

A note on the nomenclature of the Thracian veterans

Ivo TOPALILOV¹

Abstract. *The author analyses the importance of the tribe in nomenclature of Thracian veterans. Despite its introduction probably in pre-provincial time, when part of the provincial elite gained Roman citizenship and therefore Roman names, a practice which continued decades after the establishment of the new province, it seems that the Roman tribe system remained unpopular and uncommon in Thrace and more or less isolated. The Roman tribe was used rarely and when used it was either in the nomenclature of the Thracian elite or of non-Thracian veterans settled in Thrace. The inscriptions also reveal that this practice was characteristic for a certain span of time, probably till the time of Hadrian.*

Rezumat. *Autorul analizează importanța tribului în nomenclatura veteranilor de etnie tracă. Se pare că acest sistem a rămas nepopular și neutilizat în rândul tracilor, chiar după ce un număr din ce în ce mai mare de veterani capătă cetățenia începând cu a doua jumătate a secolului I p.Chr. Inscripțiile arată faptul că această practică a fost utilizată până într-o anumită perioadă, probabil până sub Hadrian.*

Keywords: Thracian veterans, Moesia inferior, Thrace, Roman tribes.

It is well known that each Roman citizen was supposed to possess *tria nomina*, *pater* and *tribus*. These requirements are based on the *lex Iulia*, issued in 44BC (CIL I, 593: *q(uei) c(ives) R(omanej) erunt censum / ag[i]to eorumque nomina prae nomina patres aut patronos tribus cognomina*). Thus, one should expect that each Roman citizen would be registered in an official list of the Roman citizens set up in Rome². It is logical to assume that the nomenclature of each citizen would be extracted by means of this official list when they were issued military diplomas, *laterculi*, or other official documents as it seems that some of the epitaphs were set up by officials. In fact, in most cases the military diplomas were the only evidence for the official nomenclature, civic status of the holder and his relatives in the provinces³. Among them were the Thracian veterans whose nomenclature is the subject of this article. It is well known that Thracians entered the Roman army long before the establishment of the Roman province of Thrace. Up to now, more than forty units are attested so far with Thracians and with Thracian names in their title. In fact, one of their

¹ University of Shumen; itopalilov@yahoo.com

² See for this MÓCSY 1986, 437.

³ On the importance of tribe in nomenclature, see FORNI 1977, 73–99.

revolts—that of 21 AD—was linked directly to the military service of the Thracians in the Roman army⁴. It should be noted that the revolt was not against the Thracian recruitment for the Roman army, but the stationing of the new soldiers in remote provinces. Thracians were also recruited for the fleet as in the case of the *Bessoï* — some of them stationed in Ravenna, but mostly in Misenum⁵, as well as for the auxiliary units. In some cases, in these early years they were also recruited for two legions—*legio I Adiutrix* and *legio II Adiutrix*—which were established as *iustae legiones* by adding sailors from both fleets⁶. Later, the Thracians entered the *equites singulares Augusti*, probably from the time of Hadrian onward or even earlier—in the time of Flavians as many *Flavii* are known in Thrace, and in the legions, which led them finally to the Praetorian Guard after 193 AD. When the auxiliary and marine soldiers were discharged (*honesta missio*) they received Roman citizenship and according to the *lex Iulia* they should also have been enrolled into one of existing 35 Roman tribes. The legionary soldiers should have been already enrolled into the Roman tribes, while the Praetorians used so-called ‘pseudo-tribes.’

The role of the tribe in the nomenclature of the Thracian veterans has not been studied fully yet. The study of G. Forni on the pseudo-tribes provides various examples of this practice among the praetorians, including Thracians⁷, but with few exceptions⁸, there is no a specific study on pseudo-tribes among the Thracian praetorians. Usually, when this question is examined it is as part of broader studies of military nomenclature for all veterans⁹, or the study is concentrated only on the Thracian aristocratic elite, some of who are cited with Roman tribe affiliation¹⁰. This is logical as A. Mócsy has already observed¹⁰ that it was only the praetorians and *urbaniciani* that used the tribe in their nomenclature¹¹. While discussing the Roman names and tribe in the nomenclature of the Thracian aristocracy G. Gaggero is inclined to accept that they did not relate to the juridical status of their owner¹². The other scholar working on this problem is M. Tacheva who pays attention to the spread of the tribe *Quirina* among the Thracian *strategoï*. She believes based on the known epigraphic sources that this tribe was used as early as 79 AD, and not all of the *strategoï* known from the inscriptions were enrolled into it, but only those who received special attention from the emperor. This is due to the fact, that not all of the elite mention *Quirina* in its nomenclature.

⁴ Tac. Ann. III, 38–39.

⁵ TACHEVA 2000, 156, 161–169.

⁶ See for example RMD III, 136.

