

MILITARY DIPLOMATA FOR THE AUXILIARY SOLDIERS FROM THE  
HELLENOPHONE PROVINCES:  
THE PROBLEM OF THE RECIPIENTS' ROMAN  
NAME-FORMULAE\*

Slobodan Dušanić

**ABSTRACT:** Military diplomata whose recipients originated from the hellenophone parts of the Roman Empire are not very numerous but are of both varied and comparatively high interest. The present discussion covers the historical nucleus of the hellenophone world (Macedonia, Achaëa, the Anatolian lands, Syria, Iudaea, Egypt, Crete with Cyrene) and focuses on one point only: the diplomata for auxiliaries whose names, as cited in the diploma texts, appear to have been those of Roman citizens (i.e. containing the following elements: praenomen, gentile, filiation, cognomen —this last probably omitted in some early diplomata). The evidence has been dealt with by the late Professor A. Mócsy in an important study of the names of the auxiliary and fleet *aere incisi* at large. Its chief conclusion, which has had wide influence, is that no firm connection can be shown to have existed between the recipient's name-formula as read in the diploma and his (*pre-missio*) citizen status (*civis Romanus*, *civis Latinus*, or a peregrine).

Various indications run counter to A. Mócsy's sceptical attitude, however. They will be examined here in three groups, which concern (I) certain general features of the military diplomata as a documentary genre; (II) the data about the recipients' families (filiation; the names of their wives and/or children, when noted) found at the end of the diploma texts; and (III) indirect information about their citizen status which can be obtained from their *origines* (usually referring to cities that were either Roman or included large communities of *cives Romani*). All these indications taken together suggest that, in the diplomata for the auxiliaries from the hellenophone provinces, the recipient's Roman name-formula tends to postulate his having the status of a Roman citizen as early as before his application for the document. This conclusion, which leads to a number of observations of broader interest for the study of military diplomata, seems to hold good for the auxiliary *aere incisi* from the "West", too.

Military diplomata whose recipients originated from the hellenophone ("Oriental" is a popular though not a well chosen equivalent) parts of the Roman Empire are not very numerous<sup>1</sup> but are of both varied and comparatively high interest. This is for several reasons: the certificates in question are quite official, cover, if unevenly, more than two centuries as well as almost all of the Greek-speaking provinces, and concern specific strata of the provincial population, which —sharing intimate contacts with the world of the Roman citizens— enjoyed a relatively favourable socio-economic position. When recorded, the names of such a recipient's wife and/or children only add to the documentary value of the record of the *pater familias*' names. Despite many differences in other spheres of provincial life, the culture of Greek-speaking areas was homogeneous enough, a fact that underlines the elements of unity of the source-material to be examined.

The problems involved are quite complex and concern epigraphy, history (social, cultural, poli-

tico-military), and law. They seem still more intricate with regard to the broader context of diploma research as modern historians continue to disagree upon certain basic features of the entire documentary genre. The present discussion, therefore, cannot be considered anything systematic or exhaustive. It will cover the historical nucleus of the hellenophone world (Macedonia, Achaëa, the Anatolian lands, Syria, Iudaea, Egypt, Crete with

\* In the footnotes (the number of which and, especially, length have been reduced), the following special abbreviations of book-titles are employed: XVI = H. Nesselhauf, *CIL XVI, Diplomata Militaria* (Berolini 1936) and *Supplementum* (Berolini 1955); RMD = M. M. Roxan, *Roman Military Diplomas 1954-1977* (London 1978) and *Roman Military Diplomas 1978 to 1984* (London 1985); RMDHQ = W. Eck and H. Wolff (eds.), *Heer und Integrationspolitik. Die römischen Militärdiplome als historische Quelle*, Passauer historische Forschungen 2 (1986).

1. Some 85 published so far, if uninformative fragments are left aside.

Cyrene)<sup>2</sup> and focus on one point only: the diplomata for auxiliaries whose names, as cited in the diploma texts, appear to have been those of Roman citizens. The legal and social status of (ex-) auxiliaries was so different from the status of (ex-) sailors, praetorians and other soldiers whose troop membership were eligible to diplomata that no detailed justification of this aspect of our paper seems necessary. As to the paper's concentration on the Roman name-formulae, its principal purpose is to contribute to recent debates on the legal value of auxiliary diplomata distributed to men who were already *cives Romani* before becoming *emeriti* of veterans. This is not, of course, forgetting that an analysis of military diplomata of the category selected herein can also prove useful from the point of view of the students of provincial history or onomastics in general.

Among the auxiliary *aere incisib* of "Eastern" origin, people bearing the Roman citizens' name-formulae (abbr. CNF)<sup>3</sup> are encountered for the first time in the early years of Domitian's reign. In the following decades, they become frequent enough. On present evidence, the latest example that can be reliably dated is from AD 179 but it is quite probable that such recipients continued to be registered till the end of the issue of diplomata for auxiliaries (which took place at a time, still impossible to fix precisely, after AD 203)<sup>5</sup>. Naturally, there are also auxiliary diplomata for "Orientals" with the peregrine name-formula (PNF)<sup>6</sup>, in the pre-Domitianic (the earliest published so far belongs to AD 75)<sup>7</sup> as well as the post-Domitianic period. They occur in approximately the same numbers as the diplomata for the CNF recipients<sup>8</sup>. In "Western" provinces, including Thrace and Moesia Inferior, the ratio is much more favourable for the PNF (almost 6: 1)<sup>9</sup>; the CNF start there as late as AD 102<sup>10</sup>. That circumstance, which has been found historically significant, justifies by itself a close analysis of the "Oriental" CNF cases. They can be summarized as follows<sup>11</sup>:

XVI 28 (AD 82)<sup>12</sup> L. Valerio L. f. Pudenti, Ancyra; ex ped. cohort. I Aquitanorum (Germ./Moes.); near Novae (Moes., future Moes. Inf.).

XVI 29 (AD 83) C. Iulio C. f. Saturnino, Chio centurioni cohort. I Hispanorum (Aeg.); Coptus (Egypt).

XVI 39 (AD 93) L. Cassio Cassi f., Larisen(si); pediti cohort. I Cisipadensium (Moes. Sup.); near Bononia (Moes. Sup.).

