

# A NEW MILITARY STRENGTH REPORT ON PAPYRUS

By J. D. THOMAS and R. W. DAVIES

(Plate VIII)

## I. INTRODUCTION<sup>1</sup>

The document which forms the subject of this article is from the collection of papyri in the Brooklyn Museum, New York. It is published here by kind permission of the Museum authorities in advance of its appearance as no. 24 in the Catalogue of Brooklyn Museum Papyri, which is being prepared by Dr. John Shelton. We are very grateful to Dr. Shelton for drawing our attention to this papyrus and for generously allowing us, because of its exceptional importance, to publish it separately in this article.

The papyrus contains a Latin document relating to a unit of the Roman army stationed in Egypt. It is written in three columns on the recto of a piece of papyrus measuring approximately 27 × 18 cm. The verso, which according to Dr. Shelton contains a Greek private letter, has no apparent connection. Although the papyrus shows damage on all four sides, it is probable that the right-hand edge is preserved in lines 12 f. of the third column (see the notes ad loc.). As it can be demonstrated that not much is lost at the left of the first column, what survives is likely to be the greater part of the original width. All three columns are incomplete at both top and bottom, and the loss here is much harder to estimate. Format and date are discussed in detail in section IV. It is here sufficient to say that it belongs in or near the year A.D. 215, and that in content it closely resembles two known papyri classed as *pridianas*, which have recently been re-edited as *RMR* 63 and 64.

The writing is typical of the period, and neither the letter-forms nor the use of abbreviations calls for special comment.<sup>2</sup> As indicated in the transcript, medial point is used regularly after *aeg* at the end of entries in the first two columns, but appears otherwise only between *leg* and *II* in I 6. The right-sloping script is a good, clear example of the type regularly used at this date for everyday documents, a type to which the label 'cursive' is usually applied.<sup>3</sup> Nowhere does the writer use capital script for headings, as in the two comparable *pridianas*, but lines 7, 10 and 13 of the second column are made to stand out by being written in slightly enlarged letters. On the other hand the writer uses a generous layout, indenting those entries which stretch over more than one line, often considerably, and setting out his numerals in separate columns at the right. For most of the entries in the third column and some in the second (the first is not extant at the relevant points) he employs short, thick lines as checkmarks; these are represented by horizontal strokes in the transcript, though, as the photograph shows, they in fact slant upwards slightly to the right.

In preparing this text for publication I have not had access to the original, but have worked from the infra-red photograph reproduced in Plate VIII. This has given rise to three difficulties in particular: (1) it is often impossible to be sure whether dark marks visible on the photograph are in reality ink; (2) some fragments of the papyrus have not been correctly placed on the photograph (as is indicated where appropriate in the notes) nor is the papyrus everywhere properly flattened out; (3) it will be observed that the transcript ignores a good deal of ink which is visible in the second and third columns; these marks have every appearance of being writing but are certainly not Latin; Dr. Shelton points out that, if viewed through a mirror, they resemble Greek characters, and what seems to

<sup>1</sup> Sections I and II are by Thomas, IV and V by Davies; we are jointly responsible for III. Abbreviations follow the usual patterns with the following exceptions:

Davies = R. W. Davies, 'The Daily Life of the Roman Soldier under the Principate', *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II. 1 (1974), 299-338.

Lesquier = J. Lesquier, *L'Armée romaine d'Égypte d'Auguste à Dioclétien* (1918).

RMR = R. O. Fink, *Roman Military Records on Papyrus* (1971).

<sup>2</sup> The closest parallels I have noted in R. Seider, *Paläographie der lateinischen Papyri* I (1972) are both from Dura: nos. 39 (post 217) and 46 (c. 233); for Egypt cf. no. 42 (237). Also very similar are the few lines in Latin in *P. Flor.* 278 (*P. Flor.* II, pp. 267-77), likewise early third century.

<sup>3</sup> The description of such hands in J. Mallon, *Paléographie romaine* (1952), para. 86 as 'l'écriture commune classique' seems to me less misleading.

have happened is that a scribe who had just written a Greek document put it down, with what seems to us like deliberate perversity, face downwards on the Latin document while the ink was still wet. Nevertheless, the photograph is adequate, I believe, to enable a reliable reading to be made for by far the greater part of the document, and this fact, together with the undoubted importance of the text, seems to us sufficient to make publication of the text in its present form justifiable and desirable.<sup>4</sup>

## II. TEXT AND TRANSLATION

Text:

Col. I

				] aq̄cesser[un]t					
				coh I] apamenor	7			i	
				a]ntoninian[a]e					
5				ab] aurelio septim[io] heraclito					
				] praef aeg					
				] ex militib[us] leg. II traian	7			i	
				a]ntoninian[a]e fortis					
				a]b eod[em] praef] aeg					
				leg II t]ra	mil			i	
10				antoninianae] fortis					
				ab eodem pr]aef aeg					
				]. . a. [ mil]				ii	
				]. a ab[ eodem					
				] praef aeg [					
15				] eadem ex n equitum [mi]				i	
				ab e]odem praef aeg					
				]mquimil p. . g[					
				]c . [					

Col. II

				d[at]i in classe[m] . . g . . [ . . . ] . [ ] . . . [					
(20)				ab eodem praef [aeg					
				— dimissus causar<i>e mil				i	
				ab eodem praef aeg					
5				— θ mil				yii	
				in is eq i dromadar i					
(25)				summa qui decesserunt mil xxx					
				in is 7 ii eq xi					
				dromadar i					
10				reliq[ui] n p mil cccclvii					
				in is 7 vi dec iv eq c					
(30)				drom xiii					
				absunt in choram mil cxxvi					
				ins. [ ] [[dec]] eq x[.]					
15				[ ] . . φ . . [					

<sup>4</sup> Since the above was written Dr. Alan Bowman has visited the Brooklyn Museum, rearranged the fragments of the papyrus, and ensured that it was more adequately flattened out. As a result I have been supplied by the Museum with a second photograph which, although inferior in quality to the first (Pl.

viii), has helped in places to overcome the difficulties listed as (1) and (2) above, and this is indicated where appropriate in the notes. I am very grateful to Dr. Bowman for having taken this trouble on my behalf, and to Dr. John Rea for checking my transcript.

