

A ration-warrant for an
adiutor memoriae

JOHN R. REA
ROBERT P. SALOMONS KLAAS A. WORP

S B. 8. 13851

Bodleian Library, Oxford
Ms. gr. class. c 126 (P)
19 × 25.5 cm (h.)

Caesarea (in Palestine?),
but found somewhere in Egypt
6 December 293
Plate VIII

Light brown papyrus, practically complete (except for a rectangle 8.5 × 2.5 cm (h.) lost at the top right) but internally damaged by worm holes. The left margin measures 2–3.5 cm, the upper *ca* 1.5 cm, the right 3.5–8 cm, the lower *ca* 3.5 cm. The ink has faded in places. The text is in a Latin cursive, with a Greek subscription by a second hand. The back is blank. There is a sheet-join (*kollesis*) running vertically *ca* 2.5 cm from the right edge. It overlaps right upon left, which indicates that the piece of papyrus was turned upside down after it was cut from the roll. None of the writing reaches so far to the right as to touch the join. In its present worn state it is easy to see that the top sheet had no vertical fibres for a width of *ca* 1.5–2 cm along the join; see E. G. Turner, *Recto and Verso* (*Pap. Brux.* 16) 20, and *P. Oxy.* LI, p. 61, for this method of reducing the bulk of sheet-joins.

Aureli[u]s . [6–8?] (vac.?) *mag(istris) s. [*
(vac.) *salutem.*

annonas . . . as . . . capitum trium Alogio

adiutori memoriae apud Caesariam

5 *et proficiscenti per . . . em in sacrum*

comitatum d(omini) n(ostris) Maximiani

nobilissimi C[ae]saris usque

ex die [. . .] um iduum Dece[m]brium

10 *in diem q[uo] ad comitatum*

uenerit.

(vac.)

(vac.)

dat(a) viii idus Dec(embres)

d(ominis) n(ostris) Diocletiano Aug(usto) . u' et

Maximiano Aug(usto) viii co(n)s(ulibus).

(vac.)

(2nd hand) Ἀλόγιος βοηθός τῆς μνήμης
τοῦ Αὐτοκράτορος.

1 *maggs*. [4 l. *Caesaream* 7 \bar{d} (?) \bar{n} 12 *dat* (or *dat*), *dec* 13 *dān*,
aug, *augiūicos*

Aurelius . . . to the *magistri* s . . . , greeting. Give(?) . . . rations of three units to Alogius, *adiutor memoriae*, in Caesarea, until he recovers his good health, and as he makes his journey . . . to the divine *comitatus* of our master Maximianus, the most noble Caesar, from the . . . th day before the ides of December to the day on which he reaches the *comitatus*.

Given the eighth day before the ides of December, in the consulate of our masters Diocletian Augustus for the fifth time and Maximian Augustus for the fourth time.

(2nd hand) Alogius, assistant of the Memory of the Emperor.

Line 1. *Aureli[u]s*. [6–8?] (vac.?). For the probable shape of *-[u]s*, with a small raised ‘u’, cf. *idus*, 12. The trace of the first letter of the *nomen* is a speck at the top level of the average letter. A darker blob at the base-line seems not to be ink. The surface before *magg* seems to be well enough preserved for a distance of ca 1.5 cm to have shown remains of letters if they had been there. Consequently there is room only for a short *nomen* of 6–8 letters and it is improbable that a title was given, cf. below, Commentary.

magg s. [. There is no sign of abbreviation in *magg* apart from a slight lengthening of the final horizontal. The traces on the edge are a speck at the height of the tops of average letters and an arc at the lower left. These would suit a round-backed ‘t’, which occurs here frequently (e.g. *salutem*, 2). See below, Commentary, for the suggested supplement *st[ationum]*.

3. *ἀνναγῆς* . . . *as* . . . *capitum trium*. Cf. *CPL* 267 (= *SPP* xiv no. XIII) .5 *annonas quaternas capitum quatuor*, ‘four rations of four units’. The recipients are four *protectores*, i.e. imperial bodyguards, or at least persons ranked as such. At first sight the phrase might seem to mean ‘four rations for four persons’, i.e. one ration each, but when we take into consideration the practice of giving superior officers and officials their salaries in multiples of *annonae* (see A. H. M. Jones, *LRE* II 643–44, cf. I 396–98), we begin to wonder whether these distinguished officers were not getting quadruple rations, and the question is further complicated by the development of *caput* and cognates to mean ‘fodder ration’, see Jones, *loc. cit.*;