2. Of these provinces, Iudaea and Crete-Cyrene have as yet produced no CNF auxiliary with a (published) diploma; Anatolia is represented through Asia and Galatia only. Moesia Inferior and Thrace have been excluded (they have supplied no CNF auxiliary in the diplomata edited so far) as deep differences divided the Thracians from the rest of the Hellenophone world. On the other hand, senatorial provinces are included. The auxiliary regiments enlisted a number (though probably small, in the early period) of soldiers there; despite the contention of Th. Mommsen and some others that such a practice would have been illegal. Cf. the case of *tirones Asiani* (AD 117; R. O. Fink, *Roman Military Records on Papyrus*, APhAss. Monographs 26 [1971] 277ff. no. 74) referred to by A. Mócsy in *RMDHQ* 450.

3. For the term, which connotes something of the honour felt by the recipients of diplomata, see *RMDHQ* 193 note 14 (S. Dušanić).

4. Which occur, in the cases examined below, in five variants (listed in the chronological order of appearance in our documents): (a) praenomen, gentile, filiation by praenomen, cognomen; (b) praenomen, gentile, filiation by gentile; (c) praenomen, gentile, filiation by cognomen; (d) praenomen, gentile, filiation by cognomen, cognomen; and (e) praenomen, gentile, filiation by gentile, cognomen.

5. *RMDHQ* 556ff., especially 566 (W. Eck and H. Wolff).

6. In diplomata, it always consists of the name and the patronymic.

7. *RMD* 2, see *infra*.

8. *RMDHQ* 451 (A. Mócsy). Fresh finds change Mócsy's figures only slightly.

9. *Ibid.*

10. XVI 47. After 102, some 15 diplomata for auxiliaries having a "Western" or Thracian origo and bearing the CNF have been registered (see M. M. Roxan's Table III in *RMDHQ* 282f.); as the "West" (together with the two Thracian provinces) provides the great majority of diplomata known so far, that high total is not surprising.

11. The catalogue items give the following data: the basic publication of the diploma and the year of the document's issue; the recipient's name and *origo* (ethnic); his rank, unit, and the unit's province; the name(s) of his wife and/or children (when noted); and the find-spot (with the indication of its province) of the diploma, precise or approximate. In the sequel, the items will be usually referred to by the year of the diploma. The catalogue does not list men whose *origines* are not extant in the diplomata, or are given as *castris*. All such cases are excluded as uncertain, though various facts may indicate that some of these recipients were "Orientals" (e.g. XVI 128; *App.* 2).

12. On the date of the diploma and its "two-province" unit list, *RMDHQ* 205-207 (Dušanić).

XVI42 (AD 98) P. Insteio Agrippae f., Cyrrh(o) ex pedite cohort. I August. Ituraeorum (Pann.); the territory of the Hercuniates (Pann., future Pann. Inf.).

XVI 44 (AD 99) M. Antonio M. f. Rufo, Abretten(o); pedite cohort. II Gallorum (Moes. Inf.); et Marco f. eius not far from Tomi (Moes. Inf.).

ZPE 70 (1987) 189-194<sup>13</sup> (AD 109) M. Herennio M. f. Polymitae(!)<sup>14</sup>, Berens(i)(!); ex pedite coh. I Montanor. (Dac.); et Ianuario et Marcello f. eius et Lucanae fil. eius; near Viminacium (Moes. Sup.).

RMD 14 + p.128 n.20 (AD 114) C. Iulio C. f. Valenti, Trall[i ?]<sup>15</sup>; ex equite coh. III Gallor. (Thr.); et Iulio f. eius et Valentinae fil. ei[us] et Gaiae fil. eius; Pisarevo in Thrace.

XVI 67 (AD 120) M. Antonio Timi f. Timi<sup>16</sup>, Hierapol(i); ex pedite coh. I Flav. Bessor. (Mac.); et Doroturmae Dotochae fil. uxori eius, Tricorn-(ensi), et Secundo f. eius et Marcellinae fil. eius; Tricornium (Moes. Sup.).

XVI 169 (AD 122) M. Antonio Antoni f. Maximo, Syro; ex gregale alae Gallor. Taurian. c. R. torquat. victr. (Maur. Ting.); et Valeriae Messii fil. Messiae uxori eius, Transduc(ta), et Maximo f. eius et Maximae fil. eius; Valentia Banasa (Maur. Ting.).

XVI 78 (AD 134) L. Sextilio Sextili f. Pudenti, Stobis; ex pedite coh. I Claudiae Sugambr. (Moes. Inf.); et Lucio f. eius et Valerio f. eius et Petronio f. eius et Valenti f. eius et Luciae fil. eius et Anniae fil. eius; in Barbarico (to the North of the Lower Moesian Danube, in the future Dacia).

AJA 95 (1991) 469-488 (AD 138) [- - - ] e f. Galbae, Cyrrho; [ex] pedite coh. I Musulamiorum (Lyc. et Pamph.) [et - - - ] pitis fil. uxori (eius) Pamph[ylae et [- - - ] f. eiu]s et Valenti f. eius; Laertes (Pamph.).

XVI 131 + RMD p.126 and 134 (AD 178/190) [- - - c. 12 letters - - - ] i f. Sigillio, [- - - c. 7 letters - - - ] a ex Syr(ia) [ex] pedite [cohort. I Hem]jesenor. (Pann. Inf.); Lower Pannonia?

RMD 123 (AD 179) Ulpio Ulpi f. Herculano, Stobis; ex ped. cohort. III Campestr. (Dac. Sup.); Drobeta (Dacia).

The major part of the evidence presented in the foregoing catalogue has been dealt with by the late Professor A. Mócsy in an important study of the names of the *aere incisi* at large — primarily those of the auxiliaries and the *classarii*. Its chief conclusion, which has had wide influence, is that no firm connection can be shown to have existed between the recipient's name formula as read in the diploma and his (*pre-missio*) citizen status (*civis Romanus*, *civis Latinus*<sup>17</sup>, or a peregrine). Applying this negative conclusion to the CNF recipients from the *auxilia*, Mócsy suggested that in two cases only the CNF — which, in the diplomata for auxiliaries, never includes the *tribus* — would be very likely to reveal people who had become

13. Cf. J. Garbsch, *BVbl* 54 (1989) 137-151.

14. *Polymitae* (a *hapax*) from Πολυμίτης rather than Πολυμίτας or Πολυμήδης.

15. Trall[i] RMD, Trall(ibus) RMDHQ 471 (M. P. Speidel). Both the readings are possible (the former being more probable if the bronze shows that a letter was lost after TRALL) and point to the same Anatolian town, *Tralle(i)s*, not to the Thracian tribe *Tralleis*; even a *Trall(i)ano* or *Trall(i)ano* cannot be ruled out. On various forms of the toponym and the ethnic see W. Ruge, *RE* VI A (1937) col. 2100f, s.v. *Tralleis* (no. 2); they include the nominative *Trallis* (-is), which could produce the ablative *Trall[i]*.