## Col. III

		].[		
(35)		item ad commoda prin[		
		copto ad pecunia. .natiui[.] .c. . .io[		
		— insecutionem eius	mil	[
	5	— cum eo ab adiutorio	mil	[
		in is eq v		
(40)		— copto cum epist[u]lis	mil	[
		— caene ad çoriasç. . .equend	eq	[
		— item principales	mil	[
	10	— officio epistrategi theb. . .os	mi	[
		in is eq ii		
(45)		item det[e]ntus est ab . . [ ]	mil	i
		marco praef alae he. . .		
		partes epistrategiae		
	15	— n̄iciu' ad epistulas perff[ere]ndas	m	iv
		— summissi et nondum [ . . . ].ersi	m	iv
(50)		— inferiore [c]hōra ab . . n. . .io		
		mar[ . . . . . ] . . . [		

*Translation:*

Col. I		] have been added to the strength		
		promoted(?) from . . . . . cohorts I] Apamenorum	centurion	1
		Antoniniana		
		by] Aurelius Septimius Heraclitus		
		Prefect of Egypt		
		] from the soldiers of legio II Traiana	centurion	1
		Antoniniana Fortis		
		by the same [Prefect of] Egypt		
		from the soldiers of (?) legio II] Traiana	soldier	1
		Antoniniana] Fortis		
		by the same] Prefect of Egypt		
		transferred from cohorts I] Apamenorum (?)	soldiers	2(?)
		Antoniniana] by [the same		
		Prefect of Egypt		
		]from the same cohorts (?) from the numerus (?) of cavalrymen	soldier	1
		by] the same Prefect of Egypt		
Col. II		posted to the Classis. . . . .		
		by the same Prefect [of Egypt		
		invalided out	soldier	1
		by the same Prefect of Egypt		
		killed	soldiers	7
		among them cavalryman 1 camel-rider 1		
		total of those who have permanently left the strength	soldiers	30
		among them centurions 2 cavalrymen 11		
		camel-rider 1		
		remainder, net number	soldiers	457
		among them centurions 6 decurions 4 cavalrymen 100		
		camel-riders 13		
		there are temporarily absent in the chora	soldiers	126
		among them (?) centurions (?) [ ] [[decurions]] cavalrymen. . .		

Col. III	likewise for emoluments NCO's (?) [	
	Coptos for . . . . . of money . . . . .	
	as escort to him (?)	soldiers [
	with him (?) from service (?)	soldiers [
	among them cavalrymen 5	
	Coptos with letters	soldiers [
	Caene to get hides (?)	cavalrymen [
	likewise NCO's	soldiers [
	office of the Epistrategus of the Thebaid	soldiers [
	among them cavalrymen 2	
	likewise, has been detained by [ ]	soldier 1
	Marcus Prefect of Ala Herculiana (?)	
	Acting-Epistrategus (?)	
	Niciu to carry letters	soldiers 4
	relieved and not yet returned	soldiers 4
	from the Lower Country by . . . . .	

## III. COMMENTARY

I 1 *accesser[un]t*: although only the feet of the letters survive, the reading is very good, and as the Prefect's name is given in full in line 4, whereas elsewhere he appears as *idem*, we ought to read part of a heading; therefore *accesserunt* may be taken as virtually certain. The lacuna before it presumably contained the date from which (*post*) the accessions were recorded (cf. *RMR* 63 i, 29; 64 i, 19).

2 *coh I apamenor*: the lacuna before this was probably filled by *factus ex* and the rank the new centurion held in his former cohort (cf. *RMR* 64 i, 20; 20 *passim*). According to the *Notitia* the cohort was then stationed at Silsilis under the Dux Thebaidos (Lesquier, 85).

3-5: other than the restorations given, there was probably nothing lost in these lines, which were presumably indented.

4 *heraclito*: all the dotted letters are difficult readings, but given the names Aurelius Septimius and the use of *Antoniniana* the reading is inescapable. On this Prefect see below, pp. 57, 60.

6-8: probably *factus* is again to be supplied in line 6 and nothing else is lost in the other lines. The final *us* of *militib[us]* was perhaps not written. The use of the phrase *ex militibus* is notable, as normally the previous unit or status of the man was given without the use of such a noun; presumably here it means that he is the first of several men joining the cohort by transfer from the legion, rather than that he was an other rank (*gregalis*).

7 *fortis*: both dotted letters are made rather oddly, but *fortis* must have been intended.

9-11: As *fortis* is not part of the title of any auxiliary unit, this man also must have been transferred from the legion, hence the restorations given in lines 9-10; *tra* is a difficult reading, but *tra]ia* is even less likely. Before *leg* we should presumably supply *ex militibus* (no doubt abbreviated) to account for the genitive. A verb such as *datus*, *acceptus*, or *translatus* will have preceded; exigencies of spacing suggest the first and similarly rule out *item*. This man is not an officer nor is he described as a *principalis* and so his transfer is presumably *militiae mutatio* (cf. *RMR* 47 ii, 21-2; 64 ii, 13; *Dig.* 49, 16, 3, 1).

12-14: among known Egyptian units a further reference to the Apameni would best fit the traces surviving in line 12, reading *apam[ mi]l*; if so, we must read in the next line *antoninia]na*, which is difficult but not impossible. The new photograph suggests that the second apparent stroke in the numeral is not ink, i.e. that here also we may have reference to only a single transfer. We may tentatively restore along the lines *translati/translatus ex cohorte I Apamenorum Antoniniana*; *translatus* seems to be the term used for the transfer of other ranks (*RMR* p. 553 s.v.).

13-18: we have assumed that the fragment containing the righthand part of these lines needs to be placed one line lower in relation to the lefthand part than it appears on the photograph. This fits very well in line 16 but gives rise to problems in lines 15, 17 and 18, as indicated below, and the possibility should be envisaged that this fragment does not belong here at all.

15 *eadem* is not a certain reading but it fits well if the previous entry is to a cohort as suggested. In view of the shortness of the entry, it was probably preceded by *item ex coh(orte)*. If the detached fragments are to be placed close to one another at this point (cf. the next note), only one letter can have stood between *ex* and *equitum*; though *c* or *p* looks easiest palaeographically, a broken *n* is possible, and this has been preferred because of the apparent parallel from Dura (*RMR* 62, 1), which shows that the mounted section of an equitate cohort could be described as *n(umerus) eq(uitum)*. This man

must therefore have been a cavalryman, and it is perhaps worth noting that a cavalryman is not normally described as *miles*; although *l* is broken, the reading *mi]l* is certain and *e]q* impossible.