⁷ FORNI 1985.

⁸ See BENEFIEL 2001; TOPALILOV 2011; 2015.

⁹ MÓCSY 1986, 437–466.

¹⁰ See GAGGERO 1978, 251–263; KIROV 2015, 79–80; TACHEVA 2007.

¹¹ MÓCSY 1986, 438.

¹² GAGGERO 1978, 253–254.

In the time of Trajan-Hadrian the tribe affiliation seems to have been abandoned¹³. The study of M. Tacheva is a step ahead, but when studying such a case, it should be remembered that *Quirina* tribe was used not only by the *Flavii*, but also a bit earlier, in the time of Claudius¹⁴.

The epigraphic monuments that provide data on nomenclature may be divided into three major groups: those deriving from Rome or set up there, which include the military diplomas issued for the Thracian veterans and *laterculi praetorianorum*, but also epitaphs and votive inscriptions, those from the provinces with the epitaphs and *laterculi*, and those from Thrace itself. One might logically expect nomenclature to be different among these sets of evidence, and a brief overview will show that this is indeed the case.

As one might suppose, a great variety of monuments on the subject can be found in Rome. The military diplomas of the earlier periods clearly provide the nomenclature of the Thracian veterans no matter which ethnic group they belong to – *Bessoii*, *Sappaei* etc. According to them the nomenclature of the veterans who become Roman citizens when discharging contained *praenomen*, *pater* and *cognomen* or mostly ethnic. Thus, we are aware of a certain *Hesbenus (!) Dulazeni f., Sapp(aeus)*, a veteran from the Misene fleet, discharged on 71, 9 February¹⁵, but also of a certain *Dernalus Derdipili f., Dacus* of the Ravenna fleet, discharged on 70, 26 February¹⁶, probably of *Tyraesus ... f(i)lius*, who was recruited for the fleet and was discharged as a veteran of *legio I Adiutrix* on a. 68, 22 December¹⁷, and of *Dules Datui f. natione Bessus*, a marine *causarius* discharged as veteran of *legio II Adiutrix* on a. 70, 7 March¹⁸. It should be underlined that these are not the only examples known, but they are among the earliest known so far, and they provide a good example of the nomenclature of the veterans in that time. Cases like that of *Sparticus Diuzeni f., [vico] Dipscurto Bessus*, a veteran of the Misenum fleet, discharged on 52, Dec. 11¹⁹, are quite rare and should be regarded as an exception rather than a rule.

One would expect a certain change in the status of the marines when the fleet was given a title of *classis praetoria* by Vespasian after AD 69. Thus, one would expect to continue with the ordinary way by which they obtained names, as clearly shown by O. Salomies²⁰, but as soldiers of *praetoria* they should also possess a Roman tribe assignation as the praetorians did. It is probably due to this change that the Thracian marines started using the Roman *tria nomina* instead of previous *duo nomina*. It is true that this change is attested for first time in a diploma

¹³ TACHEVA 2007, 6–7.

¹⁴ FORNI 1985, 45; KIROV 2015, 84.

¹⁵ CIL XVI 12.

¹⁶ RMD IV, 203.

¹⁷ RMD III, 136.

¹⁸ CIL XVI 10.

¹⁹ CIL XVI 1.

²⁰ SALOMIES 1996, 167–186.

dated to the beginning of Hadrian's time²¹, but this may be due to the lack of diplomas issued in the time period AD 70–119. Surprisingly or not, in the new nomenclature the tribe was also omitted.

The nomenclature of the Thracian marines did not change much through the 2nd and first half of 3rd century²².

The nomenclature of Thracian auxiliary soldiers developed in a similar way. In early periods, auxiliary veterans' nomenclature contained the *praenomen*, *pater* and name of Thracian tribe. Some change occurred in the last years of Trajan when some of the veterans obtained the Roman *tria nomina*. The case with *C. Iulius C. f. Valens, Tralli* of 114, 19 July is among the earliest known²³. Although visible, this practice seems to have remained unpopular among the Thracian auxiliary and such cases were rarely attested. In these and later diplomas the tribe is omitted.

This observation may be valid, however, not only for Thracian auxiliaries. In their diplomas the tribe is usually missing even in the nomenclature of the witnesses, even if among them centurions are cited such as we see in the diploma issued for *Romasta Rescenti f., Spiuro*. The *tribus* entered in these diplomas as late as the time of Galba²⁴, but it is, however, quite sporadic and in the majority of diplomas the tribe was usually omitted.

