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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. Inscriptiile arată faptul că această practică a fost utilizată până într-o anumită perioadă, probabil până sub Hadrian.
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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(omanei) erunt censum / a[quis]tum nomina praenomina 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 Rome. 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 provinces. 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
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revolts—that of 21 AD—was linked directly to the military service of the Thracians in the Roman army. 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 Bessoi — some of them stationed in Ravenna, but mostly in Misenum, 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 fleets. 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 Thracians, but with few exceptions, 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 veterans, or the study is concentrated only on the Thracian aristocratic elite, some of who are cited with Roman tribe affiliation. This is logical as A. Mócsy has already observed that it was only the praetorians and urbaniciani that used the tribe in their nomenclature. 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 owner. The other scholar working on this problem is M. Tacheva who pays attention to the spread of the tribe Quirina among the Thracian strategoi. She believes based on the known epigraphic sources that this tribe was used as early as 79 AD, and not all of the strategoi 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.
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In the time of Trajan-Hadrian the tribe affiliation seems to have been abandoned\(^{13}\). 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 Claudius\(^ {14}\).

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 — *Bessoi*, *Sappaean* 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.*, *Sappa(eus)*, a veteran from the Misene fleet, discharged on 71, 9 February\(^ {15}\), but also of a certain *Dernalus Derdipili f.*, *Dacus* of the Ravenna fleet, discharged on 70, 26 February\(^ {16}\), probably of *Tyraesus* ... *f(ilius)*, who was recruited for the fleet and was discharged as a veteran of *legio I Adiutrix* on a. 68, 22 December\(^ {17}\), and of *Dules Datui f. natione Bessus*, a marine *causarius* discharged as veteran of *legio II Adiutrix* on a. 70, 7 March\(^ {18}\). 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 Duizeni f.*, *[vico] Dipscurto Bessus*, a veteran of the Misenum fleet, discharged on 52, Dec. 11\(^ {19}\), 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. Salomies\(^ {20}\), 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.
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dated to the beginning of Hadrian’s time\textsuperscript{21}, 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 2\textsuperscript{nd} and first half of 3\textsuperscript{rd} century\textsuperscript{22}.

The nomenclature of Thracian auxiliary soldiers developed in a similar way. In early periods, auxiliary veterans’ nomenclature contained the \textit{praenomen}, \textit{pater} and name of Thracian tribe. Some change occurred in the last years of Trajan when some of the veterans obtained the Roman \textit{tria nomina}. The case with \textit{C. Iulius C. f. Valens, Tralli} of 114, 19 July is among the earliest known\textsuperscript{23}. 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 \textit{Romasta Rescenti f., Spiuro}. The \textit{tribus} entered in these diplomas as late as the time of Galba\textsuperscript{24}, but it is, however, quite sporadic and in the majority of diplomas the tribe was usually omitted.

The data provided by the military diplomas—\textit{tria nomina} and \textit{pater}\textsuperscript{25}—is supplemented in the epitaphs found in Rome with \textit{origo}, quite often marked also by \textit{natio}. Thus, we are aware of \textit{P. Aelius Bassus, nat(ione) Bessus, Claudia Apris}\textsuperscript{26} and of \textit{P. Aelius Avitus, Traianopoli, natione Trax}\textsuperscript{27}, who are typical examples of the nomenclature of Thracian Horse Guards — imperial name in \textit{tria nomina} and \textit{natione}\textsuperscript{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 found\textsuperscript{29}, put in the place of the tribe. The examples are numerous and among them one should note that of \textit{T. Aurelius T. f. Aelio Mursa Maximus}\textsuperscript{30}, but also \textit{T. Aurelius T f. Ulp (ia) Noviomag(i) Vindex}\textsuperscript{31}, etc. This might indicate that the \textit{equites} were not enrolled into Roman tribe, and this is why they use the home town with the imperial epithet instead.