17: the solution to this line escapes us. The first letter is almost certainly *a* or *m* (*dro]m* is a possibility). The reading after *qu* depends on how closely the two fragments should be placed: *quimil* is based on the supposition that the last stroke on the lefthand fragment is the beginning of the *m* which ends in the righthand fragment; but if the space were slightly greater, the reading would be *quenil*. *quimil* recalls the *q(ui) m(ilitare) c(oe)pit* abbreviation, which occurs immediately before the beginning of the Moesian and in the introduction of the Egyptian *pridiana*; unfortunately, while the letter after *mil* could well be *c*, *coepit* as a whole cannot be read and does not make sense in this position. After *mil* we have considered *prob(ati)* but that seems to be used of *tirones*, not *militēs* (*RMR*, p. 549 s.v.; *Acta Arch. Acad. Scien. Hung.* forthcoming) and, more importantly, the fourth letter cannot be *b*. This letter is very much like *g*, and *prog[* would be a good reading. Perhaps we should supply *prog(ressi)*, taking it as a synonym for *promoti* (e.g. *CIL* ix, 1609) in the sense 'promoted', though this is not attested in military papyri. If these men were promoted from outside the cohort, they could only come from the fleet or a *numerus*. However, the Egyptian *pridianum* records under accessions infantrymen upgraded to be cavalrymen (*RMR* 64 ii, 32; cf. 65, 7; 40 ii, 14); conceivably *mil(itēs) prog(ressi equites)* could be the equivalent of *facti equites*; they might even be men upgraded to *dromadarii*; perhaps other ranks of the cohort upgraded to be *principales* or even officers. Another remote possibility is *pro g[radu*. Perhaps note the contemporary *gradum promotionis* (*ILS* 7178); cf. also *per (incrementa) gradus militiae* (*ILS* 2166) and *p(ro) p(ro)cessu* (*ILS* 2415 + add. and *ILS* 2354 + add.).

18: this line cannot be part of the normal *ab eodem praef aeg* to be expected at the end of each entry.

II 1: This and the next two entries involve permanent losses.

For *d[at]i* it would be equally possible to read *d[atu]s*. *In classem* is quite a good reading and virtually guaranteed by the parallel in *RMR* 63 ii, 4. The rest of the line is wholly uncertain. In view of the probable *g*, *a[u]g* must be accounted a possibility; one would expect it to be followed by *alexandrinam* but there is a formidable palaeographical difficulty in reading that here: elsewhere in this papyrus *l* invariably has a diagonal tail descending well below the line and this ought to be visible. *syriacam* might suit the exiguous traces, but according to Starr this fleet is not attested as *Augusta*. We have also considered *aeg*, just possible palaeographically, but there is no evidence that the Alexandrine fleet was ever called *aegyptiaca*. The line should end with *mil* and a numeral, but again the *l* of *mil* should be visible. Possibly stripping of the surface, which in the next line has removed *aeg*, is responsible for its absence. Alternatively, the lacuna could have contained the name of the vessel.

3-4: as *dimissus* is much to be preferred as a reading to *dimissi*, the numeral at the right must be *i* and other apparent ink traces have been ignored. The scribe cannot have written *causarie* correctly, but this is not the only place at which he makes an error (cf. II 14, III 8 and 10) and there is no real doubt that he intended this word. To be invalidated out was one of the few ways a soldier could be discharged (*Saalburg-Jahrb.* xxvii (1970), 100; cf. *RMR* 9, 23 with *JRS* LXII (1972), 191). This appears to be the first certain example in papyri.

Note the first of an intermittent usage of checkmarks.

5 θ: this symbol and the term *thetati* are well attested (*RMR* pp. 13, 553 and 559 s.v.; cf. *JRS* XLII (1952), 56-62); the implication is often of death in action. This was also the last entry in this section in the Moesian *pridianum* (*RMR* 63 ii, 11).

vii: the numeral is almost certain.

7: There is a tear along the line (no doubt along an ancient fold) and the top and bottom halves of the letters are not correctly aligned. If the top is visualized as moved slightly to the left in respect to the bottom, the whole reading is clear.

*decesserunt*: *decedere* is the technical term for permanent losses (*RMR* 63 ii, 3 and 12).

xxx: marks after this, which might be read as *ii*, are almost certainly better taken as offset.

10 n p: expand *n(umero) p(uro)* (cf. *RMR* 63 ii, 14).

ccccvii: although the dotted figures are all uncertain, the number as a whole is hardly open to doubt.

13-15: *absunt in choram* is all written in slightly enlarged letters, in particular the *h* of *chora* is written in a majuscule form not a minuscule as elsewhere. Thus the phrase appears to be used as a heading, which raises a problem. In the Moesian *pridianum*, *absentes* appears as a heading, followed by the individual entries in this section, ending with a total. Here we appear to have a conflation of the heading *absunt* (*abesse* is the technical term for a temporary absence, cf. *RMR*, p. 532 s.v.) and the first entry of men *absunt*, namely those *in choram*. *Chora* ought to be used in its technical sense of Egypt outside the Greek cities, or the country of Egypt as opposed to Alexandria. Another possible interpretation we have considered is that *absunt in choram* is contrasted with another heading for men absent elsewhere (e.g. in Alexandria or another province), just as the Moesian *pridianum* divides men

absent into those outside and inside the province (*RMR* 63 ii, 17, 24 and 38); but in this case it is irregular for it to be followed by a total.

The understanding of line 13 depends partly on how we understand the next line. The reading at the start appears to be *insu*l or *insq*l, but what is written after *ins* could be taken as part of the centurial sign, the rest of which is lost in the lacuna. Thus we could correct to *in* <*i*>*s* 7[ etc., giving a breakdown of personnel here as in lines 8 and 11 above; in which case *dromadarii* should be mentioned in line 15, but it does not seem possible to fit this to the traces. If this is right, we could suppose that the writer put first 7, *dec* and *eq* in line 14, afterwards filling in the numbers and deleting *dec* when he realized there were no decurions in this entry. This might explain why *eq* and the numeral come at the extreme right, under the numeral in the preceding line and not inset as elsewhere in a breakdown. Alternatively, it is perhaps possible that line 13 recorded the absence of 126 infantrymen in the *chora* and that line 14, wrongly indented, recorded the absence of 10 + cavalrymen (correctly entered in the right margin) at some place or assignment *in s-* (perhaps even *insu*[*la*]), and that the clerk wrongly wrote *dec* and deleted it.

The detachment of legionaries and auxiliaries to the countryside is well attested (Davies, 321–3); what is very notable here is that 126 of 457 men available were on this duty, i.e. 27 per cent of the current strength of the cohort. The number of *equites* cannot be established with certainty: the last figure might be *v*, if what is to be seen underneath is a checkmark from the third column (cf. III 17), but whether one or two letters are lost in the lacuna is uncertain.

III 1–18: on the nature of these entries see p. 59.