TLL s.vv. *capitum, capitus, caput* v (col. 427). Certainly *CPL* 267 bears a remarkable resemblance to *C. Theod.* 8.1.10: *actuarius... pseudocomitatensium... quaternas annonas et quaternum capitum ex horreorum conditis praecepimus <dari?>* (there is a lacuna in the text). The reading of *CPL* 267 is confirmed by the plate in *SPP* xiv Taf. XIII. We need to compare also *P. Oxy.* 1 43 *recto* iv 8-10 *ἐλάβομεν παρὰ σοῦ εἰς διάδοσιν τῶν στρατιωτῶν κάπιτα ἀπλάδι ἑκατὸν πενήτηκοντα ἕξ ἡμερ(ῶν) γ*, 'we received from you for distribution to the soldiers 156 simple *capita* for 3 days'. The receipt is issued by an *optio*, a *tesserarius*, and one other (his name is lost and the word for his rank is damaged), to an *ἐπιμελητῆς ἀγύρου*, so it is fairly clear from this document of 295 that *κάπιτον/caput* at that date already had the sense of 'animal fodder', cf. *Amm. Marc.* 22.4.9 *uicenas... annonas totidemque pabula iumentorum, quae uulgo dictitant capita*. So possibly 'four rations each, of four *capita*' means four times the daily ration of a private soldier for human consumption, plus four times the daily ration of fodder for one horse. It seems quite probable that part of these could be commuted into money, although evidence for this is lacking till a later date: see A. H. M. Jones, *LRE* II 629-30.

In spite of the odd grammatical formulation with *capitum* in the genitive, this looks like the most probable interpretation, and it is likely that the present text had a similar phrase. However, the patch of damage should also have contained a main verb, unless it was entirely omitted. *CPL* 267 has *annonas quaternas kapitum quatuor... preuere (= praebere) curate*. Here there is obviously no room for periphrasis, so we expect an imperative or jussive subjunctive meaning 'deliver', preferably in the plural. Since the remains are intractable on this hypothesis, we have reluctantly accepted that, after ... *as*, *da* might be possible, on the supposition that the document would be presented to only one *magister* at a time. It is not a persuasive reading, but the remains are very much damaged. *CPL* 267 suggests that in ... *as* we should look for an adjunct to *annonas*, e.g. *ternas, trinas, singulas, simplas*. None of these convincingly fits the traces. All are too long. Before *as* there is a short upright, seemingly free at the top, which in this hand suits only 'i' or 'u'. It is joined from the left near the foot by a descending oblique stroke, which favours 'u', since ligatures forward to 'i' join it at the top. Before the possible 'u' is the foot

of a rather thick upright which descends below the base-line, though only for a short distance. This is joined or approached from the left not far above the base-line by a rising stroke. Possibilities might be *b*, *d*, *q*, *ci*, *ei*, *ti*. Probably no letters are missing between *αμνονας* and these traces. In point of sense *δυνας* might be tolerable, but none of the other 'd's is formed in a precisely similar way. Moreover we expect rather *binas*. *-τινας* recalls *statiuas*, 'lodgings', but there is certainly no room for that.

For the name Alogius cf. H. Solin, *Die griechischen Personennamen in Rom* II, 707; *P. Vindob. Salomons* 19.5 (late Byzantine period).

4. *adiutori memoriae*, cf. 14 βοθηδς τῆς μνήμης τοῦ Αὐτοκράτορος. This post is attested here for the first time, but it is not surprising to find an *adiutor* in a palatine department, see e.g. *ILS* III.1, pp. 414-15 (Index s.v.). On the department of the *magister memoriae*, for which there is not very much evidence, although it must have been important because of its proximity to the emperor, see *R-E* xv 655-57, s.v. *memoria* (Fluss), II 897-98, s.v. *scrinium* (Seeck); F. G. B. Millar, *The Emperor in the Roman World* (New York/London 1967) 265-66; A. H. M. Jones, *LRE* I, 367-68. This passage confirms that Galerius had his own *memoria* department right from the beginning of his reign: see further below, p. 110, and cf. Jones, *op. cit.* 50-51. In the fourth century the *memoriales* became very influential: see Ch. Vogler, *Constance II et l'administration impériale*, 173.

Antiquarians may like to recall that the ancient title of King's, now Queen's, Remembrancer still exists in the English legal profession, although the duties are now ceremonial.