The data provided by the military diplomas—*tria nomina* and *pater*²⁵—is supplemented in the epitaphs found in Rome with *origo*, quite often marked also by *natio*. Thus, we are aware of *P. Aelius Bassus, nat(ione) Bessus, Claudia Apris*²⁶ and of *P. Aelius Avitus, Traianopoli, natione Trax*²⁷, who are typical examples of the nomenclature of Thracian Horse Guards — imperial name in *tria nomina* and *natione*²⁸. No tribe is attested in the Thracian cases, although in the epitaphs of some other soldiers the full title of the home town with the epithet are found²⁹, put in the place of the tribe. The examples are numerous and among them one should note that of *T. Aurelius T. f. Aelio Mursa Maximus*³⁰, but also *T. Aurelius T f. Ulp (ia) Noviomag(i) Vindex*³¹, etc. This might indicate that the *equites* were not enrolled into Roman tribe, and this is why they use the home town with the imperial epithet instead.

²¹ PAUNOV 2005, 39–51.

²² See for example the *constitutio* of *M. Aurelius Spori fil. - - -]drubius, Nicopoli e[x Thracia vel Moes(ia) inf(eriore), vico] Dizerpera* issued in 224: WEISS, 1999, 246–248.

²³ ROXAN, PAUNOV 1999, 269–279.

²⁴ CIL XVI 7 — *C. Iulius Col(lina) Libonis*.

²⁵ MÓCSY 1986, 438.

²⁶ CIL VI 3177.

²⁷ CIL VI 3176.

²⁸ See also SPEIDEL 1965, 2–3.

²⁹ See for example *domu Flavia Sirmio*: CIL VI 3184.

³⁰ CIL VI 3214.

³¹ CIL VI 3237.

Unlike the *laterculi*, the tribe was used in the nomenclature of the legionaries in their epitaphs. In the case of the Thracian veterans, however, we are aware of the *laterculus* CIL 03, 14507 dated to 195 where only *tria nomina* and *origo* is mentioned. No tribe is attested on the epitaphs also.

It is quite different when we are dealing with the praetorians. As mentioned above, the tribe is mandatory attested in the nomenclature of praetorians on the military diplomas. In the earliest known praetorian *laterculus* of AD 119–120³² the tribe is omitted and only *tria nomina* and *origo* are presented, while as late as AD 127–128 the filiation appeared also³³. The fragmentary CIL VI, 2376 does not allow us to check if the full nomenclature has been already established at that time as it appears on *laterculus* CIL VI 2377 of a. 136. It was not, however, until ca. 149 when this full nomenclature was entirely accepted³⁴. One may assume that the appearance of the tribe may be due to the provincials entering the Guards which affected the official nomenclature required.

The tribe affiliation found its place in the nomenclature of the praetorians in their funeral inscriptions set up in Rome as early as the first half of 1st c. as the study of M. Claus revealed³⁵. Thus, we are aware of *L. Cassius L. f. Rom Niger, domo Atestae* dated to that time³⁶. Numerous stelae are also known dated to that time. It should be noted, however, that not all of the stelae contain tribe affiliation. Despite this, it seems that it was inseparable part of the nomenclature of the praetorians since the very beginning. In the following decades, more information is given in this respect and this continued till the 3rd c. including. Therefore, it is not surprisingly that the tribe affiliation is attested also on stelae found in the provinces, although the majority of them were found in Rome and Italy. Some examples are known from Hispania citerior³⁷, Baetica³⁸, Achaia³⁹, Macedonia⁴⁰, Dalmatia⁴¹, Noricum⁴², Numidia⁴³, Gallia Narbonensis⁴⁴, Moesia inferior⁴⁵, Syria⁴⁶, Lusitania⁴⁷, Dacia⁴⁸, Asia⁴⁹, Lugudunensis⁵⁰, Africa

³² CIL VI 2375.

³³ CIL VI 2376.

³⁴ CIL VI 2380.

³⁵ CLAUSS 1973.

³⁶ CIL VI 2429.

³⁷ See for example CIL II 2610, 4461.

³⁸ CIL II 1168; AE 2000, 736.

³⁹ CIL III 505.

⁴⁰ CIL III 14203,35; AE 2012, 1379.

⁴¹ ILJug 252, 2085, 2098; CIL III 2887.

⁴² CIL III 5538.

⁴³ CIL VIII 5531 = CIL VIII, 18910.

⁴⁴ CIL XII 1529; CIL XIII 1834; AE 2004, 898.

⁴⁵ ILBulg 65.

⁴⁶ AE 1912, 179; 1955, 225.

⁴⁷ AE 1993, 915 = AE 2001, 1164.

⁴⁸ IDR III/2, 113.

proconsularis⁵¹, Moesia superior⁵² etc. Not surprisingly, these cases are not numerous as the Roman tribe system was not familiar to the provincials. It seems, when possible, the person belonging to a certain Roman tribe would proudly state that in his inscription.