2 *item*: this shows that this entry was similar to the lost preceding one.

*ad commoda prin*[ : the fragment at the top right on the plate should be set lower so as to join the main fragment in line 7; this has been done in the new photograph, but it is still not clear how closely the two fragments join in this line. Consequently what has been taken as the second part of *d* in *commoda* might conceivably be the *a*, which would then be followed by a second *a*. The letter before the break could as easily be *m* as *n*. Thus *commoda* might be followed by *aprin*[ or *aprim*[ (but *april*[ is impossible) or by *prin*[ or *prim*[. *Prim*[ suggests *prim*[*a* as a possibility, which would presumably be the equivalent of the numeral used with *stipendium* in pay documents (*RMR* 68–70 *passim*). *Commoda* (or *chommoda* according to Arrius quoted in Catullus 84) meaning ‘emoluments’ (cf. Vegetius 2, 21; *OLD* 367 s.v. 4) is attested here for the first time in a military papyrus, though it is found of veterans in, e.g., *BGU* 628 v, ii, 17 = *CPL* 103; Cicero, *Epist. ad fam.* 11, 2, 3; Suetonius, *Nero* 32. If *prin*[ is the right reading, it might be a noun or gerundive depending on *commoda*, but is more probably *prin*[*cipales* (cf. line 9), followed by *mil* and a numeral; if so, *principales* was almost certainly abbreviated.

3–4: the small detached fragment to be seen at the foot of this column in the photograph fits at the right of these lines forming the top half of *mil*.

*copto*: on the plate *kopto* looks a more acceptable reading, but the new photograph suggests that *copto* is just possible and this is to be preferred in view of lines 7 and 8. Coptos was always an important military base in Upper Egypt and was now the base of the *ala Herculiana* (Lesquier, 238, 408–9).

*ad pecunia . . natiui*[.].*c. . . ip*[ : both reading and interpretation are uncertain and all we can be sure of is that the duty involved the collection of money. After *pecunia* the adjoining fragment seems to begin with an *e*, then an uncertain letter followed by *nati*; after this *ui* is the best reading, though *q* is possible. *natiui* puts one in mind of *donatiui*, but although the letter before *nati* could be *o*, there would seem to be no room for *d*, and we are hardly justified in correcting to *pecuniae* <*d*>*onatiui*. To suppose *natiui* a reference to the emperor’s or the unit’s birthday (*nativum* = *natale*, cf. *P. Beatty Panop.* 2, 164 etc.; Du Cange 5, 574 s.v.; *ILS* 9125–31) leaves the letter between *pecuniae* and *natiui* unexplained. After this one might read *a*]ceptio[nem or *su*]ceptio[nem, but the palaeographical support is frail and the run of the Latin would seem to require *et* to follow, joining this entry to the next line, or *mil* and a numeral; there seems to be insufficient room for either of these possibilities. This problem would be eased if we could read *insecutionemque* in the next line; but *que* has only a superficial attraction and *eius* is much to be preferred. It would seem probable that these two lines refer to a single entry, with *mil* written at the end of the entry and not at the end of the first line of an entry as is the clerk’s usual practice. The absence of a checkmark in line 3 supports this, but against it is the fact that line 4 has not been indented as we should expect. Other possibilities we have considered in line 3 are *pecuniae ration*], *pecuniae op*nion], and, at the right, a rank other than *mil*; nothing suitable appears palaeographically possible, with the exception of *d*]eç after *natiui*, but what follows cannot be read as a numeral.

4 *insecutionem eius*: *insecutio* is not otherwise attested in a military papyrus and *TLL* records no comparable use. It often means ‘following’, perhaps in a hostile sense (cf. *insequor*). Here it may simply be the equivalent of *prosecutio* used of military escorting (*RMR*, p. 549 s.v.; Davies, 328). Troops were often used to convoy money (*Historia* xvi (1967), 115–18). *Eius* could refer to *pecunia* or to the officer or goods mentioned earlier.

5: although *adiutor* as a military rank meaning an assistant to an official is well attested (*RMR* pp. 507, 533 s.v.), this is the first appearance of *adiutorium* in a military papyrus, and at least one infantryman and five cavalymen were involved. The lexica give *adiutorium* only in the meaning 'help' or 'service'; if so, it may be the equivalent of *ministerium* (Davies, 314). *Cum eo* would then connect this line with what has gone before, *eo* referring to the same man or thing as *eius* in line 4.

Alternatively, if *cum eo ab* has no connection with what has gone before, it could perhaps be translated 'with the man from', possibly comparing *RMR* 47 ii, 8 *cum eis ad praet praes*. But if so, *adiutorium* would presumably have to be taken as 'the office of the *adiutor*', which would be unparalleled (Pflaum, *Carrières*, 1083, 1086, attests an *adiutor* to the *praefectus Aegypti* and the *rationalis Aegypti*).

7 *cum epist[u]lis*: for letters, see III 15; taking letters was a common military duty (Davies, 325).

8 *Caene*: a place in the Lower Thebaid, renamed Maximianopolis in the early fourth century, and usually identified with modern Keneh; see Skeat in *P. Beatty Panop.* 2, 153. The statement of Lesquier, 405 that it was in the Arsinoite nome is incorrect.

*ad çoriaşç. . equend*: after *ad* the next letter could equally well be *p*; a reference to hides would be excellent sense, but in order to read this it would appear that we must take *corias* as an error for *coria*. What follows must then be a gerundive of a compound of *sequor*, but whether from *consequor*, *persequor* or *prosequor* is unclear. *Consequor* gives the most likely sense, reading *ad çoria{s} çonsequend(a)*. If the above suggestion is right, the entry records that one or more cavalymen were assigned to collecting hides *ad usus militares*, a well-attested task in Egypt (Davies, 316); cf. perhaps *BGU* 655 of A.D. 215.

9 *item*: this shows that various NCO's were similarly involved in the mission at Caene. Although the Greek form appears in a private letter of A.D. 108 (*P.Mich.* 465, 16), this is the earliest attested use of *principalis* in a military papyrus. Unlike the Dura records and the Moesian *pridianum* (but like the Egyptian one) our document does not include the number of such NCO's (*duplicarii* and *sesquuplicarii*) in the breakdowns.

10 *thēb. . oş*: sufficient of this word can be read for us to be sure that, with *epistrategi* preceding, the scribe intended *thebaidos*, but he seems not to have written this; perhaps read *thēbai<d>os*. Two cavalymen and at least one infantryman were at the *officium* of the *epistrategus* of the Thebaid. Troops are occasionally attested assigned to duty with the *epistrategus* (Davies, 328); this is the first instance of soldiers seconded for clerical work at his *officium*, though such deployment is known for other officials (Davies, 312–14). The *officium* was probably at Ptolemais.

