

ERIC BIRLEY

SOME LEGIONARY CENTURIONS

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 79 (1989) 114–128

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

SOME LEGIONARY CENTURIONS*

This paper is offered as an epilogue to three earlier studies of mine, re-issued recently in a single volume, "The Roman Army: papers 1929-1986" (MAVORS IV, Amsterdam 1988): "The origins of legionary centurions", written in 1939 and first published in 1941; "Promotions and transfers in the Roman army II: The centurionate", 1964; and "*Evocati Aug.*: a review", 1981. It has been prompted by the publication, during the past few years, of a number of inscriptions which throw welcome light on the careers of men who obtained commissions in the legions, in some cases at an early age.

I

First of all, I take the case of L. Maximius Gaetulicus, who in A.D. 184 fulfilled, as primus pilus of legio I Italica, the vow which he had made 57 years previously, as tiro apud leg. XX V. V., on an inscription now best cited from ZPE 57, 1984, 181-184. He was already known as a centurion of that legion by an inscription from Greatchesters / Aesica on Hadrian's Wall, RIB 1725, and as a centurion by an altar from Newstead / Trimontium, RIB 2120. Not every recruit can have had the confidence to make such a vow, still less to have seen it successful after so long an interval. But his case offers us welcome confirmation of a point made by Brian Dobson, in his survey of the significance of the centurion and "primipilaris" in the Roman army administration (ANRW II 1, 1974, 393): it was "the central theme of the article that the hope of becoming *primipilus* was the main stimulus to men seeking the centurionate and staying in it long beyond the normal term of service." It happens that I only know of two centurions with longer service than Gaetulicus: cf. MAVORS IV 220, for L. Retonius Lucius, p.p. leg. I Adi. with 58 years (III 11031) and Aelius Silvanus, 7 leg. II Adi. with 61 years (an unpublished text, kindly reported to me by the late Professor Mócsy).

* The following abbreviations are employed:

- Alföldy, Personennamen = G. Alföldy, Die Personennamen in der römischen Provinz Dalmatia (Beiträge zur Namensforschung, neue Folge, Beiheft 4, Heidelberg 1969)
- Forni = G. Forni, Il reclutamento delle legioni da Augusto a Diocleziano (Milano / Roma 1953)
- Kajanto = I. Kajanto, The Latin Cognomina (Helsinki 1965)
- LE = W. Schulze, Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen (Berlin reprint 1933)
- Nomenclator = Nomenclator provinciarum Europae Latinarum et Galliae Cisalpiniae cum indice inverso, edd. A. Mócsy & others (Budapest 1983)

II

We do not know how many years elapsed after Gaetulicus joined leg. XX V.V. before he became a centurion. But it is worth noting that centurions, like equestrian officers, might be selected from men in three different age groups: late teens or early twenties, early thirties, and later still. It was the publication of an inscription from Tarraco, by Géza Alföldy, in *MAVORS III*, 1987, 514ff., which has led me to discuss the topic: *Ti. Iulius Ti. f. Fa[b]ia Maternus domo Roma ann[or.] XXVIII 7 leg. VII Ge[m. ---*. In his commentary Professor Alföldy observed that comparatively few men can have reached the centurionate in their twenties or earlier, and suggested that Iulius Maternus may well have been given a direct commission. It happens that I know of a centurion of leg. III Augusta p. v. (under Septimius Severus at earliest), *P. Flavius Clemens*, who also died aged 28 (VIII 2869); and *L. Mantius Hispanus*, centurion in that legion after leg. VII Gemina f(elix) (thus before the time of Severus), was just 30 when he died (VIII 2938). These two cases can be matched by those of men who became centurions before the age of 20: *Sex. Pilonius Modestus*, commissioned *ex equite Romano* at only 18 (III 1480 = ILS 2654 shows that he died aged 37 after 19 years in the centurionate), and *Ti. Claudius Fatalis* was 42 when he died, serving in his seventh post, in legio X Fretensis, after 23 years' service, thus starting at 19 (AE 1939, 157). A comparable early start must be supposed for the elder *Petronius Fortunatus*, who served as centurion for 46 years, after only four in the non-commissioned ranks (VIII 217 add. = ILS 2658 add.); by contrast, his son *M. Petronius Fortunatus* (on the same inscription) was first commissioned at the age of 29, for he died aged 35 after six years' service in two postings. A potential commission in the mid-twenties was evidently involved in the case of *Caecilius Valentinus*, *opt. spei leg. XIII [G.]*, *qui vixit annis XXIII menses III dies XVIII* (V 6423, Ticinum).