16. The cognomen and patronymic are obviously the same name, in two heteroclitic variants: Τίμι(ο)ς, latinized as *Timis*, -is (the cognomen) and *Timius*, -i (the patronymic) at the same time.

17. Th. Mommsen (*Ges. Schr.* VI 43ff. 76ff.) advanced the hypothesis that those of the CNF auxiliaries whose names include an ethnic (instead of a city-*origo*) but exclude a tribe-indication were of a Latin status. That hypothesis has proved untenable, and with good reason Mócsy did not consider it, having reduced our choice as to the legal identification of the CNF bearers to two possibilities: Roman citizens or peregrines (crypto-peregrines, as called *infra*). Cf. H. Wolff, *Chiron* 6 (1976) 267-288; P. A. Holder, *The Auxilia from Augustus to Trajan*, BAR Int. ser. 70 (Oxford 1980) 50ff.; D. B. Saddington, *The Development of the Roman Auxiliary Forces from Caesar to Vespasian*, 49 B.C.-A.D. 79 (University of Zimbabwe 1982) 192, 250 and 261. On the problem of the omission of the *tribus* from the CNF of the auxiliary *aere incisi*, below, note 24.

Roman citizens before their discharge and/or receiving the diplomata: when the recipient's praenomen differs from his father's (no example known as yet among the "Eastern" bearers of the CNF), and when the recipient's rank was high enough (e.g. *centurio cohortis*, AD 83) to imply the possibility of a *translatusex legione*. All other CNF of the "Oriental" auxiliaries' bronzes were invented, in Mócsy's opinion, by the provincial officials at the moment of the future soldier's *probatio*. In order to give the tiro a name conforming to Roman taste and usage, those clerks replaced the *tiro*'s original names—even if he bore a PNF—by a CNF; Mócsy was inclined to believe that the recruit's Greek or "barbarian" cognomen (or principal name, if the man was a peregrine) also had to be changed on that occasion. According to the Hungarian scholar's reasoning, the majority of the soldiers whose names are enumerated *supra* may have been peregrines till the day of becoming *aere incisi*<sup>18</sup>. Mócsy probably reckoned very much on that possibility (which depends on his theory that the *tria nomina* need never presuppose their bearers' status of *cives Romani*) as purely Roman cognomina prevail in our catalogue.

Various considerations run counter to Mócsy's hypothesis, however. They may be envisaged in three groups, which concern (I) general indications that, in the diplomata at least, the CNF tended to denote *cives Romani*; (II) the data about the recipients' family (filiation; the names of their wives and/or children, when noted) found at the end of the diploma texts; and (III), indirect information about their citizen status that can be obtained from their *origines*. While partly aware of the difficulties presented to his theory by (I) and (II), Mócsy did not discuss (III).

## (I)

There can be little doubt that Roman citizens did appear—and increasingly, with time—in the circle of the candidates for the auxiliary diplomata. That tendency led i. a. to the introduction c. AD 140 of the *qui eorum non haberent in the clause (Imperator ...equitibus et peditibus...) civitatem Romanam ... dedit*. Some features of the *epikrisis* documents seem to point in the same direction

and imply that citizenship was acquired by certain *aere incisi* from *auxilia* "during (or at the end of) their military service" but before their candidature to diplomata<sup>19</sup>. Admittedly, a natural inference from such a state of affairs is that the CNF appertained to that class of recipients whose citizen status (either inherited or acquired during service) and frequency made the authors of the *constitutiones* underlying the diplomata introduce the *qui eorum non haberent* modifier<sup>20</sup>.

This inference gains probability with regard to two facts: in pre-Domitianic times, the CNF is absent from the "personal" part of the texts of diplomata for auxiliaries, which cites the PNF only; the simultaneous use of both onomastic formulae continues from Domitian's reign into the late Antonine epoch, and probably beyond it. If the use of the CNF had been officially permitted to those *aere incisi* who did not possess Roman citizenship before obtaining their bronzes, we should expect the PNF to occur there rarely or never, especially in the post-140 period. The effect of the actual evidence being quite different, it is hard to accept Mócsy's contention that the CNF's value, in diplomata, was cultural rather than legal. The *civitas Romana* gradually spread to the provinces; this was due to immigration from Rome and Italy (and the propagation of the immigrants' descendants, clients, freedmen), as well as to the generosity of the Emperors, the provincial governors and other notables. The notion that *cives Romani* could and should serve in auxiliary units

18. *RMDHQ* 437ff., especially 450f. 456f. 461-3. Cf. Mócsy, *Klio* 52 (1970) 287ff. Similar ideas were expressed by Mommsen (the preceding note), Kraft (who believed L. Cassius, AD 93, and P. Insteius, AD 98, were peregrines—because of their name-formulae) and some other scholars. See the critical observations of Holder and Saddington cited in the preceding note.

19. *RMDHQ* 222 (Dušanić).

20. Cf. XVI 38 (AD 93), with a similar modifier (*qui peregrinae conditionis probati erant*) regarding the *aere incisi* from the *coh. VIII voluntariorum civium Romanorum* (Dalmatia).

was gradually recognized, too<sup>21</sup>. The tempo of those interrelated processes as we follow them nowadays corresponds, in the main, with the changing ratio PNF : CNF in the catalogue of the recipients of auxiliary diplomata. However, from that point of view, the fates of the “Eastern” and “Western” subjects of the Empire were dissimilar, a fact which will be dealt with at the end of the present paper.

Our statistical sample is far too small for a more precise analysis of the chronological order, but purely epigraphico-onomastic indications tend to support the thesis that in documents such as Domitianic and post-Domitianic auxiliary diplomata, the CNF implies, recipients who were, in principle, Roman citizens. On the one hand, all the persons with an obligatory citizens status who are named in military diplomata of various kinds—emperors, governors of provinces, the equestrian army officers, *testes*<sup>22</sup>, recipients from the City troops—are consistently given the CNF by the officials composing the lists of diplomata beneficiaries.

Demonstrable examples of the use of the PNF for citizen recipients from the *auxilia* of fleets are also missing. Gaius Lucif. (XVI 87, AD 139) should by no means be taken as one since Roman praenomina are frequently met with in the function of the peregrines’ names—in diplomata<sup>23</sup> and ordinary inscriptions alike. On the other hand, the diplomata reveal an analogous bureaucratic strictness in treating the PNF and omitting the tribe from the auxiliary CNF<sup>24</sup>. It is instructive to signal the cases wherein the recipients had some title to the more imposing style, the CNF, but remained nevertheless listed with the PNF. The diplomata for the members of *leg. I Adiutrix* (AD 68) and *II Adiutrix* (AD 70)<sup>25</sup> are especially eloquent in that respect. All their recipients have the PNF though these soldiers, as (ex-)legionaries, were in a position to require the CNF from Galba’s and Vespasian’s clerks, respectively. It is obvious that the *officium* in charge qualified them, essentially, as sailors, which they really were for the best part of their military careers. In their capacity as sailors, they were both entitled to diplomata and expected to bear the PNF, not CNF, in their certificates.