12–14: again a tear has resulted in the top and bottom halves of line 12 being misaligned for part of its length; the top of *tusest* needs moving to the right, which makes the reading almost certain, despite the surprising introduction of *est*.

*item* shows a connection with the previous entry, as the reference to *epistrategia* confirms. Whether *detentus* implies arrest or simply that the soldier stayed behind (cf. *remansit, non reversus, non secutus*) on the orders of a senior officer is not clear. *Marcus* as a *cognomen* is rare but attested (e.g. *RMR*, p. 483 s.v.) but unfortunately not of any Equestrian officer; presumably his *nomen* came in the lacuna in the preceding line. The only Egyptian *ala* beginning with *h* is *herculiana*, and as that was stationed at Coptos, it is no doubt the one mentioned here (cf. Lesquier, 79, 409). *Partes* is presumably the equivalent of μέρη (cf. *LS* II.B.2; H. J. Mason, *Greek Terms for Roman Institutions* (*ASP* 13, 1974) s.v. μέρος 3), and the phrase means that Marcus was Acting-Epistrategus of the Thebaid. The papyrus perhaps read *alae her(culianae) ag(ente)*. It is noteworthy that a military prefect is appointed to such a post, since the office of Epistrategus is generally considered to have been purely civil; in Egypt, however, there were very few Roman officials and senior military officers were frequently employed on civil duties (Davies, 331; *JRS* LXV (1975), 132, 134).

15 *niciu*: offset badly obscures the start of this word, but since *ciu* is almost certain the reading given must be accounted very probable; it does not seem possible to read a place-name in the Thebaid. *Niciu*, a transliteration of Νίκιου (sc. πόλις) is the metropolis of the Prosopite nome in the southern Delta, cf. A. H. M. Jones, *Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*<sup>2</sup> (1971), 337.

*epistulas*: the papyrus appears to read *epistulis* but such a mistake is unlikely. For carrying letters see III 7.

*m iv*: *iv* is so written that we must take it as a numeral. To make sense of what precedes, we must suppose that the vertical tear visible on the plate masks a gap in the papyrus; the new photograph shows that, contrary to the appearance on the plate, the papyrus is also broken at this point below line 16. There is then no difficulty in reading *m iv* here and immediately below (line 16); presumably *m* is to be understood as an abbreviation for *milites* and the unusually short abbreviation was used because of shortage of space; this supports the view mentioned in the introduction that we have preserved at the right here the original edge of the papyrus.

16 *summissi*: this verb is the technical term for 'relieve' or 'substitute' (cf. *RMR* 89 4, i, 8, with *JRS* LXII (1972), 192; perhaps *RMR*, p. 13 on *p(ro)* and name). Less probably, *summissi* might be the equivalent of καταπεμφθέντες meaning 'sent downriver'.

*].ersi: reversus* and *non reversus* occur not infrequently in military papyri of soldiers returning to their units (*RMR*, p. 550 s.v.), so that *reversi* would make excellent sense here; the letter before *ersi* might just be *u* and, if we are justified in ignoring the dark marks visible before this, the reading *re]uersi* is possible; *re]gressi* (*ILS* 470, 9090; cf. *RMR* 47 ii, 3) is palaeographically less attractive; see also below, p. 60. Legal writers make it clear that a soldier was allowed a certain amount of time to return to his unit before being posted as 'missing' (e.g. *Dig.* 49, 16, 3, 7-9; cf. *RMR* 47 ii, 20: *non comparet*).

17 *inferiore [c]hora: chora* is not an easy reading palaeographically, in particular it appears rather long for the available space, but it must be accounted very probable in the context. *Inferior chora* = Κάρω Χώρα = Delta; it occurs also in a military context in *P.Mich.* 593 iii 18.

The previous entry would make better sense if it were accompanied by a place from which the soldiers had not yet returned, i.e. if line 17 were not a new entry but continued that in line 16. But the line is not indented and there seems to be a checkmark at the left (the apparent figure *i* at the extreme right is not visible in the new photograph and may safely be ignored). After *ab* we presumably have the *nomen* and *cognomen* of the relevant official, but it could conceivably be a place-name.

#### IV. THE DOCUMENT

The document clearly falls into three separate sections. Col. I opens with the heading *accesserunt*, followed by a detailed listing of personnel; this must have occupied all of the preserved part of this column. Next must have come a total for this section, followed by a heading *decesserunt* and a second section in full detail; most of this was contained in the missing parts at the end of col. I and the beginning of col. II; the end of this section appears with the entry *summa qui decesserunt* and total and breakdown (II 7-9). This total for the second section was subtracted from the grand total at the end of the first section to give the net number of men (*reliqui numero puro*) left on the books of the unit, again with breakdown (II 10-12). Then comes the third section, a list of men absent from the unit (*absunt*) on various assignments (II 13). This division of the document into three separate sections and the use of the special technical terms for accessions (*accedere*), permanent losses (*decedere*), and temporary losses (*abesse*) is paralleled exactly in the *pridianum of cohors I Hispanorum veterana quingenaria equitata* in Lower Moesia in A.D. 105;<sup>5</sup> this new document can be confidently assigned to the same classification. It resembles the Moesian and not the Egyptian *pridianum of cohors I Augusta praetoria Lusitanorum quingenaria equitata* of A.D. 156<sup>6</sup> in apparently just giving the minimum information about the new members of the unit, and not detailing their date of enlistment and effective date by day and month that they joined the unit and were assigned a specific *centuria* or *turma*.

The document can be dated quite closely. The appearance of the imperial title *Antoniniana* (I 3 and 7) restricts it to the reign of Caracalla or Elagabalus. A closer dating is provided by the names and titles of Aurelius Septimius Heraclitus, *Praefectus Aegypti* (I 4); as there is no *tunc* before his title, the document must have been drawn up during his term of office.<sup>7</sup> Heraclitus is attested as Prefect of Egypt by a document dated 16 March A.D. 215 and was still there in September, but other men are known to have held that post on 29 January 213 and 5 June 216; consequently, this new document must date to the years 213-16. Heraclitus may well have had a comparatively short term as Prefect, since at least seven men are attested as *Praefectus Aegypti* in the years 212-22, an average of only eighteen months in office. As Aurelius Antinous, who was probably *Iuridicus*, is known to have been Acting-Prefect in 215/6 (probably January-March 216), Heraclitus may well have died in Egypt.<sup>8</sup> Both *pridiana* show that the normal date from which accessions were recorded was 1 January; however, apparently in Egypt a second *pridianum* was drawn up for the start of the Egyptian year and the corresponding date was converted to 31st August.<sup>9</sup>

The net number of men left on the unit's books, after the deduction of the permanent losses, was 457; this comprised 6 centurions, 4 decurions, 100 cavalry, 13 camel-drivers and 334 infantrymen. The unit is consequently a *cohors equitata*; according to Hyginus a *cohors*

<sup>5</sup> *RMR* 63 = *P. Lond.* 2851 = *ChLA* 219; for the date *JRS* LXII (1972), 191.