III

By contrast, men commissioned after service in the praetorian guard and *evocatio* might have been nearly 40, unless indeed their military service had begun at well below the normal age of 18-22. Such was the case with *M. Caesius Verus*, whose epitaph was published in *ZPE* 71, 1988, 177: 16 years in the Guard, seven as *evocatus*, then for four years centurion in leg. V Macedonica, with his total service 27 years, and his age at death only 41; he must therefore have enlisted at only **fourteen** ! Such an early age for enlistment, however, is not without other examples: cf. Forni's useful (if incomplete) list in his *Appendice A, Tabella I*. p. 135, and my citation of a case in the British Army in 1914, *MAVORS IV* 335f. Another former *evoc.* Aug., *L. Pupianus Verinus*, died aged 39 years, two months and five days, after a total of 21 years' service — after 16 years in the Guard, he was in his third centurionate when he died: evidently he enlisted at 18, and must have been 34 when he first became a centurion (IGLS 9187, Bostra). *C. Aninius Gallus*, from *Tifernum Tiberinum* (XI

5935), died aged 60: he had served in the Guard for 17 years, as *evocatus* for two years, and then as centurion of leg. III Scythica for 19 years; to judge by his total service of 38 years, he must have been little under 40 when he received his commission. By contrast, a commission in the early thirties was in case for M. Domitius Capetolinus, 7 leg. XI Cl. p.f. (III 771, Tomi): *vixit annis XXXII, factus 7 vixit me[n]ses --*. In this case we have an example of what, since W. Baehr's dissertation of 1900, can be taken as the norm, a man whose commission was granted within the ten to fifteen years after his enlistment in the legion.

IV

Forni's *Tabella IV, Carriere di legionari*, of set purpose excludes the centurionate, except in cases of inscriptions which give details of previous careers in the ranks. An exception is his listing of VI 3351 = ILS 2366, giving a *frumentarius* leg. XXII Pr., with the note that the same man (in fact C. Mellonius Severus) is recorded as 7 leg. XXII Pr. on XIII 6682. There are several cases in which pairs of inscriptions give us men of leg. III Augusta in Numidia, first in the ranks and then as centurions. I have noted half a dozen instances, as follows:

1. Acutius Ingenus is first of four *speculatores* on AE 1917/18, 57; and VIII 2618 gives us M. Acutius Ingenus 7 m.h.m. Examples of centurions recorded as discharged are comparatively uncommon; it will therefore be worth while to mention the case of P. Iulius Theodorus: VIII 7080 = ILS 6855 is the epitaph of his wife, a *flaminica* of the III *coloniae Cirtensium* (evidently a well-to-do lady), by Iulius T[he]odorus *nuper ex centurione legionis honesta missione missus*; and AE 1954, 138 (Lambaesis) is by P. Iulius Theodorus 7 leg. III Aug. in honour of Ti. Claudius Gordianus, leg. Aug. pr. circa A.D. 188.

2. C. Calventius Ianuarius occurs as the second of two *cornicularii* on VIII 2586 = ILS 2381; VIII 2742 shows him as 7 leg. III Aug. *Alexandrianae*, honouring P. Iulius Iunianus Martialianus.

3. L. Cornelius Cato is one of the *optiones* dedicating *pro salute Augg.* on VIII 2554 = ILS 2445, while VIII 2848 is his epitaph: *d.m.s. L. Cornelio Catoni 7 leg. III Aug., qui et caligatus stip. XIII* - in other words, he became centurion at a little more than thirty.

4. Q. Iulius Florus is *mil. leg. III Aug.* on VIII 2554, while VIII 18025 may be restored to give us the following reading: [Deo] Soli Invicto Mithrae, [Iu]lius Florus [7] leg. III Aug., [---]us Pastor [si]g. al. I Pa[nn.], [Pom]ponius Ma[xi]mus bf. [c]os., [v.s.] l.m. Identity is evidently less than certain, but the group of centurion, *signifer alae* and *bf. cos.* is a logical one to infer.

5. C. Iulius Longinianus is one of the *optiones* dedicating *pro salute Augg.* on VIII 2554 (cf. also VIII 2555 = ILS 2446); as Iulius Longinianus 7 he was responsible for

commemorating his mother (VIII 2905), his mother-in-law (2906), his father, ex dec. alae (2923) and his step-father (2962): the total of six inscriptions in VIII refers to one and the same man!

6. C. Publilius Septiminus is attested as an optio on VIII 2554, circa A.D. 200, while AE 1917/18, 50, shows him as 7 leg. III Aug. Antoniniana, a candidatus of the governor Ti. Iulius Pollienus Auspex, for whom cf. my suggested dating of the governorship to c. 217-220 (MAVORS IV 118).

Incidentally, an inscription eligible for addition to Forni's Tabella IV is to be found in RIU 2, 1976, 412 (Brigetio): I.O.M. et genio scoles sig., Homonius Quintianus quod sig. vovit, 7 solvit lib. mer.

V

Another route to the legionary centurionate led from the emperor's horseguards, for which see M.P. Speidel's *Die Equites Singulares Augusti* (Antiquitas 1/11, Bonn 1965). In the Rangordnung, Domaszewski cited three cases, noted below, but passed briefly over them,; and Forni made no reference to them in his Tabella IV, presumably because they had not served in the ranks of the legions. In most cases, it seems probable that it was from the decurions of the horseguards that promotion to the centurionate was to be expected, from the time of Hadrian onwards, as in the case of M. Ulpius Martialis, below. We can now offer more than a dozen instances, which I list in alphabetical order:

1. P. Aelius Amandus must be regarded as no more than a possibility: VI 715 = ILS 2184 is a dedication by him ex voto suscepto, accepta missione honesta ex numero eq. sing. Aug. in A.D. 158, while VIII 18065 = ILS 2452 gives us Aelius Amandus as one of the centurions in coh. X of. leg. III Aug.; in my paper on the origins of legionary centurions I suggested that this was a case of promotion from the horseguards (MAVORS IV 193, footnote 24); but if so, note that he had not become a decurion in that unit.