Caesariam = *Caesaream*. On the phonetic change of 'e' to 'i' in hiatus, see J. N. Adams, *The Vulgar Latin of the Letters of Claudius Terentianus*, 18. On the likely location of Caesarea, see below, Commentary, pp. 110-11. For literature on Caesarea in Palestine, see *Talanta* 12-13 (1980) 38-39 n. 31.

5. *quousque...perceperit*. The meaning is obviously best expressed in English by 'until he recovers his good health', but Lewis and Short, *Latin Dictionary*, and P. W. Glare, *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, do not record the extension of the meaning of *quousque* from 'so long as' to 'until at length', which is needed here; nor do they record 'get back' rather than 'get' for *percipere*. Perhaps this verb is used because of its association with the perception of feelings (*uoluptates*,

dolores, luctus, gaudia – Lewis and Short s.v., B, cf. *Oxford Latin Dictionary* s.v. 6), which might be applicable to states of health too, i.e. 'until he feels good health' is equivalent to 'until he feels well'.

6. *et* co-ordinates the subordinate clause *quousque...perceperit* and the participle *proficiscenti*, which therefore means 'as he makes his journey' rather than 'as he sets out'. This is confirmed by the indefinite term for the validity of the warrant – *in diem q[u]o ad comitatum uenerit* (10–11).

per . em. The first trace is probably a short length of a vertical, slightly sloping to the right, but could be part of a rounded letter; the second is a rounded foot. Letters with risers are excluded in both places, and the second letter has no descender either. For the first the possibilities seem to be *a, g, i, n, o?, p?* (generally too broad, too straightbacked), *t, u*; for the second only *a, i?* (generally too straight), *o*, and *t* seem possible. No sense has so far emerged from these possibilities, unless *per item* could represent *per idem* (cf. M. Jeanneret, *Rev. phil.*² 41 (1917) 9: *eatem = eandem*) and mean 'at the same rate'.

Two other desperate solutions have been thought of. One is to take it that the rounded lower half of 'e' is also doing duty for 'u' and read *per nauem*, 'by ship', cf. *Dig.* 35.1.122.1...*quas (merces) Brentesio empturus esset et per nauem Beryto inuecturus*. If true, this would reinforce the identification of Caesarea with Caesarea Maritima in Palestine, but it introduces an exceptional winter voyage and an exceptional ligature of *ue* not supported by *quousque* (5) and *usque* (8). The other is to read the final *m*, which is undamaged and at first seems a clear reading by comparison with several other idiosyncratic final 'm's in the document, as *r*, i.e. *per iter*, 'by road', cf. *Dig.* 9.3.1.1 *publice enim utile est sine metu et periculo per itinera commeari*; 22.5.3.6 *testes non temere euocandi sunt per longum iter*. These passages are hardly compelling, but perhaps this could be taken as a reference to the public post, which was bound to follow the official routes, cf. *C. Theod.* 8.5.25 ...*si quis... ab itinere recto deuerit... poena in eum competens proferatur* (A.D. 365). Palaeographical support for *r* can be found in *P. Lat. Strassb.* 1.18, 19 (plates in *Archiv* 3 (1904–6) opp. p. 338; R. Seider, *Paläographie d. lat. Papyri* 1, no. 51, Taf. XXVII), where the small hand of the subscription has the final 'r' of *semper* (18) in a very similar form; *gaudear* (19) is not unlike. The date of that papyrus is ca 317–24,

see *P. Ryl.* iv, p. 104; T. D. Barnes, *The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine*, 153.

None of these suggestions is more than a possibility.

6-7. *sacrum comitatum*. On the early tetrarchic *comitatus*, see A. H. M. Jones, *LRE* I, 49-55, cf. 366-73, chiefly on the later stages. For a brief summary of its origin and development, see Millar, *Emperor in the Roman World*, 42-43, with ch. 3 (Entourage, Assistants and Advisers, 59-131) for a detailed account.

7. *Maximiani*: i.e. C. Galerius Valerius Maximianus, known usually as Galerius, see Barnes, *New Empire*, 4, 37-38, 61-64.

8. *nobilissimi C[ae]saris*. See H. G. Pflaum, in *Recherches sur les structures sociales dans l'antiquité classique*, ed. C. Nicolet, 160-61.