<sup>6</sup> *RMR* 64 = *BGU* 696.

<sup>7</sup> cf. *RMR* p. 220 s.v. for examples of *tunc*, to which add 66 a ii 2.

<sup>8</sup> *ZPE* xvii (1975), 306-7; *BASP* iv (1967), 110-11; *JRS* LXV (1975), 126-7, 147.

<sup>9</sup> cf. the discussions of J. F. Gilliam in *Collection Latomus* LVIII (1962), 747 f., especially 748-9, 752-4, and R. O. Fink in *RMR*, pp. 181-2.



*quingenaria equitata* had 6 centurions, 4 decurions, and 120 *equites*; as this unit has the same number of officers and the grand total is 457, this points to the cohort being quingenary. However, to this total must be added 30 permanent losses, including 2 centurions, 11 cavalry and 1 camel-driver, to give an original total of 487. It would be easiest to suppose that the 2 centurions listed among the accessions replaced the 2 centurions recorded among the permanent losses; otherwise, we must postulate supernumerary officers<sup>10</sup> or conceivably an alteration in the table of organization introduced by Severus.<sup>11</sup>

Our unit is a *cohors quingenaria equitata* and it is possible to narrow down the list of candidates. The diploma of 156/61 lists thirteen cohorts; in his recent study of the diploma evidence for the Egyptian garrisons H.-G. Pflaum has identified twelve of these units.<sup>12</sup> Even though it is possible that other cohorts subsequently arrived in Egypt in the next half century, or that not every cohort then had men for discharge in that year, this diploma must remain the basis for any attempt to identify our cohort. Of Pflaum's dozen units only six, according to Lesquier's collection of evidence, have produced any information that they were *equitata*.<sup>13</sup> *Cohors I Apamenorum* must be excluded as it supplied a centurion and possibly other men to our cohort (12). *Cohors I Ulpia Afrorum* is not attested after A.D. 177, does not appear in the *Notitia*, and may have left Egypt by the time of our document; all the other four cohorts are attested in Egypt by inscriptions of the third century or by the *Notitia*. The number of equitate cohorts and thus candidates for possible identification with our cohort is comparatively small. Unfortunately, the evidence for *dromadarii* in Egypt is scanty; it is not known whether each unit had a small number of *dromadarii* or only one or two cohorts; the paucity of evidence might suggest the latter; camel-drivers *may* be attested attached to *cohortes I Nomidarum* and *II Ituraeorum*, but the identity of both units is very uncertain indeed; <sup>14</sup> the only unit where they are without doubt members is *cohors I Lusitanorum*, whose *pridianum* clearly shows nineteen *dromadarii* plus a recruit. The geographical references to areas of the Thebaid and Delta cannot be used to locate the vicinity of the base of the cohort *with certainty*, as the Dura records and Moesian *pridianum* show that a unit could frequently have men on duty many miles from base. However, it might be thought highly probable that men from the nearest cohort would be sent to the *officium* of the *epistrategus Thebaidos*, and Coptos (the base of the *ala Herculiana*) and Caene are also in the Thebaid. Furthermore, Dr. Robert Bianchi informs us that the container of the papyrus, where it was housed before unrolling in August 1938, bore a label in the hand of Charles Edwin Wilbour, the original owner, which read 'Elephantine, February 19, 1888'. Have we another *pridianum cohortis I Augustae praetoriae Lusitanorum equitatae . . . quae hibernatur Contrapollonospoli Maiore Thebaidis*?

From the format of these official documents it is possible to deduce the nature, if not the precise details, of some of the missing lines. Firstly, the heading to the whole *pridianum*. Before the *accesserunt* heading there are six lines in the Moesian *pridianum* and fifteen (plus a further three blank) in the Egyptian *pridianum*; it is not possible to say whether our document follows the more laconic or loquacious form. However, comparison of these two documents shows that the minimum ours will have contained is: the word *pridianum* followed by the full title of the cohort; the base of the cohort; the name and rank of the commanding officer; the date of the *pridianum* will also have been given. Next will have come the total of the soldiers (*summa militum*) of the unit on the day from which calculations were normally based, which seems to have been 31 December, followed by a breakdown of personnel. Assuming that this was the date used, we may restore: *summa militum pridie kalendas ianuaras* [ ] *in is 7 vi dec iv eq* [ ] *drom* [ ].<sup>15</sup> Simple arithmetical calculations based on later subtotals and totals show that the maxima for the grand total must have

<sup>10</sup> cf. Fink's comments on *RMR* 47 i, 1 and 64 ii, 1.

<sup>11</sup> As presumably with *Cohors XX Palmyrenorum*; cf. *Epigr. Stud.* iv (1967), 109; viii (1969), 63 f., especially 64-5, 67-9; *Historia* xiv (1965), 74-81. For units *aucta* by Caracalla, *CIL* III, 1378; *AE* 1958, 231.

<sup>12</sup> *Syria* XLIV (1967), 339 f.; *AE* 1968, 513; *CIL* XVI, 29, 184; cf. *Aegyptus* XXXVI (1956), 235 f.; L (1970), 310-13.

<sup>13</sup> *I Ulpia Afrorum, I Apamenorum, I Flavia Cilicum, I Augusta Lusitanorum, II Ituraeorum, II Thracum*; Lesquier, 83-96.

<sup>14</sup> cf. Fink's remarks (201-2) on *RMR* 52 c, 6, and (311, confirmed by *AE* 1968, 513) on *RMR* 78, receipts 48 and 49; *Aegyptus* LIV (1974), 179-80.

<sup>15</sup> *RMR* 64 i 17 adds at the end of the breakdown *pedites* and numeral; the format of the rest of our document suggests it did not follow this practice.

been 481, for the *equites* 110, for the *dromadarii* 14, the *pedites* 347. These five pieces of information required six lines in the very laconic Moesian *pridianum* and it is scarcely possible that they occupied less in the new one; as our clerk was generous in his layout, many more lines may be missing. In the lacuna to the left of the first preserved line (I 1) will have been the date from which the accessions were recorded, presumably *post kalendas ianuarias*, perhaps abbreviated.