2. P. Aelius Longinus (VI 31169), to leg. I Minervia (Lower Germany).

3. P. Aelius Lucanus (VI 3211), 7 leg. VII Gemina on the epitaph of T. Aurelius ?Mansuetinus, tur(ma) Lucaniana; cf. also VI 3176 = ILS 2199, the epitaph of a tubicen turm. Aeli Lucani.

4. P. Aelius Lucius (VI 31175), 7 leg. VII Gemina - note his wide choice of deities to venerate, characteristic of the equites singulares cited in my study of M. Cocceius Firmus, below.

5. P. Aelius Marcus (VI 31182a), 7 leg. X Gemina (Upper Pannonia).

6. T. Aurelius Amandus (VIII 2817 = ILS 2212, noted by Domaszewski, Rangordnung p.51), died as 7 leg. III Augusta.

7. Another Aurelius Amandus, the first of no. 6's two heirs on the same inscription.

8. T. Aurelius Decimus (II 4083= ILS 2416, Tarraco): dedicating for the health of Commodus in A.D. 182, as 7 leg. VII G.fel., praep. simul et camp(idoctor) of the equit. sing. — presumably those of the governor's horseguards; it seems reasonable to infer that he came via the decurionate in Rome.

9. T. Aurelius Gentilis: the second heir of no.6 is Aurelius Gentilis, 7 leg. eiusdem (which I take to refer to no.7 also), while VIII 18065 = ILS 2452 shows Aurelius Gentilis as the first of six centurions in coh. II of leg. III Augusta in A.D. 162. There seems little doubt that he is attested by VI 32796, the epitaph of a fourteenyearold Raetian slave by his master, T. Aur. Gentilis, duplicarius, from the inscriptions of the equites singulares in Rome; presumably soon decurion, and then posted to the Numidian legion.

10. M. Aurelius Lucilius (II 4147, noted by Domaszewski): from Poetovio, ex singularib. imp., centurion first in leg. I Adiutrix (Upper Pannonia) and thereafter in five other legions, dying as hastatus prior of VII Gemina in Hither Spain.

11. L. Aurelius Quintus (VI 768 = ILS 4776) dedicating Sulevis et Campestribus on 24 August 160, as 7 leg. VII Geminae; the deities were among the favourite recipients of the horseguards' devotion.

12. M. Cocceius Firmus: cf. my paper on "M. Cocceius Firmus: an epigraphic study" (first published in 1936, reprinted in *Roman Britain and the Roman Army*, Kendal 1953, 87-103); his altars from Auchendavy, on the Antonine Wall in Scotland, now RIB 2175-2178, particularly 2177, are dedicated to just such a series of deities as characterises the equites singulares Augusti on so many of their inscriptions in Rome, so that there can be no reasonable doubt that he had served with them, presumably rising to the decurionate and from that to become centurion in leg. II Augusta in Britain.

13. M. Ulpius Martialis (VI 31158 = ILS 2213 noted by Domaszewski) dedicated to I.O.M., Iunoni, Herclenti, Campestribus — ex decurione factus 7 ab imp; Hadriano leg. I Minerv(i)ae, voto suscepto. Hadrian may therefore be supposed to have established this particular route to the legionary centurionate.

Professor Speidel has kindly suggested a further candidate for inclusion in the list:

14. T. Aurelius Vibius (VIII 2826) from Aquincum, buried at Lambaesis as 7 leg. III Aug. p(iae) v(indicis), thus under Septimius Severus at the earliest; so may T. Aurelii are to be found among the emperor's horseguards, that the inference seems a justifiable one.

One should be more cautious, however, about assuming a similar career in the case of the Aurelius Geminus, centurion in coh. I of Leg. III Augusta in A.D. 162 (VIII 18065 = ILS 2452), for it might seem improbable that a man granted citizenship by Antoninus Pius and commissioned from the equites singulares Augusti could have risen to the legionary primi

ordines within a year of that emperor's death. In this case, I would prefer to think that the man's citizenship was of longer standing.

It will be seen that III Augusta may claim five centurions (nos. 1, 6, 7, 9 and 14); VII Gemina has four (nos. 3, 4, 8 and, in his final posting, 10); I Minervia two (nos. 2 and 13), with one each for I Adiutrix, II Augusta and X Gemina. But no doubt there were others, in the period from Hadrian to at least the time of Septimius Severus.

VI

Next I take cases in which men were commissioned from the ranks of a legion in one province to the centurionate in another. Most of the cases can be found in Forni's *Tabella IV*, but their significance deserves to be looked into; I have discussed several of them in my paper on the promotions and transfers of centurions, *MAVORS IV* 214f. and 218, but a detailed analysis of the phenomenon deserves to be made. In some cases, a specific reason for the posting can be offered without difficulty: thus, the Saturninus of VIII 17626 who, as [bf.] leg. III Au[g. ex]pleta [s]tatione pr[o]motus ad [7] leg. II Italicae, honoured I.O.M., Mars Victor, dii iuvantes and the Genius stationis Vazaivitanae, was presumably the client of C. Macrinus Decianus, whose transfer from Numidia to the governorship of Noricum (VIII 2615 = ILS 1194) will have given him the opportunity of taking Saturninus with him, to fill a vacant centurionate in its legion. By contrast, an optio of the British legion II Augusta, dedicating Genio leg. I Adi. p.f. scolae 77 ob honorem dd. nn., C. Silvinus Clu[vian]us¹ (RIU II 390, Brigetio) was presumably already serving with a vexillation of II Augusta on campaign in Lower Pannonia — rather than having been sent there as an individual from his British base at Caerleon/Isca.