The nomenclature of many recipients reflects, therefore, a clerical concern about formalities typical of diplomata—as highly official types of documents—in general. The procedure leading to the grant of individual diplomata was obviously complicated and diachronically combined several sources of information on the beneficiaries; carefully led, it obviously presupposed the possibility, even necessity, of more than one consultation of provincial *witnesses* who were to provide data on the recipient and, when needed, his family members<sup>26</sup>. This fact, among others, does not suit

21. Saddington (*supra*, note 17) 187-192. Cf. *infra*, note 24.

22. For the exceptional t. 4 of XVI 16 see *Epigraphica* 46 (1984) 103f.

23. M(arcus) Damae f. (XVI 15, AD 71), Perasi (dat.) Publif. (XVI 22, AD 78), Tertius Marci f. (XVI 23, AD 78), Lucius Terti f. (RMD 108, AD 126/161?), Volsingus Gai f. (RMD 55, AD 161).

24. The tribes are consistently omitted from the CNF of diploma recipients for non-citizen troops (auxiliaries, sailors, *Equites Singulares*), even in cases wherein such recipients must be expected to have been *cives Romani* at the moment of the issue of the corresponding *leges* (XVI 160, 163; the most diplomata postdating the *Constitutio Antoniniana*, etc.). As is well known, on the contrary, diplomata for the Praetorians and the Urbanicani consistently cite the tribes within the CNF till the later 230’s, and some inscriptions have been found with the tribe-indications added to the name-formulae of the auxiliary soldiers (Mommsen, *Ges. Schr.* VI 44 note 1). In our opinion, the reason for such a state of affairs should be sought in a certain legal traditionalism of the clerks responsible for the production of auxiliary diplomata. Obviously, they did not find it in order to include the *tribus* within the name-formulae of people receiving documents primarily (and originally) intended for peregrines. In a similar way, they did not acknowledge changes in the citizen status of recipients of naval diplomata on a related point: even in the post-212 diplomata for sailors of the *Classes Praetoriae* (some of whom were *Italici!*), we find neither the *qui eorum non haberent* modifier nor an equivalent to it. For the view (not an uncontroversial one) that the omission of the *qui eorum non haberent* from the naval diplomata reflects the scribes’ “legal traditionalism” just spoken of, see *RMDHQ* 222, 224 (Dušanić).

25. AD 68: XVI 7-9 (cf. *AEp.* 1985, 770). AD 70: XVI 10f.

26. *RMDHQ* 233-6 (Dušanić) and 440 (Mócsy). Cf. e.g. Pliny, *Ep.* X 29f.

Mócsy's hypothesis that the diplomata consistently repeat the name-formulae under which the recipients were originally entered in the lists of recruits preserved in the *officia* of the provinces' governors. It is still less compatible with the corollary of the same hypothesis which makes the lists subject to their compilers' arbitrary choice between the PNF and the CNF, and ascribes the clerks a tendency not only to give the CNF to the peregrine *tirones* but also to change the *tirones*' native names (cognomina) into "einfache lateinische Namen ... die aus einer beschränkten Zahl von 'Soldatennamen' gewählt wurden"<sup>27</sup>.

The Syrian examples —pertaining to a major province, which has left us a comparatively important amount of documentation— suffice to show some defects of the theory that provincial recruiting-officers had their own standards as to the selection of the recruits' name-formulae, standards allegedly determining the way in which the "personal" part of the auxiliary diploma text was going to be formulated more than two and a half decades after the *probatio*. Our catalogue cites five men from that province, who were granted their diplomata in AD 98, 120, 122, 138, and 178/190 respectively. Their CNF has been expressed through at least three variants (c, d, e, possibly also a)<sup>28</sup>. Besides, Syria has produced a PNF recipient (*RMD*2, of AD 75: *Herae Serapionis f., Antioc.*), who must have been a peregrine to judge (*i.a.*) from the early date of the document. To that plurality of name-formulae belonging to auxiliaries whose origins were in the same province, another detail can be added which also contradicts Mócsy's ingenious conjectures: both the patronymic and the name (cognomen) of the Antiochene of *RMD* 2 are non-Roman —nothing similar to the simple "Soldatennamen", — and the same holds true for the soldier rewarded in AD 120. Finally, the *origines* as quoted *supra* show a variety of form and content which by itself contrasts with the practice of distinct provincial patterns assumed by Mócsy. Thus we see the dative *Syro* in AD 122, the toponyms in the ablatives in AD 98, 120 (probably)<sup>29</sup>, and 138, and the composite formula [- - -] *a ex Syr(ia)* in 178/190. Diplomata whose recipients did not belong to the group of auxiliaries with the CNF make this repertory somewhat more complete:

*Suros* (!) (XVI 8, AD 68), *Suro Garaseno* (!) (XVI 15, AD 71), and *Antiochia ex Syria Coele* (*ZPE* 96 [1993] 77; AD 206). All these variations of the formulae noting the recipients' home —their orthography as well as their structure— can also be followed in diplomata distributed to men from other provinces, even Italy itself. They illustrate changes and oscillations in the scribal conventions in central *officia*, not the decisive influence of lists composed locally, in Syria or elsewhere.

## (II)

Our short catalogue gives us an insight into the family situations of the auxiliary aere incisi born in "Oriental" provinces. There are reasons to believe that the most of them were families of Roman citizens.

To begin with, in at least four diplomata (of AD 93, 122, 134, and 179), the recipient's filiation is that by (his father's) gentile. The case of M. Antonius Maximus' wife is probably the same (AD 122)<sup>30</sup>. Though the purpose of the formula—which is not rare in inscriptions and other diplomata— has been a matter of learned controversy, it is difficult to escape from the conclusion that "it was to give sure proof of Roman citizenship" as "the normal method (i.e. the filiation by praenomen).....could be usurped by peregrines"<sup>31</sup>. Neither

27. *RMDHQ*462 (Mócsy).

28. (C): AD 98; (d): AD 120; (e): AD 122; (d) or, less probably, (e): AD 138 (the [- - -]e f. ended a cognomen — e.g. [Galba]e f. — rather than a gentile — e.g. [Caecina]e f.; (e), (d) or, less probably, (a): AD 178/190 (the [- - -]i f. should be restored as a gentile or a cognomen rather than a praenomen).