In the lacuna between the end of col. I and the start of col. II must have occurred the total for the *accesserunt* section; the comparable entry in the Moesian *pridianum* (but with the addition of the relative *qui* and *milites*) and comparison with II 7 suggests the restoration: *summa qui accesserunt mil(it)es* [ ] *in is 7 ii eq* etc. This must have been immediately followed by the grand total, for which the technical term was probably *summa militum perfecta*; this is easily obtained by adding the total permanent losses (II 7-9) to the following net balance (II 10-12): *ccccxxxvii in is 7 viii dec iv eq cxi drom xiiii*. This in turn will have been followed by the heading *ex eis decesserunt*. If col. I were the same width as col. II, these two totals would each occupy some three lines and the heading a seventh; to these must be added several other lines at least for the loss of two centurions, ten cavalry, and up to nine infantry; even if all these men were lost on a single entry, it would appear that an absolute minimum of ten lines is lost between col. I and col. II; if the unknown permanent losses were incurred on a variety of entries, this number could easily be double, especially as each entry in col. II needed two lines; moreover, we do not know how many accession entries, often at three lines per item, are to be added, or whether there are infantrymen upgraded to cavalry or camel-riders to be entered under accessions. There could, unfortunately, easily be more than a score of lines lost in this lacuna.

Thirdly, the lacuna between the end of col. II and the beginning of col. III must be considered. Unfortunately, less certainty can be given to restoring the missing parts here. As has already been pointed out, the *absunt* line seems unusual; unless II 13-15 is a completely self-contained heading and entry, there must have been a concluding summary to the section: *summa qui absunt mil* [ ] *in is 7* [ ] *dec* [ ] *eq* [ ] *drom* [ ]. It is not impossible, as has already been noted, that this section on temporary losses was divided into subsections geographically. At the end of this section will have been the balance of men actually present at the unit's base, followed by the total and breakdown; the Moesian *pridianum* and other documents suggest that the technical term was *reliqui praesentes*; <sup>16</sup> the cohort now cannot have numbered more than 331. However, not all of these, even though they were present at the base, would be fit for action; the Moesian *pridianum*'s last recorded entry at this point was the deduction of men who were not fit for service through illness (*ex eis aegri*); conceivably, there could be other men who, while theoretically present and available at base for any duty, were in fact not. Finally, there was presumably a statement of the number of men actually ready and able for action at the base; the technical term for this is probably *reliqui ad signa*, followed by total and breakdown of the men present and available.<sup>17</sup>

Unfortunately, both the Moesian and Egyptian *pridiana* are incomplete, and only the former now contains sections on permanent and temporary losses. The natural assumption is that the whole of col. III detailed these temporary losses. However, whereas in the Moesian document the locative case is used, as is only to be expected, to indicate where a man was temporarily absent, in our document it is not; instead, the ablative case is regularly used, which normally indicates motion from. The morning reports regularly record any daily changes to the strength of the cohort at Dura; they list the men going away on a duty (*missi*) and those returning (*reversi*), or that there was no change that day to the number at Dura (*omnes permanserunt*); <sup>18</sup> other documents show that records were kept of men temporarily leaving base or returning to it on completion of an assignment elsewhere, and of how this affected the grand total of men in the unit's base.<sup>19</sup> All these factors strongly point to a hitherto unattested fourth section in a *pridianum*, but one suggested by logic and

<sup>16</sup> RMR 63 ii, 41; cf. 62, 4.

<sup>17</sup> cf. RMR 52 b, 7-10; c, 2-5; Pliny, *Ep.* x, 20 and 22. I discuss this term in greater length in *Aegyptus* LVII (1977).

<sup>18</sup> cf. RMR 47 with 50.

<sup>19</sup> e.g. RMR 66 (strength report); 10 (*viritim* detachment record).

other documents: men who have returned to their base from whatever duty made them temporarily absent; the Dura evidence strongly points to *reversi* as the correct technical term.<sup>20</sup> These men returning are presumably those who were absent at the time when the last document was drawn up (e.g. 1 January), and whose arrival changed the total of men at base camp; there would be little point in recording self-cancelling missions, that is the return of men who left after the last stocktaking date and returned before the present one (*reversi quondam deputati* etc.). Such entries, while suitable for the morning or strength reports, would be inappropriate for the essentially stocktaking purpose of the *pridianum*.

If these arguments about the nature of col. III are correct, it must have been preceded by some heading such as *reversi (sunt)*, presumably preceded by a date (e.g. *post kalendas ianuarias*). At the end of this section would be *summa qui reversi (sunt) mil* plus total and breakdown; there were at least twenty-seven men, including at least eight *equites*, involved in miscellaneous activities in this column. This total of men returning was presumably added to the total obtained after the deduction of all losses to form the final part: the grand total of men at the time of the compilation of the present *pridianum* who were actually at base camp. This invites comparison with the entry in the morning reports of A.D. 239 at Dura and suggests the restoration: *sunt in hibernis cohortis [ ] Antoninianae numero puro (or perfecto) mil [ ] in is 7 [ ] dec [ ] eq [ ] drom [ ]*, possibly followed by *summa* and even the name of the cohort again.<sup>21</sup>

#### V. HISTORICAL SETTING

Our *pridianum* must date to the years 213–16. The Prefect of Egypt, Aurelius Septimius Heraclitus, is attested by papyri in that post in March and September of 215, and the *Acta Alexandrinorum* point to him still being in office towards the end of the year.<sup>22</sup> All the ancient writers are unanimous on the most important event in Egypt in Caracalla's reign: the visit of the emperor in 215 and the consequent massacre(s).<sup>23</sup> Caracalla seems not to have arrived before midsummer of 215 and to have left by the beginning of the next year at latest.<sup>24</sup> The sources record that Caracalla 'entered the city with his entire army' and had them massacre the Alexandrian young men; 'not a few of the soldiers lost their lives'; non-Alexandrians were expelled from the city to the countryside ( $\chi\omega\rho\alpha$ ).<sup>25</sup> The *cognitio Heracliti* refers to rioting and runaway slaves; apparently the Prefect was convicted, lost his life and was replaced by Antinous, Acting-Prefect.<sup>26</sup>

There are various entries in our papyrus which could fit in with these events. The transfer of personnel to the Egyptian fleet for disciplinary reasons, or to the Syrian for the planned Parthian campaigns, would be understandable.<sup>27</sup> Seven men were killed, apparently in action, and an eighth had to be invalided out of the army.<sup>28</sup> The surviving part of the *pridianum* does not record that any recruits joined the unit this year, certainly not at the expected point in the document; the lack of recruits is hardly surprising in the circumstances, nor the fact that losses were made up by the transfer of serving soldiers. Twenty-seven per cent of the unit's strength dispersed in the countryside makes sense after the expulsion of non-Alexandrians from the city, and the need to keep strict military sur-

<sup>20</sup> cf. *RMR*, p. 550 s.v. to which add 2 xii, 18; see our commentary on III 16.

