - - might be a verb in the imperative mood to balance the similar phrase in the previous line, but I cannot find one that fits the required sense (mourn, pity, weep for, etc.) and begins with σει[- - -. However, it is also possible that it is a noun in the Genitive governed by οὔνεκα.

LINE 11. The verb *παραβαίνω* frequently has the meaning "stand beside" in the perfect tense, and it is, of course, very common for sepulchral inscriptions to ask the wayfarer to stop and examine the tombstone, to read the story of the deceased's life, and to pity him.⁶

LINE 12. I cannot find a satisfactory noun ending in --]ΣΑΡΑΙΟΝ.

LINES 13-14. For the Dative and infinitive with *θέμις* see W. Peek, *Griechische Vers-Inschriften* no. 1706, line 1 (=IG II² 11974): [*π*]άντων,

⁵ He says, *op.cit.* 327: "Der Ablauf des Pentameters verlangt die Pause vor *εἰλης* δ' *εἰπτόσυνος* (substantivisch, oder ein Substantiv stand in nächster Vers), nicht eben elegant."

⁶ See Richmond Lattimore, *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs* [Illinois Studies in Language and Literature XXVIII, nos. 1-2] (Urbana 1942) 230-34.

ὦν θέμις ἐστὶ τυχεῖν εὐδαίμοσι θνητοῖς, κτλ. What is needed in line 14 apparently is a noun or participle meaning men, mortals, or posterity in general.

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.⁷ Nevertheless the pulling or the cutting of the hair as an act of mourning is not too common in the epitaphs.⁸ 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.⁹

II

The *ala veterana Gallica* may not have arrived in Egypt until the second century, perhaps being transferred there from the Syrian army.¹⁰ 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.¹¹ Its main camp in the last quarter of the second century, and probably earlier as well, was in Alexandria.¹² 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-

⁷ M. P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion I*² (München 1955) 136–39, 180–81 with bibliography.

⁸ Lattimore, *op.cit.* 202–203. To his material add IG XIV.1863 (=Peek no. 1981, lines 5–6).

⁹ A. E. R. Boak in *TAPA* 68 (1937) 218. The text is given also in *P.Mich.* V. 243, lines 9–10.

¹⁰ See C. Cichorius in *RE s.v. ALA*, col. 1245; J. Lesquier, *L'Armée romaine d'Égypte d'Auguste à Dioclétien* [Mémoires publiés par les Membres de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale du Caire XLI] (Cairo 1918) 76–78; T. Mommsen and H. Nesselhauf, *CIL XVI*, no. 3; W. Wagner, *Die Dislokation der römischen Auxiliarformationen in den Provinzen Noricum, Pannonien, Moesien und Dakien von Augustus bis Gallienus* (Berlin 1938) 42. On the connection with the *ala veterana Gallorum et Thracum* see S. Lambrino, *Revue de Philologie*, Ser. III, 5 (1931) 256ff. and K. Kraft, *Zur Rekrutierung der Alen und Kohorten an Rhein und Donau* [Diss. Bern. I, fasc. 3] (Bern 1951) 28.

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 *ἐλευθερίη* and the reasonable restoration of *[δῶ]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 *tribunus militum* not because he had slaves with him but because he had used a ship to transport them instead of his soldiers.¹³ In the first century Tacitus writes as if the presence of slaves in the army was very common.¹⁴ And for the Principate in general there are scores of examples, mostly epigraphical.¹⁵ 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.¹⁶

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

¹⁴ Speaking of Vitellius in *Hist.* 2.87, Tacitus says: *sexaginta milia armatorum sequebantur, licentia corrupta; calorum numerus 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 prétoriennes* (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 Tiridaten gesti dispensatorem, quem Nero III [CXXX] manumisit. sed hoc pretium belli, non hominis, fuit, . . .* One would like to know more of this dispenser.

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.¹⁷ 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*.¹⁸ And in the *alae* themselves we have evidence of a *strator* on duty with the *praefectus*, but presumably he was drawn from the ranks.¹⁹ 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.²⁰ 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.²¹

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 Λιβύη*. 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 *trans erar[.]m equatum*.²² Then an inscription from Termessus in Pisidia of A.D. 140/45 (*SEG VI.628=TAM III.52*) mentions an ἀρχιστράτωρ attached to the staff of the *praefectus Aegypti*. And from Dura a papyrus mentions the *probatio* of a military horse by the governor of Coele Syria.²³ 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 ἀρχιστράτωρ. 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 *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 *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.

THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT BUFFALO

November, 1964

²² Cf. G. Cantacuzène in *Aegyptus* 9 (1928) 72-3, 90-91, and 95.

²³ Gilliam, *op.cit.* 175-76 (=P.Dura 8a).