In some cases, we may be justified in inferring what may be termed "War Office postings", that is to say transfers and commissioning of men judged deserving of centurionates, initiated by the emperor's secretary ab epistulis in Rome. Thus, an aquilifer of leg. XXX Ulpia Victrix made centurion in leg. XIII Gemina Martia Victrix, moving from Lower Germany to Upper Pannonia (XIII 6952, Mainz), or P. Ferrasius Avitus, from aquilifer of I Adiutrix in Upper Pannonia to 7 leg. VIII Aug. p.f.c.C. in Upper Germany in A.D. 191 (XIII 6646, Stockstadt), or Aelius Restutus, c(ornicularius) of I Adiutrix becoming 7 leg. III Aug. in Numidia (VIII 2788); so too, presumably, the man of VIII 1653 = ILS 3101 (from Theveste), [ce]nturio [fru]mentarius [le]g. secundae Adiutricis, pro[ba]tus in leg. III Aug.

In two cases, we may suspect that the reason was the need to strengthen eastern legions by appointing Danubian soldiers to the centurionate in them: Iulius Crescens, ex leg. VII Cl.

¹ RIU has Clu[---]us, but Kajanto 144 shows Cluvianus as a suitable cognomen, attested by V 3798 and a signaculum, IX 6083, 147.

ordinatus 7 in leg. III Scyt. (VI 3603 = ILS 2668), and M. Aurelius Clemens, 7 leg. VI Ferrat., qui est prob(atus) in leg. II (Adiutrice) a Cornel(io) Plotino leg. (III 10507, Aquincum), may be examples of this. One case may be merely the result of a vexillation having been sent from Syria to the Numidian legion: Aufidius Lucius (AE 1898, 15, Lambaesis) was 7 [leg. III Aug., proba]to in III Gallica; the date is probably of the third century, since his widow gave his age in years (now missing), two months and six days. There remain three cases in which no apparent reason for the move can be offered: Aebutius Victorinus from X Gemina to XI Claudia (and six more legions thereafter, III 260-6761, Ancyra); M. Iulius Paternus, VI Victrix to VIII Aug. (and two further legions), III 2035, Salona where he was buried, though he came from Aquae Sextiae in Narbonensis; and the unknown man of III 14178 from Cyanaea in Lycia, probatus in leg. I Ad., optio et 7 leg. XIII G. (and three further legions).

VII

Finally, I turn to the centurions of legio II Traiana in A.D. 157, on the noteworthy inscription from its fortress at Nicopolis near Alexandria. It was first published by A.A. Aly in 1955, commented upon by J.F. Gilliam in 1956 (*AJPhil.* 77, 359-375 and reprinted in *MAVORS II*, 1986, 145-161, with the observation that "A study of their names, however, might be rewarding"), and accorded a revision of the text and a commentary on its contents by Giovanni Forni and Donata Manini in 1969 (*Studi di Storia Antica in Memoria di Luca De Regibus*, 177-210); they have also been taken into account by Maria Gabriella Angeli Bertinelli in her study of 1985, *I centurioni della "Legio II Traiana"* (*Studi in onore di Arnaldo Biscardi IV*, 143-199). In each of these cases some individual names have been discussed, but there is good reason for the fuller treatment which Professor Gilliam suggested.

In a paper first published in 1975, and reprinted in *MAVORS II*, 1986, 370f., Gilliam discussed P. Hibeh 276 = CPL 260: Iulius Repositus Cl. Germano suo salutem. Et praese(n)s te, domine frater, rogaveram coram Ammonium orthographum leg. n. amicum n. karissi[mum] ..., "on the verso Repositus identifies himself as coll(ega)." The text has been repeated and discussed by M.P. Speidel in *Aegyptus LXVI*, 1986, 163ff.: he points out that the two men occur on that inscription of II Traiana in 157, as the first two centurions of coh. III, and he observes that, in a military context, collega must here mean "of the same unit", adding that the post orthographus leg(ionis) is to be added for the first time to the list of legionary other ranks.

There are two other centurions on the list who call for special comment; Antonius Nereus of coh. X recurs in 162 as a centurion of coh. VIII in leg. III Augusta (VIII 18065); and Papius Firmus of coh. IV is surely to be taken as the same man as the "Patius" Firmus of

coh. II on the same Lambaesis text, for "Patius" is otherwise unattested, whereas Papius is well known, particularly in the south of Italy (as has been pointed out by Alföldy, *Personennamen* p.107): it seems reasonable to infer that the stonemason at Lambaesis has mis-cut the man's nomen. It seems to follow that, between 157 and 162, these two centurions, perhaps with their centuriae, had been transferred in a vexillation from Egypt to Numidia. A transfer in the opposite direction, not necessarily with a vexillation, seems indicated by the career of M. Valerius Secundus (AE 1930, 151 = 1938, 20 = RIT 183, Tarraco): from 7 leg. VII G. fel. he was item leg. III Aug. item leg. II Traian. item leg. XIII Gem.