It is assumed that near the middle of 2nd century the original tribe system ceased to be in use any more and replaced by the so-called pseudo-tribe system⁵³. The change occurred more significantly in the praetorian nomenclature after 193 AD when the old praetorian guards were disbanded and replaced by soldiers from the legions, loyal to Septimius Severus. After that time many provincials, including Thracians entered the Praetorian Guard. It is almost certain that they were recruited from the legions and not from the auxiliaries⁵⁴, and as Roman citizens they should also possess Roman tribe affiliation. This led to the mass use of pseudo-tribe into the nomenclature of the new praetorians, a process almost completed in second decade of 3rd century as CIL VI 32 624 reveals. This date of the inscription is suggested by G. Forni⁵⁵, followed by C. Ricci⁵⁶, while a more precise date is proposed by R. Benefiel⁵⁷. Thracians as one of the major ethnic groups in the Guard were also part of this process. It is not my intention here to discuss how the pseudo-tribes were chosen among the Thracian praetorians⁵⁸, but I would like to note the huge diversity of them such as *Iulia*, *Claudia*, *Flavia*, *Ulpia* and *Aelia*⁵⁹ with an observable preference for *Flavia* and *Ulpia*. The majority of these praetorians have the names *M. Aurelii* and most probably got their Roman citizenship from their fathers, who in these cases gained it in the time of M. Aurelius or Commodus.

In sharp contrast to this is the *constitutio* of *P. Aelius Pacatus* issued on March 1st, 152 where he is ascribed to the tribe of *Vol(tinia)*. It has been assumed that the listed *origo* of *Philipp* refers to Philippopolis⁶⁰, but it is more likely *Philippis*, the Roman colony established by Octavian in Macedonia, the bulk of whose citizens were assigned to the tribe of *Voltinia*⁶¹.

There are two more examples which are of interest for our study. Thus, in the *laterculus* CIL VI 32 640, 7, among the veterans one would find *[M.] Aurel(ius) M(arci) f(ilius) Qui(rina) Orestes Trim(ontio)* while in the *laterculus* CIL VI 32 624, c, 3: *T. Fl(avius) T(iti) f(ilius) Qui(rina)*

⁴⁹ AE 1974, 619; 1978, 790.

⁵⁰ AE 1955, 211.

⁵¹ AE 2002, 54.

⁵² ILJug 38.

⁵³ See FORNI 1985, 34–35.

⁵⁴ See for this problem the study made by KENNEDY 1978, 275–301.

⁵⁵ FORNI 1985, 72.

⁵⁶ RICCI 1993, 178, n. 18.

⁵⁷ BENEFIEL 2001, 224.

⁵⁸ See for this TOPALILOV 2015.

⁵⁹ TOPALILOV 2017.

⁶⁰ RGZM 6.

⁶¹ On the *colonia Augusta Iulia Philippensis* — see PAPAZOGLU, 1988, 405–413; TOPALILOV 2013, 287–300.

[An]tiochus IRIMU (expanded as *Trimuntio – sic*)⁶². In the former case, the tribe *Quirina* is one of the three tribes attested in the inscription with *Cl(audia)* and *Pol(lia)* in the nomenclature of praetorians from *Scip(is)*⁶³ and Carthage respectively⁶⁴. The case with *Quirina Scupis* is well known⁶⁵ as well as the case with *colonia Iulia Carthaginienses*, whose elite seem to have been attributed to *Quirina* also⁶⁶.

In the latter case, that of *T. Fl(avius) [An]tiochus*, it should be noted that some more praetorians from Trimontium (Philippopolis) are also attested in this *laterculus*. Unlike *T. Fl(avius) [An]tiochus* they are presented with the pseudo-tribes *[U]l(pia)* or *[F]l(avia)*⁶⁷. In this inscription *Quirina* is also one of the very few Roman tribes attested among, for example, the *Pap(iria)*, *Cl(audia)*, *Pol(lia)*, *Fab(ia)* and probably *Col(lina)*, found in the nomenclature of praetorians from *Scupis* and probably AEMDUFI⁶⁸.

It is clear from both examples that no error was made when *Quirina* was attributed to these praetorians from Philippopolis. Up to now, they are the only two known examples of praetorians not only from Philippopolis, but from whole Thrace with tribe assignation; all the rest used pseudo-tribes.

These examples raise the question: if the tribe of *Quirina* was used for Thracians, to whom was it assigned?

When studying the epigraphic monuments of Thrace it is not surprising to find out that the Roman tribe system was not widely in use. According to the extant inscriptions it is to be found, albeit rarely, in two main groups of inscriptions: those commemorating Thracians, and those commemorating others. On the other hand, they could be also divided into two more groups: that of *Quirina*, and of other tribes.