9. [...]um. One of the ordinal numbers between *octauum* and *tertium* must be supplied, i.e. 6-11 December. A date earlier than the day of issue, 6 December, is excluded, because 5 December in the Roman calendar is the Nones; 12 December is *pridie idus*. The day of issue, [*octau*]um (see line 12), seems also the most likely here; the day after, [*septim*]um looks too long for the gap. It seems unlikely that there would be an interval of two or more days between the issue of the warrant and the beginning of the entitlement, because that might leave an opening for the abuse of the warrant.

For the accusative after *ex die*, cf. *P. Grenf.* II 110 (= *RMR* 86 = *ChLA* III 205) .3, *ex d[i]e septimum*. Our document seems to confirm that it was not uncommon to omit *ante diem* (cf. 12 below and *BGU* II 696 *passim*, where, however, the days are given in figures), but to let the ordinal stand in the accusative as if *ante diem* was there, cf. *CPR* v 13.8 n.

iduum Dece[m]brium. Here *idum* (*sic*) would be the easiest reading; perhaps read *idu<u>m*, but *Dece[m]brium* is clear enough and suggests that *iduum* was just written rapidly and carelessly, cf. *P. Ryl.* iv 609 (= *ChLA* iv 246) .7 *ex die iduum [...].m*. Below in 12 we have the conventional *iiii idus*.

14-15. This Greek subscription could well be by Alogius himself, see *C. Theod.* 8.6.1, where veterans presenting imperial letters authorizing travel are supposed to append their own subscription, *sua subscriptione subiecta*. However, in *SPP* xiv Taf. XIII (= *CPL* 267) the names of the four *protectores* seem to be in the same Latin hand as the text, certainly not in four different

hands. The Greek subscription there, though damaged, does not seem to mention names.

Commentary

This papyrus, which has already been illustrated and described,¹ takes a unique position among papyri hitherto published and thus seems worthy to be published in the present volume celebrating the centenary of papyrology as a discipline.

It is a warrant, dated 6 December 293, for the issue of rations to an *adiutor memoriae*, that is, a subordinate of a *magister memoriae*. The rations were to be issued to him at a place called Caesarea for as long as it took him to recover from an illness and for the duration of his subsequent journey to rejoin the retinue of Galerius. The mere fact of its survival without special indication of its provenance is enough to show that the papyrus was found in Egypt. Dr Barker-Benfield informs us that it is one of a number of papyri presented to the Bodleian Library by Mrs A. S. Hunt in 1934, and we can be sure that A. S. Hunt would have taken special care to record a non-Egyptian provenance. We can deduce that the warrant was kept till the nominee rejoined Galerius in Egypt and was discarded there after its usefulness had expired. It therefore brings strong support to the recent demonstration that Galerius went to Egypt near the end of 293 to put down a revolt in the Thebaid.² Most earlier accounts³ placed him on the Danube frontier. A. H. M. Jones, though not anticipating Barnes, was sceptical.⁴

Barnes concluded that the passages of Lactantius, Praxagoras, and Aurelius Victor which say that Galerius had responsibility for the Danube frontier refer to no date earlier than 299.⁵ This seems convincing; it would be very hard to take their flat statements to

1. *Manuscripts at Oxford: An Exhibition in Memory of R. W. Hunt*, ed. A. C. de la Mare and B. C. Barker-Benfield (Bodleian Library, Oxford 1980) p. 2 fig. 3, p. 8 no. 1.20. We are grateful to the Keeper of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library for permission to publish it here, and to Dr Bruce Barker-Benfield for his help and advice on various questions.

2. See T. D. Barnes, 'Imperial Campaigns A.D. 285-311', *Phoenix* 30 (1976) 180-82, 187; *idem*, *New Empire*, 62.

3. For example *CAH* XII 334; A. Mócsy, *Pannonia and Upper Moesia*, 272.

4. *LRE* I 39.

5. *Phoenix* 30 (1976) 187.

refer to a few months in 293 or to that short period in combination with the long one from 299 or 300 to 311. Nevertheless, Barnes also concluded from the evidence of the movements of Diocletian in the first half of 293 that it was somewhere near the Danube, perhaps at Sirmium, Diocletian's chief residence at that time, that Galerius was invested as Caesar. Moreover the troops who were still with Galerius in Egypt in 295, as evidenced by *P. Oxy.* 1 43, were detached from legions normally serving in Moesia, viz. *IV Flavia*, *VII Claudia*, and *XI Claudia*.⁶ A detachment of *V Macedonia*, from the same area, was in Egypt during the reign of Diocletian and Maximian, quite possibly at the same time.⁷ Therefore, although we have nothing to show exactly how long Galerius may have remained on the Danube frontier, we have indications that at least part of his army was mustered there and probably accompanied him from Moesia to Egypt.