VIII

I now turn to an alphabetical list, by nomina, of the 47 centurions for whom nomen and cognomen are given, offering comments on the possibility of assessing where each man came from, and noting cases in which suggestions have been made by my predecessors.

1. Aelius Pharnacianus, coh. IX: the nomen implies recent citizenship, but Furni and Manini, p.209, suggest that the cognomen implies origin in an Asian province, perhaps Pontus, "per ovvia ragione"; but an Aelius with this cognomen seems to me more likely to be the son of a P. Aelius Aug. lib. Pharnaces, given a commission in virtue of his father's standing, in which case he may be assigned to Rome itself.

2. Aelius Proculus, coh. IX: the conjunction of names is far too common for his origin (though not his recent citizenship) to be guessed at; a P. Aelius Proculus occurs on VIII 8498, indeed, but for example Alföldy, *Personennamen* has three Aelii Proculi in Dalmatia, and four Aeliae Proculae.

3. Aelius Sabinus, coh. VII: I note one homonym at Dertona, V 7580 = ILS 8169, and there is another on VIII 7981, but none in Dalmatia; like Proculus, he may be taken for the son of a recent citizen, commissioned after service in the ranks, and origin in Italy rather than Africa seems likely. But Angeli Bertinelli cites (p. 151, note 41) a homonym, attested by AE 1951, 184 as one of the 77 exercitatores of the equites singulares Aug. in AD 153; this may well be the same man, a few years before transfer to II Traiana (one might wonder whether the exercitatores had themselves seen previous service in the horseguards, in which case he might be considered for possible inclusion in my list in section V, above).

4. Agrius Maximus, coh. IX: there is a homonym on VIII 19873, and an Agria Maximi fil. Maximina on VIII 18926. The nomen is less rare than might be thought by reference to LE 115, but it is widespread, cf. Alföldy, *Personennamen* p.56 (eight in IX, eleven in X, as many in XIV, but 37 in VIII and 14 in Dalmatia), so that Africa is perhaps a likelier origin than Dalmatia or Italy.

5. Antonius Acilianus, coh. VIII: his cognomen is a rare one, Kajanto 139 listing two senators and in CIL only eleven men and one woman; there are none in VIII and none in Dalmatia. The Iberian peninsula seems a possibility.

6. Antonius Nereus, coh. X, already referred to: the cognomen seems definitely to have a servile flavour. Forni and Manini note that it occurs in III 256 and 1314, IX 4827, X 6228 and XIII 1942, as well as here, cf. also III 9610; Nomenclator p. 200 notes three examples in II and one in XII. A humble origin in Italy, and service first in the ranks, seem to be likely in this case.

7. Antonius Pudens, coh. II: a M. Antonius Pudens occurs on VIII 7199 but the conjunction of name is too colourless to be a guide to his origin.

8. Arrenius Apollinaris, coh. I: here we have a rare nomen, which LE 125 notes is only attested relatively commonly in VI and XI; VIII has only one example, Arrenia Ancil(la), on 8460. We may be confident in giving Italy as his probable origin.

9. Attius Auctus, coh. III: the cognomen is commonly servile, as Alföldy, *Personennamen* p.159 observes; there are two homonyms, both freedmen, on VI 21696 = ILS 7967 and 37504; we may be confident that this man came from Italy, at first serving in the ranks.

10. Aurelius Theo, coh. VII: Forni and Manini, and Angeli Bertinelli, are disposed to infer Oriental origin. But he might well be the son of a freedman of Antoninus Pius, from Rome — and it seems possible that he was an ancestor of M. Aelius Aurelius Theo, cos. 253/260.

11. Caecilius Syriacus, coh. X: Forni and Manini assume that the cognomen implies Syrian origin, but to me it seems more likely to record that a member of the family had served in Syria (cf. Maximius Gaetulicus, above, who came from Vienna in Narbonensis, and not from Gaetulia); Nomenclator p. 276 records one in Cisalpina, three in Hispania and one each in Dalmatia, Pannonia and Noricum. But Rome itself has yielded C. Caecilius L. f. Syriacus (VI 13781), and that is likely to be the origin of our centurion.

12. Claudius Germanus, coh. III: we have already seen him receiving that letter from his colleague Iulius Repositus. I have noted a Tib. Claudius Germanus as a *Iivir* of the municipium Tropaeum Traiani in Lower Moesia (III 7481 = ILS 7183), and a Ti. Claudius Germanus buried near Scupi in Upper Moesia (*Inscr. de la Mésie supérieure*, VI, 1982, 104), so that Moesian origin, and perhaps a direct commission, might seem possible. But other *Claudii Germani* have been noted, for example in Rome and at Volubilis in Tingitana.

13. C. Domitius Maternus, coh. VIII: his *origo* is given as Seleuco, and that raises a very difficult problem. Aly suggested that it referred to the mons Seleucus, a *mansio* in the territory of the Vocontii in Narbonensis; and the cognomen Maternus is far commoner in II, XII and XIII than elsewhere, cf. Kajanto 303: but Forni and Manini point out, p. 188f., that

neither *mons* nor *mansio* was lawfully admissible as an *origo*, so Forni concludes, reluctantly it seems, that we should assume a place-name *Seleuco(polis)*, somewhere in the East. But I would be happier to conclude that a Vocontian preferred to give a legally incorrect but actual origin. Among the men originally enlisted in 132 or 133, *Domitius Maternus* presumably began his service in the ranks, becoming centurion an indeterminate number of years later, accepting *honesta missio* rather than serving on in the hope of becoming *primus pilus*. (It may be noted that VI 32638 a 4 gives a homonym, a praetorian guardsman from *Teurnia* in *Noricum*, under *Marcus Aurelius*.)