It is well known after the *IAThr* E84 dated to 46–60 AD that most of the Thracian *strategoï* gained the Roman *tria nomina*, viz. Τιβέριος Κλαύδιος or Γάιος Ίούλιος and preserved the Thracian cognomen and therefore Roman citizenship. This process continued also in the time of *Flavii* with their successors and descendents, but also others, such as the ἀρχιερεὺς τῆς ἐπαρχείας, for instance. In some cases the tribe of *Quirina* appeared in their nomenclature presented in the inscriptions⁶⁹. Thus, we are aware of the strategos Τι. Κλαύδιος Κυρεΐνα Θεόπομπος Θεοπόμπου⁷⁰ and his probable brother⁷¹, of *Ti. Claudius Teopompi f. Quir. Sabinus*⁷²,

⁶² See for this MATEESCU 1923, 126, 268; PASSERINI 1939, 177.

⁶³ CIL VI 32 640, 22, 28, 38.

⁶⁴ CIL VI 32 640, 44.

⁶⁵ CIL III 7289.

⁶⁶ See for example CIL II 3418.

⁶⁷ CIL VI 32 624, 8, 9.

⁶⁸ CIL VI 32 624, c, 29, d, 6; d, 20.

⁶⁹ TACHEVA 2007.

⁷⁰ IGRR I, 677; IMS III/2 101.

⁷¹ IGBulg III/2, 1606=V, 5581: [Τιβ. Κλαύδιος Θεοπό]μπου υἱὸς Κυρεΐνα Διόδωρος.

but also of Τίτος Φλαύιος Σκελου υἱὸς Κυρεῖνα Δινις, who was hereditary priest of Sabasios and priest of the Thracian assembly⁷³ and Τ. Φλ. Κυρεῖνα Βειθυκενθος Ἐσβενειος⁷⁴.

The appearance of *Quirina* in the nomenclature of just some representatives of the Thracian provincial elite led M. Tacheva to believe that not all of the new Roman citizens were enrolled into the Roman tribe system, but only those who gained special attention by the emperors⁷⁵.

The question is more complex if we have in mind that new Roman citizens were enrolled in the tribe of *Quirina* as early as the time of Claudius⁷⁶ which goes well with their imperial names. In the official inscription *IAThr* E 84, however, the tribe is omitted not only in the nomenclature of Thracian *strategoī*, but also in that of the provincial governor *M. Vettius Marcellus*. The only answer could be the character of audience for which the inscription was set up—the provincial society in newly established province—which obviously was not well acquainted with the Roman tribe system. As mentioned above, in Rome at that time the tribe assignment was widespread not only in official inscriptions, but also in epitaphs which are more or less private.

It seems also that this practice did not gain wide acceptance among the new Roman citizens too. In the time of *Flavii*, however, as pointed out by M. Tacheva it appeared quite frequently as shown by the above examples⁷⁷. It seems that this practice spread among the elite more or less and the *Quirina* shows their high status and dignity despite the fact that this practice was not common in Thrace. The nature of epigraphic monuments reveals that they do not necessarily belong to the official inscriptions. As the preserved inscriptions reveal, the majority are in fact dedicatory inscriptions placed on votive plaques and huge blocks found in sanctuaries scattered across the administrative territory of later Roman cities. Only one inscription is found so far within the city.

The inscriptions allow us to trace some aristocratic families and their *cursus honorum*⁷⁸, but what makes an impression is that no descendant of those who cited *Quirina* used this tribe again. In fact, no tribe has ever been mentioned in their nomenclature. It remains unclear whether this is due to the unpopularity of practice in Thrace which applied also to them and they did not pay much attention to it or whether in fact they did not belong to it at all. Nonetheless, the inscriptions known up to now reveal that the use of Roman tribe is to be found in the nomenclature of the aristocratic Thracians only.

⁷² SAYAR 1998, 192.

⁷³ IGBulg V, 5592.

⁷⁴ IGBulg III/ 2, 1714.

⁷⁵ TACHEVA 2007, 6.

⁷⁶ See FORNI 1985, 45; KIROV 2015, 84.

⁷⁷ TACHEVA 2007, 6.

⁷⁸ See TACHEVA 2007; IGBulg V, 5592.

As mentioned, there was another group of *Quirina* citizens in Thrace. Thus, a fragmentary inscription found south of Philippopolis suggests that veterans from a legion and auxiliary were settled there⁷⁹. The inscription itself contains the names of three *Flavii* and *Quirina*⁸⁰ which allowed B. Gerov⁸¹ to assume that it is either a list of veterans or a family of auxiliary veteran of *Quirina* tribe who were part of a small community of Roman citizens settled on the administrative territory of Philippopolis without impact on the civic status. Whether these auxiliary veterans are of Thracian origin remains unclear as they are in sharp contrast to the remaining known Thracian veterans of this time attested so far in the epigraphic sources from the provinces and Rome; the *T. Flavii* are not found yet among the Thracian veterans in the 1st century, although numerous diplomas are known. A more likely assumption is that they were part of imperial policy to settle veterans from elsewhere in Thrace, in this case in Philippopolis near the *Via Diagonalis*.