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{21} PAUNOV 2005, 39–51.
\bibitem{22} See for example the \textit{constitutio} of \textit{M. Aurelius Spori fil[. - - - -]drubius, Nicopoli e[x Thracia vel Moes(ia) inferiore], vico Dizerpera} issued in 224: WEISS, 1999, 246–248.
\bibitem{23} ROXAN, PAUNOV 1999, 269–279.
\bibitem{24} CIL XVI 7 — \textit{C. Iulius Coll(ina) Libonis}.
\bibitem{25} MÓCSY 1986, 438.
\bibitem{26} CIL VI 3177.
\bibitem{27} CIL VI 3176.
\bibitem{28} See also SPEIDEL 1965, 2–3.
\bibitem{29} See for example \textit{domu Flavia Sirmio}: CIL VI 3184.
\bibitem{30} CIL VI 3214.
\bibitem{31} CIL VI 3237.
\end{thebibliography}
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 119–120 the tribe is omitted and only *tria nomina* and *origo* are presented, while as late as AD 127–128 the filiation appeared also. 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 accepted. 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. Clauss revealed. Thus, we are aware of *L. Cassius L. f. Rom Niger, domo Atestae* dated to that time. 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 citerior*, *Baetica*, *Achaia*, *Macedonia*, *Dalmatia*, *Noricum*, *Numidia*, *Gallia Narbonensis*, *Moesia inferior*, *Syria*, *Lusitania*, *Dacia*, *Asia*, *Lugudunensis*, *Africa*.
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proconsularis\(^{51}\), Moesia superior\(^{52}\) 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 2\(^{nd}\) century the original tribe system ceased to be in use any more and replaced by the so-called pseudo-tribe system\(^{53}\). 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 auxiliaries\(^{54}\), 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 3\(^{rd}\) century as CIL VI 32 624 reveals. This date of the inscription is suggested by G. Forni\(^{55}\), followed by C. Ricci\(^{56}\), while a more precise date is proposed by R. Benefiel\(^{57}\). 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 praetorians\(^{58}\), but I would like to note the huge diversity of them such as \textit{Iulia}, \textit{Claudia}, \textit{Flavia}, \textit{Ulpia} and \textit{Aelia}\(^{59}\) with an observable preference for \textit{Flavia} and \textit{Ulpia}. The majority of these praetorians have the names \textit{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 \textit{constitutio} of \textit{P. Aelius Pacatus} issued on March 1\(^{st}\), 152 where he is ascribed to the tribe of \textit{Vol(tinia)}. It has been assumed that the listed \textit{origo} of \textit{Philipp} refers to Philippopolis\(^{60}\), but it is more likely \textit{Philippis}, the Roman colony established by Octavian in Macedonia, the bulk of whose citizens were assigned to the tribe of \textit{Voltinia}\(^{61}\).

There are two more examples which are of interest for our study. Thus, in the \textit{laterculus} CIL VI 32 640, 7, among the veterans one would find \textit{[M.] Aurel(ius) M(arci) f(ilius) Qui(rina) Orestes Trim(ontio)} while in the \textit{laterculus} CIL VI 32 624, c, 3: \textit{T. Fl(avius) T(iti) f(ilius) Qui(rina)}
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[An]tiochus IRIMU (expanded as Trimuntio – sic)\textsuperscript{62}. In the former case, the tribe Qui\textit{rina} is one of the three tribes attested in the inscription with Cl\textit{(audia)} and Pol\textit{(lia)} in the nomenclature of praetorians from Scip\textit{(is)}\textsuperscript{63} and Carthage respectively\textsuperscript{64}. The case with Quir\textit{ina} Scup\textit{is} is well known\textsuperscript{65} as well as the case with col\textit{onia iulia Carthagini\textit{enses}}, whose elite seem to have been attributed to Quir\textit{ina} also\textsuperscript{66}.

In the latter case, that of T. Fl\textit{(avius)} [An]tiochus, it should be noted that some more praetorians from Trimontium (Philippopolis) are also attested in this laterculus. Unlike T. Fl\textit{(avius)} [An]tiochus they are presented with the pseudo-tribes [U]l\textit{(pia)} or [F]l\textit{(avia)}\textsuperscript{67}. In this inscription Quir\textit{ina} is also one of the very few Roman tribes attested among, for example, the Pap\textit{(iria)}, Cla\textit{(udia)}, Pol\textit{(lia)}, Fab\textit{(ia)} and probably Coll\textit{(ina)}, found in the nomenclature of praetorians from Scup\textit{is} and probably AEMDUFI\textsuperscript{68}.