14. *Flavius Avianus*, coh. I: cf. *Kajanto* 141 for this extremely rare cognomen, borne by a friend of *Cicero*, and by a man and a woman in II 5791 and 3219, a freedman in *Dacia*, III 1088, and a woman in Upper Germany, XIII 7678. At least, this centurion can hardly have been African.

15. *Flavius Serenus*, coh. VII: the names are too common for his origin to be inferred. It may be noted, however, that a homonym, *T. Flavius Serenus*, was procurator of *Mauretania Caesariensis* under *Elagabalus*, perhaps a grandson of our centurion? (*Thomasson*, *Die Statthalter der römischen Provinzen Nordafrikas*, 1960, II 273, suggests that the emperor was *Severus Alexander*, but his case is not convincing).

16. *Gerellanus Verinus*, coh. X: the nomen is rare, occurring at *Canusium* (IX 338 = ILS 6121) and *Puteoli* (X 2452) as well as in Rome; but it was also the nomen of a *primipilaris* from *Heliopolis* in *Syria*, under *Nero*, perhaps the brother of the praetorian tribune mentioned in *Tacitus*, *Annals* 15, 69 (cf. *B. Dobson*, *Die Primipilares*, 1978, 201f.); our centurion may be assigned without discomfort to either Italy or *Heliopolis*, by his nomen; the cognomen is fairly common, but indistinctive, cf. *Alföldy*, *Personennamen* p.324.

17. *Iulius Alexander*, coh. IX: several examples in VIII, while a *L. Iulius Alexander* occurs on III 2689 in *Dalmatia*; but African origin seems likely in this case and that of most of the *Iulii* in the present list.

18. *Iulius Crescens* p.p., coh. I: as *Gilliam* has pointed out, there are four centurions so named in L. R. Dean's 1916 dissertation, and there is no reason to equate this man with any of them; but *Aly* had suggested that he might be the same as the prefect of the *Misenum* fleet in 166 (XVI 122).

19. *Iulius Felix*, coh. V: there are plenty of *Iulii Felices* in VIII, and there is no reason to doubt that this one came from Africa.

20. *Iulius Fronto*, coh. II: the conjunction of names is too common for an origin to be suggested; among homonyms, *Alföldy*, *Personennamen* p. 208 reports one at *Aenona*, III 2981. *B. Dobson*, op. cit. p. 345, cites the *primipilaris* attested by IGR I 627 (*Tomi*), and *Angeli Bertinelli* p.161 footnote cites that.

21. Iulius Gemellinus, coh. VIII: in MAVORS II, 1986, 151 Gilliam cites AE 1912, 271 from Iconium for him; we may take it he was a colonial Roman from that city. But I note that VIII 20574 gives us a Quintus Iulius Gemellinus. Gilliam has pointed out, in MAVORS II, p.150 footnote, that Lesquier identified the centurion at Iconium with the soldier C. Iulius C. f. Pol. Gemellinus, castris, in coh. V, 7 Servili Pudentis, of II Traiana in 194 (III 6580 = ILS 2304), but that is now evidently incorrect.

22. Iulius Hannibal, coh. IV: the cognomen proclaims African, and specifically Punic origin; it happens that there is no Hannibal in VIII!

23. Iulius Martius, coh. III: the conjunction of names is colourless, but it may be noted that a homonym centurion is attested, first on a dedication of A.D. 180 at Mainz (AE 1979, 422), by a man 7 Iul. Marti; and by the altar to Mithras at Xanten in 189 (XIII 8640) by M. Iul. Martius 7 leg. XXX U.V., leg. XXII Pr. p. f. He was evidently not the same man as our centurion of II Traiana, but conceivably his son? His origin must remain unknown.

24. Iulius Repositus, coh. III: we have already seen his letter to his colleague Claudius Germanus. In this case, the very rare cognomen is decisive for an African origin, cf. Kajanto 355, noting in CIL nine men and five women, nine examples in Africa. For what it may be worth, VIII 18612 is the memorial of a Iulius Reposi[t]us, set up by himself in his lifetime.

25. Iunius Gemellus, coh. VI: the names are not distinctive enough for an attribution to be attempted; African origin might seem likely, but I note that in A.D. 70 one of the plebs dedicating to the Pax Aeterna of the family of Vespasian was a C. Iunius Gemellus (VI 200 viii 53): Roman origin cannot be excluded, therefore.

26. Livius Severus, coh. V: there are plenty of Livii in VIII, but the conjunction of names is too colourless for us to be certain if he did in fact come from Africa, and not elsewhere.

27. Marius Quadratus, coh. I: there is only one Marius among the soldiers on the inscription, a man from Thysdrus; but Kajanto 65 notes that a third of the Quadrati on his files come from Africa where, in any case, VIII includes a great many Marii, reminiscent of the great general of the Republic. The odds are, therefore, that our centurion was African.