<sup>21</sup> *RMR* 50 i 5–6 and 11–2; ii 5–6.

<sup>22</sup> *BGU* 362 vii 8–9 and 21; H. Musurillo, *Acta Alexandrinorum* (1961), xviii = *SB* 9213; see above, n. 8. Heraclitus may have taken the additional Aurelius to honour Caracalla in 212, cf. *Archäologisches Korrespondenzblatt* IV (1974), 355–8; *Historia* XIV (1965), 81–92.

<sup>23</sup> Herodian IV 8,6–9,8; Dio LXXVIII, 22–3; Suda s.v. 'Antoninus'; SHA, *Caracalla* 6, 2–3. Cf. Lesquier, 31–2.

<sup>24</sup> For the chronology see n. 26; the commentary of C. R. Whittaker in the Loeb Herodian; *Syria* xxxiv (1957), 297–302; *Chron. d'Ég.* xxxiv (1959), 120–3; *P. Oxy.* 3090.

<sup>25</sup> *P. Giess.* 40 II 16–29 = *W. Chr.* 22.

<sup>26</sup> *Ét. de Pap.* VII (1948), 17–33; *SB* 9213.

<sup>27</sup> C. G. Starr, *Roman Imperial Navy*<sup>2</sup> (1960), 192 cites *AE* 1934, 64 for transfer of personnel of Egyptian fleet to Syrian at this time. *RMR*, 89, 39 (recently confirmed by R. Marichal in *ChLA* 321MM) seems to show personnel of the Egyptian *ala Herculeana* in Syria in 216. For Egyptian soldiers requisitioning camels at this time for imperial use, Lesquier, 371, cf. *P. Oxy.* 3091.

<sup>28</sup> *P. Ross.-Georg.* III 1 and 2 are private letters written by doctors and are dated palaeographically to the early third century; they record heavy military casualties and an oblique reference to a military command; they may be contemporary with our document; cf. *Épigr. Stud.* VIII (1969), 93–4.

veillance in the countryside.<sup>29</sup> The opening entries in col. III seem to record troops collecting special money; soldiers did receive money as a result of imperial visits;<sup>30</sup> and the epitomator of Dio records immediately after the Alexandria events that Caracalla gave the troops  $\xi\theta\lambda\alpha$ ,<sup>31</sup> while inscriptions record that units were *indulgentiis eius aucta liberalitatibus ditata*.<sup>32</sup> These inscriptions were dedicated *optimo maximoque principi*, and it is perhaps worth wondering whether *prin*[ in III 2 could in fact refer to Caracalla.<sup>33</sup> *Insecutio* could refer to the pursuit of the fugitives mentioned in the *cognitio Heracliti* or the escort of the cash; it might also be used of an escort of honour to Caracalla, comparable with the men from Dura escorting Elagabalus and Mammaea a few years later;<sup>34</sup> similarly *adiutorium* might refer to service with the emperor. The replacement of the Epistrategus Thebaidos by a senior military commander might well have been the result of the rioting or association with the Prefect;<sup>35</sup> we may note the execution of Flavius Titianus, perhaps *Idiologos*, at about this time.<sup>36</sup> If our *pridianum* is a standard one (and not a special one in unusual circumstances, as with the Moesian one in the Dacian fighting), then it should have been drawn up from the beginning of the Roman or the Egyptian new year; it thus should be the one drawn up on 31 December A.D. 215 or, perhaps more probably, the *pridianum mensis Augusti*, after the massacres but before the fall of Heraclitus, dated to 31 August A.D. 215.

This document is of immense importance. It adds to our meagre sum of *pridiana* and shows points of similarity and difference, especially the new fourth section; it provides details of the previous career of a further two auxiliary centurions, and gross and net figures of the strength of a *cohors quingenaria equitata* and of *dromadarii*. It provides the earliest official use in a papyrus of the technical term *principalis*, the first evidence for the secondment of troops to the *officium* of an Epistrategus and for a military officer taking over the duties of the *epistrategia*. It confirms the multifarious nature of military assignments and adds some new ones. Finally, and perhaps most fascinatingly of all, it may provide glimpses of the involvement of ordinary soldiers with imperial history. Truly *plurimum ex parvo*.

*Durham University; Sunderland Polytechnic*

<sup>29</sup> Davies, 321–2, 331; see also our commentary on II 13–15. *RMR* 5 ii (originally dated by Fink to July A.D. 215 but perhaps two years later) seems to record the absence of various Egyptian infantrymen with a *praefectus castris ante [...] ruticia*.

<sup>30</sup> Suetonius, *Gaius* 46; *Galba* 6; *ILS* 9134. Cf. *Historia* xv (1966), 127.

<sup>31</sup> Dio LXXVIII, 24, 1.

<sup>32</sup> *CIL* III, 1378; *AE* 1958, 231. For Caracalla and money given to troops cf. *PBSR* xviii (1950), 58–9; *Historia* VIII (1959), 479–83; *Latomus* xxx (1971), 687–95.

<sup>33</sup> Unfortunately, however, *RMR* can cite no example of *princeps* in this meaning. Perhaps note *P. Paris* 69 = *W. Chr.* 41 (cf. *Neue Heidelberger Jahrb.* ix (1899), 159–62) for special celebrations held

by commanding officer, centurions, *beneficarii* and *principales* of Cohors I Flavia Cilicum in the Caesareum and unit's *principia* on the emperor's birthday in 232, when the troops received a *congiarium*; there also seems to have been a special parade (*decur(sores) xxxi*) on the emperor's birthday at Dura (*RMR* 62); cf. R. Marichal in *ChLA* 309 and 347.

<sup>34</sup> Davies, 328.

<sup>35</sup> An unpublished papyrus shows that by December A.D. 216 our *praefectus alae* had been replaced as Acting-Epistrategus by a *praefectus montis Bernelicidis*.

<sup>36</sup> Dio LXXVIII, 21, 4; H.-G. Pflaum, *Les carrières procuratoriennes équestres sous le Haut-Empire romain* (1960–1), 1085.