It is clear from both examples that no error was made when Quir\textit{ina} 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 Quir\textit{ina} 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 Quir\textit{ina}, and of other tribes.

It is well known after the IAThr E84 dated to 46–60 AD that most of the Thracian strategoi gained the Roman tria nomina, viz. Τιβέριος Κλαύδιος or Γάιος Ἰούλιος 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 ἀρχιερεύς τῆς ἐπαρχείας, for instance. In some cases the tribe of Quir\textit{ina} appeared in their nomenclature presented in the inscriptions\textsuperscript{69}. Thus, we are aware of the strategos Τι. Κλαύδιος Κυρείνα Θεόπομπος Θεοπόμπου\textsuperscript{70} and his probable brother\textsuperscript{71}, of Τι. Claudius Teopompi f. Quir. Sabinus\textsuperscript{72}.
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but also of Τίτος Φλαύιος Σκελού υίος Κυρείνα Δινις, who was hereditary priest of Sabasios and priest of the Thracian assembly\textsuperscript{73} and Τ. Φλ. Κυρείνα Βειθυκενθός Ἐσβενειος\textsuperscript{74}.

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 emperors\textsuperscript{75}.

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 Claudius\textsuperscript{76} which goes well with their imperial names. In the official inscription \textit{IA}Thr E 84, however, the tribe is omitted not only in the nomenclature of Thracian strategoi, 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 examples\textsuperscript{77}. 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 \textit{cursus honorum}\textsuperscript{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.

---

\textsuperscript{72} SAYAR 1998, 192.
\textsuperscript{73} IGBulg V, 5592.
\textsuperscript{74} IGBulg III/ 2, 1714.
\textsuperscript{75} TACHEVA 2007, 6.
\textsuperscript{76} See FORNI 1985, 45; KIROV 2015, 84.
\textsuperscript{77} TACHEVA 2007, 6.
\textsuperscript{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 there\(^{79}\). The inscription itself contains the names of three *Flavii* and *Quirina*\(^{80}\) which allowed B. Gerov\(^{81}\) 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 1\(^{st}\) 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 Δάφνην\(^{82}\). 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) [A]ntiochus* 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 prestige\(^{83}\). 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 ἔπαρχον σπείρης δ’ Θράκων (sic), ἐπίτροπον τοῦ σεβαστοῦ Μακεδονίας καί Θράκης, ἐπαρχον [στ]όλου τοῦ Ῥαου[ή]νην\(^{84}\).

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
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inscription of Τίτος Φλούιος Σκελου νίδος Κυρείνα Δινίς is dated. 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(it) 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 shows. As known despite this law, the Roman names continued to be used by non-Roman citizens 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 urbanicians in Rome, but also elsewhere, that tribal affiliation was inalienable part of their nomenclature. 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. MIHAILEV 1975, 50–51.
86 Suet. Claudius 25, 3.
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 mention 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 AD\(^90\). In one of them he is cited as C. Vetidius C. f. Vol(tinia) Rasinianus, dec(urinis) Philippien\(\text{is}\)\(^91\), while in the other two the tribe is omitted. The one of the latter diplomas, however, is full of errors\(^92\), 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. Antioc(hia), an auxiliary discharged on 28 April 75 is a good example for this\(^93\).

It is well known that the list of the witnesses is made with a hierarchical arrangement starting with the highest-status person\(^94\). 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 display with no tribe. Also striking is that the majority, but not all, of diplomas issued for the auxiliary lack any the tribe assignation of the persons mentioned. When assigned, it was mostly on praetorian diplomas.

It is therefore not surprisingly to discover the lack of tribe assignation 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 Aduatrix: CIL XVI, 10.
\(^{92}\) SHARANKOV 2006, 40.
\(^{93}\) RMD I, 2.
\(^{94}\) KUBITSCHEK 1914, 170–172.
A Note on the nomenclature of the Thracian veterans

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 decreatum 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.
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