28. Minicius Serenus, coh. VIII: there is nothing useful on the nomen in LE 361, while VIII includes more Minucii than Minicii; I note a centurion Minicius Censor on VIII 18065, but there is really no clue to this man's origin.

29. Mutilius Clemens, coh. V: this nomen is common in the north of Italy, as Alföldy, Personennamen p.101 observes, and there are only two Mutilii in VIII, 23823, so that African origin is far from likely. We may note, therefore, that P. Mutilius P. f. Cla. Crispinus of Nedinum (III 2864 = ILS 1015) honoured as his friend the eminent senator Iavolenus Priscus at that place, so that our man might perhaps have come from Dalmatia, if not from northern Italy.

30. Octavius Montanus, coh. X: in this case, Dalmatia yields C. Octavius Montanus at Iader (III 2927), and I would not wish to look further for our centurion's origin, though there are several Montani in VIII. Note, however, an Octavia Montana in Rome (VI 23350).

31. Palaesius Respectus, coh. III: no other example of this nomen has been found, but LE has Paesius at 179, Blaesius 295, Aesius 159 footnote and Palius 206 and 364, so that a rare Italian name seems in question. The cognomen is widespread in Europe, cf. *Nomenclator* p.242, but there are also a good many Respectae and Respecti in VIII. In this case, Italy seems to be the most probable origin.

32. Papius Firmus, coh. IV: as we have seen, this man is probably to be identified as the "Patius" Firmus of III Augusta in 162, and Italian origin is perhaps most probable, though I note that there are ten or eleven Papii in VIII.

33. Pompeius Siculinus, coh. VII: Kajanto 193 has only Siculina (VI 26544) and Siculus is very uncommon (in CIL four men and one woman); Italian origin seems more than likely.

34. Pomponius Bassus, coh. II: there are two Pomponii among the soldiers on this text, from Carthage and Thysdrus; but there are four consular homonyms and it might seem likely that this man's father was a client of the senatorial family, giving the son a cognomen to demonstrate it, and that he should be assigned to Italy.

35. Sempronius Donatus, coh. X: the cognomen is preponderantly African, and there are two Sempronii Donati in VIII, 2972 and 9886. For a curiosity, there is a homonym in Rome, VI 26158 = ILS 8435: *homin. frugalissimo, qui vixit annis LXV mens. III dies V hor. VII, cuius frugalitati heres maximus gratias agat, amplius merento heres honorabit.*

36. Sempronius Geminus, coh. IX: a Sempronius from Acholla is the only soldier of that nomen on the list, C. Sempronius Gallus (another cognomen which does not have any bearing on its bearer's immediate origin). He might well be African, like no. 35 above.

37. Sergius Longus, coh. IX: in this case, there are two inscriptions of a centurion so named to cite — III 12286 is a dedication in the quarries at Carystus, and ILS 8717 is on a block of Carystian marble in Rome. We can hardly doubt that a single man is in question, though the sequence of his moves between II Traiana, XV Apollinaris at Carystus and XXII Primigenia, on the Rome text, must be a matter for conjecture. His origin cannot be known at present, though there are a good many Sergii in VIII.

38. Seuius Leo, coh. VI: the nomen is not common, cf. LE 223, occurring predominantly in Italy, but with examples also in II and III (Salona, III 2529; VIII can only show Sevia Venusta, 12907. The cognomen is not uncommon, cf. Kajanto 327, and there are four or five examples of it in VIII, but Italy or Spain or Dalmatia seem more likely than Africa.

39. Titidius Maximus, coh. IV: the nomen is very rare indeed, cf. LE 198; there is no example of it in VIII, and Nomenclator p.290 can only cite one example, in Cisalpina. Italian origin seems virtually certain.

40. Torius Victor, coh. II: as Brian Dobson pointed out in *Germania* 35, 1957, 120ff. (cf. now *Die primipilares*, 1978, p. 258), this man recurs as M. Torius Victor, prefect of leg. XXII Primigenia on an inscription from Mainz, AE 1956, 86 = 1958, 61, clearly to be assigned to a good many years later than his service as a mere centurion in 157. The nomen is rare (no example in VIII), occurring sparsely in Italy, the Danube lands, Gaul and Baetica, though Italy seems perhaps the likeliest origin.

41. Tullius Proculus, coh. VIII: the nomen is no guide in this case, for it is widespread, and the cognomen is one of the commonest, cf. Kajanto 176; there are some 30 Tullii in VIII, but VI provides two homonyms: 1058 v 36 gives L. Tullius Proculus in coh. V vigilum in A.D. 210, and 2883 is the epitaph of a soldier of coh. X urbana. Italian origin is therefore not excluded.

42. Ulpus Martinus, coh. VIII: there are two Ulpii among the soldiers on the Nicopolis text, M. Ulpus Diodorus from Larissa, and C. Ulpus Iovinus from Lepcis; Martinus is fairly common, cf. Kajanto 212. But VI 9074 is the epitaph of [M. U]lpus Martinus [A]ug. lib. ex tabularis, and we may not be wrong to suspect that the centurion was the son of Trajan's freedman, and therefore to be given Italy as his origin.

43. Valerius Aquila, coh. II: there are abundant Valerii throughout the Roman world (four of them among the soldiers here, from Carthage two and one each from Cyrrhus and Neapolis, presumably the Italian town); as for Aquila, it is fairly common, Kajanto 330. No origin can be suggested.