29. The alternative *Heliopol(itano)* seems less plausible, cf. *Nicopoli* (*RMD* 132), *Claudiopoli* (*RMD* 133).

30. It seems that her gentile was Messia, not Valeria (which should be taken for the gentile in the function of the cognomen). The position of the two names has been changed by an inversion well known from epigraphical documents.

31. Holder (*supra*, note 17) 51. *Aliter*, F. Papazoglou (*infra*, note 61) 317 note 55 (on the Ulpius Ulpi f. of *RMD* 123).

does the omission of the recipient's cognomen in the example of AD 93 imply a (crypto-) peregrine<sup>32</sup>. The diploma was issued at a time when the cognomina were not as yet obligatory to record<sup>33</sup>; among the *testes* (who as such were all citizens) to XVI 3 (AD 54), there is a man with an analogous name-formula<sup>34</sup>. And the percentage of formulae containing the kinds of filiation which were not by the father's praenomen (the latter being "die homonyme Filiation" in Mócsy's terminology) is high enough (AD 93, 98, 120, 122, 134, 138, 178/190?, 179) to discourage the notion that the "homonyme Filiation" was preferred by the constructions of the fictitious CNF. After all, C. Iulius C. f. Saturninus' rank of the *centurio cohortis* (AD 83) makes it probable that his citizenship went back to his father at least<sup>35</sup>.

Second, the nomenclature of children. As in many other texts, in our diplomata it tends to derive from the praenomina, gentilicia, or cognomina of the fathers (AD 99, 109 [*Marcellus*] 114, 120 [*Marcellina*], 122, 134 [*Lucius, Lucia*]). If the fathers' names were more or less arbitrarily selected, it would have been strange to find them in such numbers as the source of the children's cognomina. The relative colourlessness of all these names does not suffice, by itself, to prove the hypothesis of their administrative, not family, origin. This will have been especially true in the case of the cognomina, the choice of which must have been upon the soldiers themselves. For, generally speaking, the *aere incisi* were not forbidden from preserving non-Roman cognomina for themselves (AD 109, 122, and many diplomata not in our list) or giving them to their sons and daughters<sup>36</sup>. No bureaucratic considerations of expedience seem to have been at work there; let us note, after all, that the children's Roman cognomina need not have meant an advantage for their bearers when the recipient's decision was to live in a hellenophone area after his *honesta missio* (AD 98, 114, 138)<sup>37</sup>. Thence the nomenclature of the children and its source in the fathers' names can lend no support, to say the least, to Mócsy's theory of artificial name-giving in the *officia* of the *probatores*.

Third, the diploma of AD 98, issued P. Insteio Agrippae f., Cyrrh(o). As pointed out by B. Isaac<sup>38</sup>, the father of the recipient was likely to owe his

(rare enough) gentile and his citizen status to Insteius Capito, Domitius Corbulo's *praefectus castrorum* in Armenia (AD 58)<sup>39</sup>. The cognomen Agrippa points to Herod Agrippa or, rather, Agrippa II. "The following *curriculum vitae* of father and son is suggested: Agrippa, the father, will have served in an Ituraean unit of Agrippa II—hence the name—which was dispatched to reinforce Corbulo's army in Armenia. He served under the command of Insteius Capito, whose gentile name he gave to his son. He may have been based at Cyrrhus, where the son was born. The son joined the Roman army when the Ituraean forces had already been organized as regular auxiliary units"<sup>40</sup>. There may be analogous items in our list for which various indications—onomastic, historico-military, geographical—tend to reveal that the recipient's ancestors (and, very probably, the

32. The same holds true for the example of AD 98.

33. Holder (*supra*, note 17) 51 and 53, against Kraft.

34. Ti. Sex. Magius, b(eneficiarius) Rufi navarchi (cf. Nesselhauf's index of the Signatorum nomina, p. 200; the same name is entered in the index of *RMD* p. 104 in two variants [Sex. Magius Rufus, Sex. Magius], as it figures in the diploma in the [usual] genitive: Sex. Magi...).

35. Mócsy (in *RMDHQ* 451 with note 55) thought of the *centurio* as a *translatus ex legione*.

36. To quote only some examples of children of the CNF auxiliaries: *RMD* 11; 86; 20; 32 (all coming from the "West").

37. In such areas, Greek names will have been socially preferable (cf. e.g. E.A. Meyer, *JRS* 80 [1990] 91-4). No doubt, the fathers receiving the diplomata of AD 98, 114, and 138 had sufficient reasons not to choose them for their children, reasons which are best connected with the fathers' family traditions and army lives. As to the name-giving illustrating these latter (cf. e.g. *Emeritus* and *Emerita* in XVI 2, *Caricus* and *Putiolanus* in *RMD* 133), note that the name Lucana (AD 109) probably reflects the contacts which the father's unit had with the soldiers from Lucus Augusti (cf. XVI 47, with note 8).

38. *RMDHQ* 259-261.

39. *PIR*<sup>2</sup> I 31.

40. Holder (*supra*, note 17) 53 (cf. *RMDHQ* 454 note 61, Mócsy) wrote: "Insteius, in fact, may well have been descended from someone enfranchised by M. Insteius, a supporter of Antony (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> I 28)". But the citizenship of the recipient of XVI 42 probably went back to a Publius.

recipient himself, too) really possessed *civitas Romana*; RMD 123 (AD 179), issued Ulpio Ulpi f. Herculano, Stobis, seems to be one<sup>41</sup>. It was essentially the same practice which led to the formation of (at least) three auxiliary cohorts *civium Romanorum* in the “East” during the Flavio-Trajanic period<sup>42</sup>.

## (III)

It is a neglected fact that the homes of men whose names are dealt with in the foregoing pages were in cities that were either Roman (AD 134, 170: Stobi, *municipium iuris Italic*) or included large communities of *cives Romani*. The only exception to that is the *Abretten(o)* of AD 99, pertaining to a *koinon* in northern Asia (Mysia)<sup>43</sup>. The majority or quasi-totality of these data cannot be assigned to the category, doubtful in itself when it comes to documents as official as diplomata, of the “new” *origines*<sup>44</sup>.

To prove the point on the crucial rôle of Greek cities with important communities of Roman citizens, we have to begin with a discussion—brief and, as far as possible, free of the circular argument—of *origines* whose identification is open to controversy. Four such cases have been recorded: *Ancyra* in AD 82, *Larisen(s)* in AD 93, *Berens(i)* (!) in AD 109, and *Hierapol(i)* in AD 120. All other items in the catalogue refer either to the clear *Syro/ex Syr(ia)* (AD 122, 178/190) or contain toponyms whose identity is virtually beyond doubt (AD 83, 98, 114, 134, 138, 179)<sup>45</sup>.