Next to this inscription a *mensa* was also found set up in 76 AD by a veteran of *legio VII Claudia Pia Fidelis* who was from Ἀντιοχέος τῆς πρὸς Δάφνην⁸². The origin of the legionary veteran is in line with the suggestion above of non-Thracian *T. Flavii*, but also allows allusion with one of the praetorians with the tribe *Quirina* from Philippopolis mentioned above. It is also for this reason that *T(itus) Fl(avius) [An]tiochus* and *[M.] Aurel(ius) Orestes* are regarded as descendants of these veterans as a part of community which lasted at least 120 years with great prestige⁸³. It is the tribe which distinguishes them from the descendants of the remaining Thracian veterans — auxiliary and marine.

The latest introduction of an original Roman tribe is in the nomenclature of *Lucius Cassius Severus* who was ἑπαρχὸν σπείρης δ' Ἰθακῶν (sic), ἐπίτροπον τοῦ σεβαστοῦ Μακεδονίας καὶ Θράκης, ἑπαρχὸν [στ]όλου τοῦ ἐν Ῥαυ[ή]ννῃ⁸⁴.

This short analysis on the distribution of the Roman tribe in Thrace allows some observations.

Despite its introduction probably in pre-provincial time when part of the provincial elite gained Roman citizenship and therefore Roman names, a practice which continued decades after the establishment of the new province, it seems that the Roman tribe system remained unpopular and uncommon in Thrace and more or less isolated. The Roman tribe was used rarely and when used it was either in the nomenclature of the Thracian elite or of non-Thracian veterans settled in Thrace. The inscriptions also reveal that this practice was characteristic for a certain span of time, probably till the time of Hadrian, when the

⁷⁹ See GEROV 1980, 50.

⁸⁰ IGBulg. III, 1, 1411.

⁸¹ GEROV 1980, 50–51.

⁸² IGBulg III/1, 1410.

⁸³ TOPALILOV 2011, 268.

⁸⁴ IGBulg V, 5410.

inscription of Τίτος Φλούιος Σκελου υἱὸς Κυρεῖνα Δινις is dated⁸⁵. What also makes an impression is that only the tribe *Quirina* was used in Thracian nomenclature; no *Papiria* and *Sergia* of Trajan and Hadrian respectively or *Iulia* and *Claudia* was given to the Thracian elite or at least no one cited it in his names.

The inscription of *Lucius Cassius Severus* may reveal a revival in the use of the original Roman tribes in the nomenclature in Philippopolis, although if we keep in mind his office, he could simply be following the practice in Rome, where he came from to Philippopolis. Surprisingly or not, it was about that time when the inscriptions of *T(itus) Fl(avius) T(iti) f(ilius) Qui(rina) [An]tiochus IRIMU* and of *[M.]Aurel(ius) M(arci) f(ilius) Qui(rina) Orestes Trim(ontio)* are also dated.

When, however, the Roman tribe was used it was mark of dignity and prestige for the owner. It is without doubt also connected with the juridical status of the owner, as the Roman name does not necessarily mean Roman citizenship as the law of Claudius shows⁸⁶. As known despite this law, the Roman names continued to be used by non-Roman citizens⁸⁷ and in this sense, the tribe affiliation may be regarded as a clear mark of Roman citizenship. The invention of the tribes *Iulia* and *Claudia* should distinguish the mass of new Roman citizens personally linked to C. Iulius Caesar and Claudius from the rest assigned to the original tribes. This would have caused the long-standing tradition with the original tribes, although originally more prestigious, to lose its significance gradually in favour of the new imperial tribes which would need some time to be fully exploited. I would even suggest that the replacement of the old tribes system by the imperial tribes, or pseudo-tribes, in the middle of 2nd century was in fact an end of a long process in which the official institutions of the republican state were replaced by those of the emperor, which became new state institutions. It seems that this also occurred in the Roman name system where a change was made deliberately to recognize officially the superiority of the imperial system over the state's. The new citizens should be loyal to the emperor, not the state (as represented by the senate); they received Roman citizenship and names from him, so they should be enrolled into his own tribe to secure their loyalty. In this sense, the Roman tribe system did not lose its importance; it just was adapted in a way more acceptable for the emperors.

It is well established from the military diplomas and funeral epitaphs of the praetorians and *urbaniciani* in Rome, but also elsewhere⁸⁸, that tribal affiliation was inalienable part of their nomenclature⁸⁹. In fact, they possess the full Roman nomenclature unlike the rest of the troops and this is logical considering their status at the top of the military hierarchy and

⁸⁵ Cf. MIHAILOV 1975, 50–51.