In passing we may note that *O. Mich.* 441, dated at Karanis on 28 May 293 by regnal years 9 (Diocletian), 8 (Maximian) and 1 (Constantius and Galerius), is another strong argument in favour of Barnes,⁸ in accepting that the investiture of Galerius took place on 1 March (*Paneg. Lat.* 8(5).3.1; Lactantius, *Mort. Persec.* 35.4) and not on 21 May (*Chr. Min.* 1.229). Seven days are not enough for news to have got to Karanis, even from Nicomedia, where the Paschal Chronicle places the investiture.

The date of 6 December, provided by line 12 of our papyrus, is of importance for the chronology of the imperial movements. While Galerius and the *comitatus* were in Caesarea, sufficient care could be taken of Alogius by the army's medical department.⁹ But the moment Galerius was about to leave for Egypt it became necessary to make special arrangements for Alogius, who was forced by his illness to remain behind. One of these arrangements was that from a day in December which was probably the 6th again (see line 9n.), rations had to be supplied to him by others, viz. the *magistri s.* [mentioned in line 1, obviously for the reason that the Caesar and his *comitatus* had left Caesarea at that date and

6. Cf. B. Filow, *Die Legionen der Provinz Moesia (Klio Beiheft vi, 1906)* 86.

7. See *P. Oxy.* xli 2950 introd.; A. K. Bowman, *BASP* 15 (1978) 27 n. 11.

8. *New Empire*, 62 n. 73.

9. Cf. A. von Domaszewski-B. Dobson, *Rangordnung des römischen Heeres* (1981) 45 and xv; R. W. Davies, *Epigr. Stud.* 8 (1969) 83ff. and 9 (1972) 1ff.

thus were no longer able to take care of Alogius. Not long afterwards Galerius will have reached Egypt. This chronology is perfectly in accord with the conclusions reached by Barnes.

A fragmentary Latin papyrus which mentions *equites promoti* of the tetrarchs seems to give us a date of 26 December (line 3) 293 (line 6), see *P. Grenf.* II 110 = *ChLA* III 205 = *RMR* 86. This does not make it perfectly clear that the expedition headed by Galerius was in Egypt by this date, but in combination with the other evidence it certainly suggests so.¹⁰ If our Caesarea is the city in Palestine (see below for discussion), we may adduce *P. Ryl.* IV 630-38.388-486 (pp. 143-45; cf. L. Casson, *Travel in the Ancient World*, 192-93) to show that a party of travellers went from there to Pelusium in Egypt in six days, 30 July-4 August, ca 317-23.

Whether or not this warrant should be described as a *diploma* is a question which we must leave unanswered for the moment.¹¹ This warrant authorizes the supply of rations only, saying nothing about lodging or the use of the animals or the vehicles of the public post, unless *per . . . em* in line 6 can be interpreted in that sense: see note. The closest parallel text authorizes rations and lodging, *annonas . . . cum solitis statibus*.¹² Nevertheless, the most likely places to supply rations were the *mansiones* of the public post, at least according to the view of D. Van Berchem.¹³

The chief objection to describing this document as a *diploma* is the expectation raised by the sources that a *diploma* should be issued by an emperor himself or in his name by a provincial governor. In this text, although the *comitatus* of Galerius is mentioned in the body of the warrant, the person who issues it is an Aurelius with a *cognomen* of not more than about eight letters, the restricted space suggesting that no title was stated. Pflaum thought that an emperor's name should stand at the head of a *diploma*.¹⁴ The inscription published by Mitchell makes it clear that in the reign

10. See Barnes, *New Empire*, 62 n. 74.

11. See S. Mitchell, *JRS* 66 (1976) 125-27, for a recent summary of what is known and concluded about the *diploma* system.

12. Wilcken, *Archiv* I (1901) 373 n. 1; *l. statibus*. See *CPL* 267 = *SPP* XIV no. XIII 5-6.

13. *L'Année militaire*, 181-87; cf. H.-G. Pflaum, 'Essai sur le cursus publicus', *Mémoires présentés par divers savants à l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres* 14.1 (1940) 358 n. 1.