Of the two *Ancyrae* which should be theoretically considered in an attempt to determine the *patria* of the recipient of XVI 28, the Galatian is a much better candidate, being far greater than its Phrygian homonym, and likely to enlist an auxiliary in the season of Nero’s Parthian War<sup>46</sup>. So far as we can see, no student of diplomata has thought otherwise.

P. A. Holder writes on the recipient of XVI 39: “There are a number of towns called Larissa<sup>47</sup> and it has been suggested he came from the one in Thessaly. However, as he was a citizen, his home town is more likely to have been in an area where recruits served in the legions or *auxilia*. No recruits are known from Thessaly at this time, therefore Asia Minor is a more suitable province of origin”<sup>48</sup>. This comment is not convincing, and it has not

been followed. On the one hand, there was no visible reason, in the last years of Nero’s reign, to search as far as Anatolia (or Syria) for a *pedes* of an Illyrican auxiliary cohort. On the other, Thessaly did supply auxiliaries in the early period<sup>49</sup>. We prefer therefore to identify L. Cassius’ home with the famous Larisa on the Peneus.

41. His grandfather was presumably a soldier of the *coh. I Hispanorum veterana* stationed at Stobi under Trajan” (Fink [*supra*, note 2] 217-227, no. 63; cf. F. Papazoglou, in ANRW II 7. 1 [Berlin-New York 1979] 349f.). *Missus honesta missione* and given the citizenship by that Emperor, the grandfather may have returned to settle in Stobi. The *Ulpii* are otherwise not attested there (F. Papazoglou, *Chiron* 16 [1986] 234).

42. Holder (*supra*, note 17) 67f.

43. Not to the fort of Abrit(t)us in Moesia Inferior, as assumed by some. Its ethnic had a different form, see *ILS* 2670, *castell. Abritanor(um)*.

44. For that notion, RMDHQ 478f. (Speidel). Note that the find-spots of our diplomata never coincide with the areas to which the *origines* point.

45. It is evident that the Cyrrhus of AD 98 and 138 must be the Syrian, not the Macedonian, town. The Thracian alternative should be excluded, without hesitation, in the case of the *origo* of AD 114.

46. RMDHQ 206f. note 74 (Dušanić).

47. Some 15 are registered in the REXII (1924) col. 840-873 (cf. *Diz. ep.* IV 410-19). Of them, five may be envisaged here: Larisa-on-the Peneus (*RE, loc. cit.*, no. 3), Larisa Cremaste (no. 2), Larisa on Ossa (no. 4), Larisa in the plain of the Cayster (no. 9; Holder would have thought of it rather than Larisa Phryconis, no. 8, or Larisa near Tralles), and Larisa Syriae (no. 12). The importance of the first-mentioned (in the Roman epoch particularly) far surpassed the importance of the rest; moreover, the considerations of military history and geography, briefly dealt with in the sequel, give Larisa-on-the-Peneus a clear advantage over its homonyms in Greece and Asia Minor. As to the form of the ethnic, we prefer, with a number of scholars, the *Larisen(s)* (cf. e.g. the ethnic *Amphissenses* and the like) to the *Larisen(o)* printed in *CIL* III and XVI.

48. Holder (*supra*, note 17) 125 note 15.

49. Saddington (*supra*, note 17) 162.



Lesser homonyms or near-homonyms excluded<sup>50</sup>, the *Berens(i)* (AD 109)—best read *Ber<o>ens(i)*<sup>51</sup>—leaves us with three theoretical possibilities of identification of the town in question: Beroea Macedoniae, Beroea Syriae, and Beroe(a), alias Augusta Traiana, in Thrace. This last may be dismissed as its history was such that in the pre-Trajanic period (Herennius and his contirones were enlisted c. AD 84) it could not have housed many Roman citizens—and least those with the non-imperial gentilicia<sup>52</sup>. Between the Macedonian and the Syrian town, the choice must fall on the former. It lay within the recruiting area of the Danubian army<sup>53</sup>, to which the coh. I Montanorum of the diploma's recipient belonged. The case of Beroaea Syriae (like the two overseas Laris(s)ae) was different—at least in normal situations, and the years about AD 84 must have been normal from that point of view as coh. I Montanorum and the Danubian troops in general had no business at that time to be in the East or to recruit the Syrians.

Lastly, the considerations from the disposition of legions and *auxilia* in the season of Trajan's Parthian War make it probable that the *Hierapol(i)* of AD 120 means the town in Cyrrhestice, not one of the Hierapolises in Asia Minor (there were three Anatolian cities of that name)<sup>54</sup>. Between its stay in Moesia Superior at the very beginning of the second century (XVI 46) and its transfer to Macedonia in the early years of Hadrian's reign (XVI 67), the coh. I Flavia Bessorum must have been part of the Upper Moesian expeditionary corps sent to fight the Parthians c. AD 114. In the East—Cyrrhestice precisely—it was likely to receive some Syrians from the local regiments, to compensate losses in the war<sup>55</sup>. The elderly M. Antonius of XVI 67 will have been transferred to I Flavia Bessorum on that occasion; no Anatolian Hierapolis had an occasion as favourable as Hierapolis Cyrrhesticae to enlist one of its citizens in that cohort in the c. AD 95-120 period<sup>56</sup>.

Now, the presence of *cives Romani* is well attested in the Galatian Ancyra, Chios, Thessalian Larisa, Cyrrhus, Macedonian Beroea, Tralles, Syrian Hierapolis. Some of these *poleis* were inhabited by Italian businessmen as early as Republican times (Chios, Larisa, Beroea, Tralles)<sup>57</sup>; Ancyra, Beroea, and Tralles remained centres

attracting Romans of various trades throughout the following centuries<sup>58</sup>.

Strategically important, Ancyra, Cyrrhus, Tralles and Hierapolis became notable sources of recruits for citizen units, primarily the legionaries, under the Principate<sup>59</sup>. A Roman *municipium*, Stobi also was a military base, in Trajan's reign at least<sup>60</sup>, and

50. Beroe-Beroea Chalcidicae, Moesia; Beruenses Raetiae, Italiae.

51. The ethnic (cf. *CIL* VI 3196: *Beroeensis*, of a man originating from the Thracian town) was obviously derived from a Berea; for that vulgar spelling of the Macedonian toponym see e.g. *Itin. Ant.* 328, 4.