44. Valerius Optatus, coh. VI: there are four men so named in VIII - 2557 b 16, 3266, 3267 and 23322, and homonyms elsewhere include a man in coh. I vigilum in 205 (VI 1056 = ILS 2156) and a prefect of coh. I Septimia Belgarum in 231 (ILS 9179a, Oehringen). But African origin in this case seems clear, with Optatus the strongest of pointers, cf. Kajanto 296 and R. Syme, *Roman Papers III*, 1984, 1105ff.

45. Vibius Postumus, coh. VII: a soldier in coh. VIII, 7 Antoni Aciliani, is C. Vibius Titianus, Ptolema.; the centurion's names give no clue to his origin, for Vibii and Postumi abound everywhere.

46. Vibius Verus, coh. I: here, too, the names seemed to provide no help, but I have noted two Vibii Veri in XI (including 1616 = ILS 7683) and one in VI (32515 a ii 15), so that Italian origin may seem likely.

47. Volusius Seneca, coh. V: in *MAVORS II*, 1986, 150 footnote, Professor Gilliam has observed that a Volusius Seneca appears in the Latin fragment P.S.I. 1308, which belongs to roughly the same time; there are many Volusii in VIII, and several instances of Seneca,

but all that can be said is that this man was not from a family whose citizenship was recent, whether he was a colonial or from Italy. It should be noted that Kajanto 301 observes that Seneca is to be found predominantly in Celtic countries, and some people may think that that is a good pointer to this centurion's origin in western Europe, rather than in Africa or one of the eastern provinces.

IX

The publication in 1986 of MAVORS II, "Roman Army Papers" by J.F. Gilliam led me to re-read his paper on "The veterans and *praefectus castrorum* of the *II Traiana* A.D. 157", and his suggestion that it might be rewarding for there to be a study of the names of the centurions on the Nicopolis inscription; the foregoing analysis is my attempt to justify his belief. In that paper, he observed that, of the 136 veterans discharged in 157, the origins of all but three are recorded, and that at least 107 men are from the West. Of them, 89 are from Africa, 15 from Italy, and one each from Gallia Narbonensis, Germania Inferior and Dalmatia; by contrast, there are 17 from Syria and Palestine, 5 from Pontus and Bithynia, and one each from Galatia, Pamphylia, Cilicia, and perhaps Egypt (MAVORS II, 146f.).

On the justifiable assumption that a good many of the centurions, like C. Domitius Maternus, will have been commissioned after service in the ranks, it has seemed likely that a good many of the 47 centurions will have had a comparable range of geographical origins. To a large extent, that supposition has been supported by the conclusions reached above, though it must be stressed that I have failed to find more than a hint of centurions from the East. If my judgement is accepted, Africa has nine certain Africans (my nos. 4, 17, 19, 22, 24, 27, 35, 36 and 44); by contrast, Italy comes out with sixteen (nos. 1, 6, 8-11, 25, 31-34, 39-42 and 46); there remain two each assignable to Dalmatia and to an eastern province (16, 21), and one each to Spain, Narbonensis and Moesia (?). But it will be admitted that there are a good many men for whose origins I can offer no opinion (nos. 2, 3, 7, 14, 15, 18, 20, 23, 26, 28, 37, 38, 43, 45 and 47). There is evidently less than certainty about the allocation of origins to the group as a whole. But two points deserve to be made: first, there are a good many men whose Roman citizenship is not of very long standing — not only the three Aelii but men arguably of freedman stock (such as Attius Auctus or Pomponius Bassus or Ulpianus Martinus); and when so many of the recruits in 132 and 133 were drawn from Italy, it would not be surprising if among them there would be men thought particularly well suited for promotion to centurion, especially in a period when, if Brian Dobson is right, there was a tendency to look more favourably on Italians when it came to selecting men for promotion to the primipilate.

In writing this paper, I have been helped by the advice, for which I am more than grateful, of my son A.R. Birley, Brian Dobson and M.P. Speidel — and most of all,

perhaps I am grateful to J.F. Gilliam for suggesting the task which has involved studying the centurions of II Traiana in 157.

POSTSCRIPT

My attention has been drawn to a paper by the Heidelberg scholar Karl Strobel, published in the new Austrian periodical *TYCHE* 2 (1987) 203-209: "Bemerkungen zur Laufbahn des Ti. Claudius Vitalis". In it, he attempts to reject a view which I advanced in the *Carnuntum Jahrbuch* 8 (1963/64) 21-33 — now reprinted in *MAVORS IV* (1988) 206-220 —, that Ti. Claudius Vitalis and L. Valerius Proclus were exact contemporaries, moving from warfare on the Danube and receiving decorations on it, to Britain, first to leg. XX V.V. and then to leg. IX Hispana. Dr. Strobel wishes to put the career of Vitalis in the time of Trajan; but this thesis is misconceived, in view of Dr. Valerie Maxfield's observation, in her book on the *Military Decorations of the Roman Army* (1981), p. 192, which indeed he cites, namely that the name of the emperor who awarded the decorations to both men is not mentioned, and that that points to Domitian; if it had been Trajan, that ought surely to have been mentioned. There are other points in Dr. Strobel's paper against which strong arguments could be offered, but this is not the place for them.

Carvoran

Eric Birley