⁸⁶ Suet. Claudius 25, 3.

⁸⁷ MANN 2002, 227–234.

⁸⁸ See for example AE 1996, 1701; CIL II 4461; III 7334; AE 2004, 82 etc.

⁸⁹ MÓCSY 1986, 438.

consequently among the elite of the empire itself. The funeral stelae of praetorians from 1st century with Roman tribe were set up by officials, but also relatives – father, brother, and wife, inheritor, but also by friends, colleagues, and clients.

It seems, however, that this is not the case with the rest of troops. As already observed, in the military diplomas which might have served as official documents no tribe affiliation is mentioned in the nomenclature of veterans from the marines, *eques*, and *auxilia*. It is true that they are some cases in 2nd century when some auxiliary soldiers were already Roman citizens when entering the army, but their citizenship is due to the successful military career of their fathers.

When studying the nomenclature on Roman diplomas one would think that the declaration of one's tribal affiliation might have been optional. This is convincing at first glance if we look at the nomenclature of other people mentioned in diplomas: the commander and witnesses, respectively. The case of a witness named as *C. Vetidius Rasinianus* may be a good argument for this as he has been now attested in at least three diplomas issued in 70 AD⁹⁰. In one of them he is cited as *C. Vetidius C. f. Vol(tinia) Rasinianus, dec(urinis) Philippiensis*⁹¹, while in the other two the tribe is omitted. The one of the latter diplomas, however, is full of errors⁹², which may answer the question.

In the military diplomas it looks like whenever engravers knew the tribe of the commander or the witnesses and could include it, they did it. The diploma for *Herae Serapionis f. Antioch(hia)*, an auxiliary discharged on 28 April 75 is a good example for this⁹³.

It is well known that the list of the witnesses is made with a hierarchical arrangement starting with the highest-status person⁹⁴. If the person at the top of the list lacks any tribe affiliation, it seems that all of the rest, whenever they were enrolled or not, were also displayed with no tribe. Also striking is that the majority, but not all, of diplomas issued for the auxiliary lack any the tribe assignment of the persons mentioned. When assigned, it was mostly on praetorian diplomas.

It is therefore not surprisingly to discover the lack of tribe assignment in the nomenclature of Thracian veterans deriving from the legions, auxiliary, horse guards and the marines. The only Thracian veterans that got Roman tribe were the praetorians who in fact gained the pseudo-tribe.

The lack of declarations of tribal affiliation among the Thracian not praetorian veterans as revealed by military diplomas and epitaphs, even those set up in Rome, along with my analysis so far would allow me to put the question whether the Thracian veterans were ever

⁹⁰ RMD IV, 203; SHARANKOV 2006, 37–46.

⁹¹ It is a diploma of a Thracian who was discharged from *legio II Adiutrix*: CIL XVI, 10.

⁹² SHARANKOV 2006, 40.

⁹³ RMD I, 2.

⁹⁴ KUBITSCHKE 1914, 170–172.

in fact assigned to an original Roman tribe? In this sense one might question whether the *lex Iulia* was strictly followed when dealing with new Roman citizens who obtained their citizenship through military service. Unlike them, when necessary part of the aristocratic elite seems to have received this privilege and enrolled into original Roman tribe. The answer of the question may lay in the observation of similarities between the praetorian diplomas and imperial *edictum* while the rest of diplomas — with the *decretum*⁹⁵ and/or the imperial desire the new citizens loyal to the emperor not to be enrolled into Republican items, but the question remains open.

Acknowledgments. My sincere thanks go to Adam Kemezis for his comments on the draft of this paper and editing of the English text.

Abbreviations

AE = L'Année Épigraphique. Paris.

CIL = Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum. Berlin.

IDR = Inscriptiones Daciae Romanae. Bucharest.

IGBulg = Inscriptiones Graecae in Bulgaria repertae. Sofia.

IGRR = Inscriptiones Graecae ad Res Romanas Pertinentes. Paris.

ILBulg = Inscriptiones Latinae in Bulgaria repertae. Sofia.

ILJug = Inscriptiones Latinae in Jugoslavia repertae. Ljubljana.

IMS = Inscriptiones de la Mésie Supérieure. Belgrade.

RGZM = Vide PFERDEHIRT 2004.

RMD = Roman Military Diplomas. London.

References

- BENEFIEL, R. 2001. A new Praetorian laterculus from Rome. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 134, 221–232.
- CLAUSS, M. 1973. Zur datierung stadtrömischer inschriften: *tituli militum praetorianorum*. *Epigraphica* 35, 55–95.
- FORNI, G. 1985. *Le tribù romaine. III. 1. Le pseudo-tribù*. Roma.
- FORNI, G. 1977. Il ruolo della menzione della tribu' nell' onomastica romana. In: *L'Onomastique latine*, 73–99. Paris.
- GAGGERO, G. 1978. Citoyens romains dans la Thrace indépendante. *Pulpudeva* 2, 251–263.
- GEROV, B. 1980. Zemevladenieto v Rimska Trakija i Mizija (I–III v.). *Godishnik na Sofijskija universitet Fakultet po klasicheski i novi filologii* 72, 2.