52. Cf. *IGBulg.* III 2 (1964) p.23-171 (G. Mihailov). For a different view, see M. Mirković, *ZPE* 70 (1987) 191f.

53. Cf. F. Papazoglou, in *ANRW* II 7.1 (Berlin - New York 1979) 344-6, 348.

54. All the students of the diploma thought the same, but none of them cited arguments for the choice of Hierapolis Syriae. The three Anatolian cities in question were: Hierapolis Castabala, Hierapolis Cydrara, and Hierapolis Phrygiae.

55. Syria and Palaestina contributing soldiers to the Danubian legions in the Neronian-Trajanic and the early Hadrianic periods: G. Forni, *Il reclutamento delle legioni da Augusto a Diocleziano* (Roma 1953) 184f. 202f.; the majority of them entered the Danubian troops at the time of the Parthian campaigns of AD 63-68 and 114-118. Cyrrhus as the military base of the Illyrican vexillations in the Parthian wars: *IGLSyr.* I 148 (Trajan), 150f. (III cent.). The Danubian auxiliaries in the East after AD 114: *ILS* 2723; *IGRR* III 173; XVI 61, etc.

56. *IGLSyr.* I 148 seems probative in that connection, though some Anatolians may have joined the Upper Moesian vexillations in Cyprus in AD 115-116 (cf. *ILS* 9491 and the papyrus referred to *supra*, note 2). For a brief history of Hierapolis in Cyrrhestice, E. Honigmann, *RE* Suppl. IV (1924) 733-742.

57. J. Hatzfeld, *Les trafiquants italiens dans l'Orient hellénique* (Paris 1919) 46f. 95-97, 23ff. 65f., 55f., 126 and 170ff.

58. Ancyra: E. Bosch, *Quellen zur Geschichte der Stadt Ankara im Altertum* (Ankara 1967). Beroea: A.B. Tataki, *Ancient Beroea. Prosopography and Society* (Athens 1988). Tralles: W. Ruge's article cited above, note 15.

59. Forni (*supra*, note 55) 166, 175, 184f. 202f.

60. F. Papazoglou, in *ANRW* II 7.1 (Berlin-New York 1979) 349f.

the home of legionary soldiers<sup>61</sup>. Roman citizens bearing the nomen *Antonius* were common in Asia Minor, a fact which makes us believe that M. Antoninus M. f. Rufus, Abretten(us) (AD 99), did not usurp his CNF. Along with the evidence analyzed *supra*, sections I-II, all this tends to show that the CNF recipients of diplomata for auxiliaries with an “Oriental” *origo* really were Roman citizens. The numerical preponderance in our list of Stobi (AD 134, 179) and the cities of Cyrrhestice (AD 98, 120, 138) taken together seems especially significant in that respect, the more so as these centres are also known from sources other than diplomata to have enlisted auxiliaries in addition to the legionaries<sup>62</sup>. And, for what it is worth, the majority of the gentilicia cited in our list<sup>63</sup> are attested in the towns/regions to which the *origines* point.

Negative evidence seems instructive, too. With the exception of the *Abretten(o)* (AD 99), the items of the catalogue omit *origines* which, historically and juridically, are expected to have had little or no Roman citizens (“tribes”, *koina*, *komalet* sim.). This feature of the source-material strongly contrasts with the relative multitude of (e.g.) Thracians among the PNF recipients of auxiliary diplomata. Moesia (Inferior) and Thrace had only several communities constituted from, or containing considerable numbers of, Roman citizens in the first and second century A.D. Thence so many Thracians are found in the PNF group and (so far) none in the CNF group. This picture has been made more complete by M. P. Speidel’s attentive analysis of the evidence concerning the auxiliary recipients of diplomata from Latin-speaking provinces. That scholar has remarked “that in the West every time a town is given as a soldier’s home, the man carries the *tria nomina*. One may be tempted, therefore, to infer that a soldier’s *tria nomina* in the West, at least, tend to suggest Roman citizenship”<sup>64</sup>. Under the influence of Mócsy’s theory, Professor Speidel resisted that temptation, but the concordance of the “West” and “East” on the point in question is too marked to allow us to suppose that among the CNF *aere incisi* from *auxilia* there were crypto-peregrines in any numbers worthy of mention.

If the main conclusion of the present paper is accepted, it suggests two interconnected observations of broader interest.

First, regarding the legal aspect of the occurrence of Roman citizens among the recipients of auxiliary diplomata. The share of such people in the class of the auxiliary *aere incisi* must have been considerable under the Flavian dynasty, and increasing in the second century; thence the *qui eorum non haberent* modifier will be introduced c. AD 140. What was the purpose of giving them documents about privileges when the main one, *civitas Romana*, was already possessed? That question, long debated, used to be answered by modern historians to the effect that if the *aere incisi* did not need *civitas* for themselves, they could still need the *ius conubii* and/or *civitas* for their children, i.e. the

61. *Ibid.*, 344 with notes 185f., 346 note 197; cf. 347. Stobi became a *municipium* early in Vespasian’s reign, if not before, and obtained the *ius Italicum* at an uncertain date not later than Elagabalus (F. Papazoglou, *Les villes de Macedoine à l’époque romaine* [Paris 1988] 313ff.). It was probably never a *colonia civium Romanorum*.

62. For the *coh. II Cyrrhestarum* (the numeral implies the existence of a *coh. I Cyrrhestarum*, too) see Saddington (*supra*, note 17) 163. At least three Stobians were soldiers of the *coh. I Hispanorum veterana* under Trajan, to judge from the papyrus referred to (*supra*, note 41: col. I lines 13, 16, 18f.). At a time when that papyrus and *RMD* 123 were unknown as yet, Mommsen (*Ges. Schr.* VI 62 note 6) thought that, for the auxiliaries, the home indications citing the cities of Stobi’s rank had been anomalous. This verdict did not take into account the process of levelling the *auxilia* and the citizen troops, a process which went rather far by the end of the first century AD (cf. *supra*, notes 2, 20, 24).

63. They are not rare enough to allow useful rapprochements. The gentile of the recipient of XVI 78 (AD 134) could be an exception, but he is (so far) the only *Sextilius* evidenced in Stobi (the names of his sons *Valerius* and *Petronius*, and his daughter *Annia*, were derived from the gentilicia—quite common, it is true—which are evidenced in the prosopography of the city: F. Papazoglou, *Chiron* 16 [1986] 233 and 235). Let us note, however, that the *M. Antonii* (AD 99; 120; 122) are quite common among the *cives Romani* attested in Syria and Asia Minor, and that some *Cas(s)ii* (AD 93) occur in the inscriptions of Larisa (*IG X.2*, 828; cf. 550, line 2). For the *Insteius* (AD 98) and *Ulpus* (AD 179) see *supra*, notes 39 and 41.