14. Pflaum, *op. cit.* (n. 13) 313.

of Tiberius there were circumstances in which a *diploma* was not required for the requisition of animals and vehicles, . . . *militantibus, et iis qui diplomum habebunt, et iis qui ex ali(i)s provinciis militantes commeabunt* (lines 16-17).¹⁵

The involvement here of the department of the imperial *memoria* recalls the inscription of a freedman with the title of *of(f)iciali ueteri a memoria et a diplomatibus* (ILS 11678), from which it has been concluded that the issuance of *diplomata* was entrusted to this very department.¹⁶ If that is true, an *adiutor memoriae* might be in a particularly strong position to acquire a *diploma* and this document might be one. However, in the closest parallel, CPL 267 = SPP XIV no. XIII (p. 4), the issuing authority is a *trib(unus) quintanor(um)*, i.e. a tribune of the *legio V Macedonica*.¹⁷

Whether or not the document is a proper *diploma*, in the circumstances the issuing authority is likely to be a palatine official, very possibly from the *memoria* department, perhaps the *magister* himself, or perhaps a subordinate with the title of a *diplomatibus*. If, as it appears, no title was given here, this may suggest that the authority was very highly placed, so that his name was well known.

In passing we may note that the papyrus now gives certain proof that right from the beginning of his reign Galerius had his own department of the *memoria*, as argued by A. H. M. Jones.¹⁸

An ἀντιγραφεὺς τῆς μνήμης called Sicorius Probus, who was sent as ambassador to the Persians several years later, is usually taken to be Galerius' *magister memoriae*.¹⁹ Even if this is correct, he need not be supposed to have held the office in 293.

The warrant, having the formal features of a letter, was addressed to *magistri s. []*, an unknown title. Who are these persons? It is clear from the text that it was to them that Alogius had to apply for rations on his way to and in Egypt. These rations used to be supplied to holders of *diplomata* in so-called *mansiones* or *stationes*. These were more or less well-equipped inns or hostels

15. *Op. cit.* (n. 11) 107; cf. 126, where Mitchell concludes that the regulations had been tightened up by the reign of Domitian.

16. See Pflaum, *op. cit.* (n. 13) 315; cf. E. J. Holmberg, *Zur Geschichte des Cursus Publicus* (diss. Uppsala 1933) 58.

17. Cf. *R-E* XII 1581-82 (W. Kubitschek).

18. *LRE* I 50-51.

19. Jones, *loc. cit.* (n. 18), *PLRE* I 740; for the disputed date, see T. D. Barnes, *op. cit.* (n. 2) 186.

A ration-warrant for an 'adiutor memoriae'

along the routes at intervals of 25–35 miles, i.e. the length of an average day's travel.²⁰ In view of these data it is very attractive to fill the gap in line 1 with *st[ationum]*. The trouble is, however, that *magistri stationum* are nowhere attested. According to *C. Theod.* 8.5.35 the manager of a *mansio* is called *praepositus* or *manceps*, but not *magister*.²¹

The parallel, *CPL* 267 = *SPP* xiv no. xiii, unfortunately dating from a much later period, ca A.D. 400 to judge from the hand, is addressed *praepositis horiorum et susceptoribus d[e]botis singuloru[m] lo[co]r[um]* – read *praepositis horreorum*, and *deuotis* if the reading is correct, but the plate suggests *et diadotis*, i.e. *diadota* (cf. *C. Theod.* 7.4.28), is a Latin version of the Greek διαδότης, cf. e.g. *P. Beatty Panop.* 1.276–331n. (pp. 123–25). If *magistri st[ationum]* is correct, this looks like an attempt to find a broad term to cover the various types of heads of post stations, cf. *C. Theod.* 8.5.35... *si quis eorum, qui praepositi uocantur aut mancipes, publico denique cursui nomine aliquo praesunt... modum patiatu[r] excedi, seuerissime... compescetur: aut militans exauctoritatem subibit aut decurio uel manceps relegatione annua plectetur*. Three types emerge, municipal liturgists (*decuriones*, e.g. *susceptores, diadotae*), contractors (*mancipes*), and military officers (*militantes*, i.e. *stationarii*, cf. *C. Theod.* 8.5.1).²²