⁹⁵ See for this RADULOVA 2016, 264–275.

- KENNEDY, D.L. 1978. Some observations on the Praetorian Guard. *Ancient Society* 9, 275–301.
- KIROV, S. 2015. Sur l'intégration des élites thraces dans le système administrative romain. In: Zl. Gocheva, M. Slavova, N. Sharankov (eds.), *Studia Classica Serdicensa IV, In honour of prof. Boris Gerov (1903–1991)*, 79–80. Sofia.
- KUBITSCHKEK, W. 1914. Ein Soldatendiplom des Kaisers Vespasian. *Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Institutes* 17, 148–193.
- MANN, J. 2002. Name forms of recipients of diplomas. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 139, 227–234.
- MATEESCU, G.G. 1923. I Traci nelle epigrafi di Roma. *Ephemeris Dacoromana* 1, 57–290.
- MIHAILOV, G. 1975. Epigraphica Thracica. *Epigraphica* 37(1-2), 25–67.
- MÓCSY, A. 1986. Die Namen der Diplomempfänger. In W. Eck, H. Wolff (eds.), *Heer und Integrationspolitik. Die römischen Militärdiplome als historische Quelle*, 437–466. Köln-Wien.
- PAPAZOGLU, F. 1988. *Les villes de Macédoine a l'époque romaine*. Paris.
- PASSERINI, A. 1939. *Le coorti praetoriae*. Roma.
- PAUNOV, E. 2005. A Hadrianic diploma for a Thracian sailor from the Misene fleet: 25 December 119 AD. *Archaeologia Bulgarica* 19(3), 39–51.
- PFERDEHIRT, B. 2004. *Römische Militärdiplome und Entlassungsurkunden in der Sammlung des Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseums, Kataloge vor- und frühgeschichtlicher Altertümer, Band 37*, vol. I-II. Mainz.
- RADULOVA, L. 2016. La forma giuridica dei diplomi militari. *Constitutiones principum e procere*. In: *Studia Classica Serdicensa*, 5. *Monuments and Texts in Antiquity and beyond. Essays for the centenary of Georgi Mihailov (1915–1991)*, 264–275. Sofia.
- RICCI, C. 1993. Balcanici e Danubiani a Roma. Attestazioni epigrafiche di abitanti delle province Rezia, Norico, Pannonia, Dacia, Dalmazia, Mesia, Macedonia, Tracia (I–III sec.). In: L. Mrozewicz, K. Ilski (eds.), *Prosopographica*, 141–208. Poznan.
- ROXAN, M., E. PAUNOV 1999. The earliest extant diploma of Thrace, A.D. 114 (=RMD I, 14). *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 119, 269–279
- SALOMIES, O. 1996. Observations on some names of sailors serving in the fleets of Misenum and Ravenna. *Arctos* 30, 167–186.
- SAYAR, M. 1998. *Perinthos-Herakleia (Marmara Ereğlisi) und Umgebung: Geschichte, Testimonien, griechische und lateinische Inschriften*. Wien.
- SHARANKOV, N. 2006. A military diploma of 7 March 70 AD for Legio II Adiutrix. *Archaeologia Bulgarica*, 10(2), 37–46.
- SPEIDEL, M. 1965. *Die equites singulares Augusti. Begleittruppe der römischen Kaiser des zweiten und dritten Jahrhunderts*. Bonn.
- TACHEVA, M. 2007. *Trakijската aristokracija v upravlenieto na provincija Trakija*. Online: www.clio.uni-sofia.bg/tacheva/MTpub1.pdf
- TACHEVA, M. 2000. *Vlast i socium v Rimska Trakija i Mizija*, tom 1. Sofija.
- TOPALILOV, I. 2013. The origo of the Thracian Praetorians in the time of Severans. *American Journal of Ancient History, New Series* 6–8, 287–300.
- TOPALILOV, I. 2017. Thracian veterans and the pseudo-tribes. In: *1st International Roman and Late Antique Thrace Conference "Cities, Territories and Identities" Plovdiv, 7–10 October 2016, Congress Proceeding volume*. In print. Sofia.

TOPALILOV, I. 2011. Edna grupa pretorianci ot Filipopol. *Istoriikii* 4, 257–268.

WEISS, P. 1999. Ein Flottendiplom von 224 n. Chr. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 127, 246–248.



© 2017 by the authors; licensee Editura Universității Al. I. Cuza din Iași. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons by Attribution (CC-BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).