64. *RMDHQ* 478. Cf. Mommsen, *Ges. Schr.* VI 44f.

two further privileges bestowed upon the recipients of standard auxiliary diplomata (the latter till c. AD 140 only)<sup>65</sup>. The answer has the disadvantage of referring to the *iura* which seem to have been used by the auxiliaries rather rarely; they could hardly justify the extensive issue of documents as costly and prestigious as the diplomata. What we learn of auxiliary veterans from inscriptions shows that they “usually had no family or intention of founding one: if ready to accept the matrimonial life at all, they preferred women of citizen status” (a marriage which, of course, did not presuppose the *ius conubii*)<sup>66</sup>. On the other hand, the first century diplomata listed above (AD 82, 83, 93, 98) tend to omit the children of the recipients. The same holds true, naturally, for the simple soldiers’ post-140 diplomata (AD 178/190, 179), so that the *liberi* are cited in the Trajan-Pius period only<sup>67</sup>. We are led therefore to search for a *raison d’être* of auxiliary diplomata that could explain the phenomenon of citizen recipients throughout its duration. The attempt at an explanation could start from the theory of “additional privileges” (*immunitates, missio agraria, monies* and the like), granted to all the *aere incisi* as such but normally not referred to in the diploma texts. These “additional privileges” were probably registered in tablets made of perishable materials, tablets distributed individually and having the value of a document only in conjunction with the diploma itself. Their legal content indirectly supports the hypothesis that the diplomata did not present automatic grants rewarding long service as such but special grants rewarding bravery and some other extraordinary merits<sup>68</sup>.

Second, on the differences between the “Eastern” and “Western” provinces as to the recipients of auxiliary diplomata bearing the CNF and (always or almost always) having Roman citizenship. As stated at the beginning of this paper, the recipients with “Eastern” *origines* are relatively more numerous and appear earlier than those with “Western” ones. This preponderance is all the more striking as the *civitas Romana* seems to have penetrated into the *auxilia* garrisoning the “East” (and locally recruited, for the most part) to a lesser degree than the *auxilia* of the “West”<sup>69</sup>. Though the quantity of diplomata concerned is too small for fully reliable statistics, and though the phenomenon may have

been a polygenetic one, we would venture a general explanation. At a time when the presence of *cives Romani* among auxiliaries was regarded as less unusual in itself, they became, for the recruiting officers acting in the “East”, the kind of *tirones* preferable to the local peregrines. This will have been especially the case with the “Oriental” citizen recruits intended for the *auxilia* stationed in the “Western”/Danubian provinces, which had more dangerous enemies to fight than the troops in the “East”<sup>70</sup>; after all, it was in the “Western”/Danubian armies that the great majority (12 out of 13) of the men listed above served their terms. A combination of two qualities must have given them a distinct priority in such a situation: their knowledge of the official language of the *exercitus Romanus* (particularly important in the “West”)<sup>71</sup>, and a certain mentality that can be defined as “martial”. This latter was usually thought of as typical of the Thracians and the “Westerners” (peregrines included) and untypical of the “Easterners”—peregrines as well

65. See e.g. K. Kraft, *Zur Rekrutierung der Alen und Kohorten an Rhein und Donau* (Bern 1951) 112ff.; M. M. Roxan, in *RMDHQ* 268ff.

66. *RMDHQ* 222-225, especially 223 (Dušanić).

67. See Tables IV A and IV C in *RMDHQ* 285-7 (Roxan). Diplomata citing the recipients’ wives but no children are quite rare (*ibid.*, Tables IV B, V C) and seem to include only one document for a (“Western” ?) CNF recipient (*RMD* 11). While the diplomata for the auxiliaries with “Eastern” *origines* omit to cite the recipients’ families in the first century, such diplomata for the “Westerners” do so rather frequently (Dr. M. M. Roxan’s Tables IV A and IV C).

68. Dušanić in *RMDHQ* 190ff. and *Epigraphica* 55 (1993) 36-43, esp. 41.

69. Cf. the post-140 testimonies cited by Dr. Roxan in *RMDHQ* 279.

70. Cf. *RMDHQ* 200-203 (Dušanić). Note that the Parthian threat was not serious, save for short intervals, in the period of the intensive production of auxiliary diplomata.

71. However, we should not overestimate the factor of the knowledge of Latin among the auxiliaries. It alone could not explain, for instance, the high proportion of (PNF) recruits from Thracian areas; the Thracians were notoriously devoted to their native tongue.

as those only superficially Romanized<sup>72</sup>. This explanation, introducing the factor of special qualities, harmonizes with the hypothesis just referred to that the military diplomata were *ob merita grants*, denied to a number of *emeriti* whose type of unit and length of service would have made

them otherwise eligible. In any case, the evidence does not support the alternative interpretations of the clear signs that the diplomata were not distributed to all the candidates indiscriminately<sup>73</sup>.

S. Dušanić  
University of Belgrade

72. The military excellence of the “Western” and Thracian *auxilia*: (e.g.) Arr. *Anab.* II. 7, 3-8 (esp. 5); *Exp. tot. mundi* 50. The military defects of the “East”: (e.g.) Tac. *Hist.* III.47, 5, and *Ann.* XIII. 35; Cass. Dio LXXVI. 12, 3.5; Herodian, III. 4, 1.5 *et passim*. Cf. Holder (*supra*, note 17) 50 and 121ff., who remarks (p. 50 and 56 notes 6-7): “...if a citizen recruit was physically fit although not tall enough for the legions, it is conceivable he would have been drafted into an auxiliary cohort rather than have been rejected. This would go some way to explain the number of Eastern citizens in auxiliary cohorts”. In my opinion, the criterion of physical fitness was less unfavourable for the “Orientals” than the criterion of “martial” mentality just mentioned.

73. A notable interpretation of that order has been that diplomata were bought by the *aere incisi*; thus the percentage of certain troops and provinces among them would have reflected the beneficiaries’ financial possibilities, not their real numbers or war merits. The comparatively high proportion of the mounted soldiers among the *aere incisi* has been explained, in that sense, as a result of “the ability of *equites* to save out of their higher stipendia; they could more easily afford to pay for a permanent record of the privileges to which long service entitled them” (M. M. Roxan, in *RMDHQ* 266). But our sample has 10 *pedites* (*ex peditibus*) versus 2 *equites* (*ex equitibus*) and one *centurio*.