We must still try to determine which Caesarea is meant in line 4, since seventeen places of this name are listed in *R-E* III 1288–95. In the interval between 1 March and 6 December 293 we have no clue where Galerius was (see above), so we are reduced to assuming that his track lay between Sirmium and Egypt, not necessarily directly. In ancient times navigation was difficult between October and May. We cannot say positively that Galerius and his army would not have gone by sea, because a revolt is the sort of emergency which might have enforced a sea voyage in the winter season,²³ but the probability is that they travelled overland. By such a route the only Caesarea that it would be nonsensical to avoid is Caesarea in Palestine. This was an important place and is by far the most likely candidate for our text. If we trace the route

20. Cf. L. Casson, *Travel in the Ancient World*, 184, 201; Pflaum, *op. cit.* (n. 13) 343.

21. Cf. *R-E* xiv 1242, s.v. *mansio* (Kubitschek).

22. On all this, see Pflaum, *op. cit.* (n. 13) 355–56.

23. Casson, *Travel*, 151.

further away from Egypt, it seems likely that the army came out of Europe across the Bosphorus and traversed Asia Minor. If so, there were at least three Caesareas in Asia Minor which might have been visited: a small town in Bithynia near Prusa, the more important Mazaca Caesarea in Cappadocia, and Caesarea Anazarbus in Cilicia. To judge from the map in K. Miller, *Itineraria Romana* (1916) 628 fig. 202, none of these is on the shortest route (Nicomedia-Nicaea-Ancyra-Tyana-Tarsus) or on any likely detour, but none can be absolutely excluded. Winter weather and other factors outside our knowledge or judgement may have affected the line of the journey. All we can say is that the only very likely candidate is Caesarea in Palestine, and that several others are possible but not favoured by any special indications. Caesarea Panias in Phoenicia, due east of Tyre and east of the Jordan, is by no means on a likely route, see K. Miller, *Itineraria*, 807 fig. 260.

We may support this view of the route by reference to the *Itinerarium Antonini*, which probably traces a journey of Caracalla between Rome and Upper Egypt in A.D. 214/15.²⁴ This took him through Sirmium, Nicomedia, Antioch, and Alexandria (*Itin. Ant.* 124.2-5), and the intermediate stages (131.4-154.5) include no Caesarea but the one in Palestine (150.1).

An estimate of the palaeographical importance of the document will have to await analysis by the experts, but it is clear that its chief interest lies in the presumption that it was written by a clerk in the palatine civil service of Galerius, a clerk who may have come from any part of the Roman Empire and who was in contact with the highest political circles. It is not, to our eyes, strikingly different from papyri without such a pedigree. Perhaps we should bear in mind the possibility, not necessarily a strong one, that it is a copy of the original document made in Egypt.

The rapid script is far from calligraphic. The slope varies from one passage to another, so that the writing is sometimes backhand, sometimes sloping forward, and sometimes upright. The beginnings of lines tend to creep inwards with each successive line, so that the margin widens rapidly. The letters are, with few exceptions, in the developed forms of the new Roman cursive. Some specimens of 'l' have an oblique descending to the right which

²⁴ Cf. Millar, *Emperor in the Roman World*, 44.

A ration-warrant for an 'adiutor memoriae'

recalls the old Roman cursive, but in ligature (*salutem* 2, *Alogio* 3) it has the later form. A few instances of 'r' in two well-separated strokes (*Aureli[us]* 1, *sacrum* 6) have an older look, but most are clearly linked in the later style. A few instances of 's' too, notably *salutem* (2), have the older form. The only marked idiosyncrasy is the exaggerated shape of final 'm', which forms a long zig-zag descending stepwise towards the right.

Papyri of similar date in new cursive which may be compared are *ChLA* III 205 (m. 1), *P. Oxy.* XLI 2953 (pl. 1), *PSI* I 111 (plate in G. Cencetti, 'Note paleografiche sulla scrittura dei papiri latini dal I al III secolo d.C.', *Memorie dell'Accademia delle Scienze dell'Istituto di Bologna, Classe sci. mor.*, Ser. 5 (1950) pl. 5). A convenient short account of the new Roman cursive is given in B. Bischoff, *Paläographie des römischen Altertums und des abendländischen Mittelalters* (Berlin 1979) 80-86; cf. S. Hornshøj-Möller, 'Die Beziehung zwischen der älteren und der jüngeren römischen Kursivschrift', *Aegyptus* 60 (1980) 161-224. A short historical account of the controversy in the palaeographical literature over the origins of the new Roman cursive is given in A. K. Bowman and J. D. Thomas, *Vindolanda: The Latin Writing-Tablets*, 53-59; there is a useful comparison of the basic alphabets of the two types on p. 54.