

THE WITNESSES TO ROMAN MILITARY DIPLOMATA

JOHN MORRIS

University of London

MARGARET ROXAN

Archaeological Institute, London

The auxiliary units of the Roman army of the principate were chiefly recruited from *peregrini* (non-citizen provincials). Apart from units raised in newly conquered territories, enlistment was largely voluntary. An adequate supply of volunteers was ensured by the grant of Roman citizenship and *conubium* (Roman marriage) to auxiliaries. Until about 140 their children born during service also received citizenship. From the time of Claudius auxiliaries and veterans of the fleets received pairs of small perforated bronze tablets, known to modern scholars as *diplomata militaria*, which recorded these grants. The text was inscribed in duplicate, on the inner and outer faces, and the tablets were then wired together and sealed, so that any suspected alterations to the outer face could be checked by breaking the seal in the presence of an authorised official, and comparing it with the sealed text. It looks as though Claudius devised a means of stopping an abuse of certificates issued by his predecessors on less durable material.

Similar certificates, granting *conubium* only, were issued to veterans of citizen units stationed in Rome (the *Praetoriani* and *Urbani*). No *diplomata* are known to have been issued to veterans of frontier citizen units, for whom bronze certificates were evidently not considered necessary; one is however known from the Urban cohort stationed in Lyon (*CIL XVI* 133, of 16 March 192). The need to guard against misuse of certificates legalising marriages entered into by serving soldiers was clearly limited to the great cities of Rome and Lyon.

The wording of the *diplomata* is simple but verbose. 'The Emperor (with the date of his *tribunicia potestas* and other titles) grants Roman citizenship and marriage rights to those who serve (or have served) in such and such units' followed by the details of the individual recipient (with consular and day date). The text covered the inner faces of the two tablets and was repeated on the outer face of one. The other face bore names of seven witnesses who

attested that the certificate was a true copy excerpted from a list engraved in bronze and displayed in Rome.

No auxiliary *diplomata* issued after the accession of Severus in 193 have yet been discovered. Fleet *diplomata* continued to be issued at least until 250 and those to praetorian guards and urban cohorts until at least 306, the latter apparently annually on January 7th; in 230 and 237 *diplomata* were issued to *equites singulares* (*CIL XVI* 144 and 146).

A conservative estimate of the numbers of soldiers who survived the requisite term of service suggests that at least 2,000 *diplomata* a year must have been required from Flavian to mid-Antonine times for *auxilia* alone. The total number of *diplomata* of all kinds from Claudius to Diocletian must have been of the order of a quarter to half a million. Of these 257, including fragments, have survived and been recorded, and fresh *diplomata* are nowadays discovered at an average rate of two or three a year. Most have been published by H. Nesselhauf in *CIL XVI* (1936) and XVI Supplement (1955); a list of those discovered since those publications is given on p. 301 (**List 1**). The names of witnesses are preserved, wholly or in part, in 120 *diplomata* (**List 2**, p. 304). The purpose of this article is to discuss those witnesses.

Only about one in every three or four thousand witness lists survives; but the form of the surviving few is consistent enough to demonstrate beyond reasonable doubt that it was repeated in those that are now lost. The ordering and nature of the witnesses shows two clearly defined changes.

In the first period, until 73/74, all witnesses were fellow soldiers or compatriots of the recipient. As yet, only one witness, Q. Publicius Crescens, is known to have attested more than one *diploma*, and the other witnesses to the two that he signed were all men from the same region. Then, during the sixty years between Vespasian's censorship and Hadrian's last years, the same witnesses commonly sign numerous auxiliary and fleet tablets, but they sign in no fixed order. In the third period, from 133/138 onward, seven witnesses signed in strict order of seniority. When the position at the head of the list fell vacant each man moved up one step, and a new witness normally began to sign in seventh place; but sometimes a new name first appears in an intermediate position.

In all periods witnessing procedures for *diplomata* of City troops were unaffected by Vespasian's and Hadrian's reforms and certificates continued to be signed by witnesses who appear to be colleagues of the veterans.

The evidence is set out below, separately for each period, prefixed by the lists of *diplomata* made known since *CIL XVI* Supplement, and of those with extant witness lists, and followed by indices of witnesses and a discussion of the evidence.

List 1. Post CIL XVI and Supplement Diplomas	301	Index 1. Period 1: A. D. 52 — 73/74.	
		<i>Nomina (and cognomina) signatorum</i>	313
List 2. Diplomata corresponding to the periods of tables and indices	304	Index 2. Period 2: A. D. 73/74 — 134/138.	
		<i>Nomina (and cognomina) signatorum</i>	316
Table 1 A. Auxilia et classes. Period 1: A. D. 52 — 73/74	307	Index 3. Period 3: A. D. 138 — 212.	
		<i>Nomina (and cognomina) signatorum</i>	320
Table 1 B. Praetoriani	308	Index 4. Cohortes praetorianae et urbanae. Nomina (and cognomina) signatorum	
			321
Table 2. Period 2: A. D. 73/74 — 138. Names of witnesses appearing more than once and the order of signature	309	Index 5. Imperial names among the witnesses A. D. 73/74 — 133/134	
			323
Table 2 A. Witnesses in the period A. D. 129—140	311	Index 6. Recurring nomina among the witnesses after A. D. 73/74	
			324
Table 3. Period 3: A. D. 138 — 212. Names of witnesses and their order in diplomata with complete or restorable lists	312		

LIST 1

POST CIL XVI and Supplement diplomas.

Recipients classified:

P = Praetorian

L = Legionary

A = Auxiliary

S = Special grant

C = Fleet

UC = Urban Cohort

[W] = names of witnesses preserved

[w] = names of witnesses partially preserved

I = Tabella I preserved

II = Tabella II preserved.

(f) = fragmentary.

1. *Studien zu den Militärgrenzen Roms VI* (Köln-Graz, 1967) 94 ff. H. Lieb. P. A.D. 73. I (f).
2. *Starinar* 18 (1967) 21 ff. D. V.-Todorović. A (Moesia) April 28, 75. I, II [W].
3. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 16, 2 (1975) 121 ff. R. Mellor, E. Harris. A (Syria) November 7, 88. I, II [W].
4. *Studia in honorem Acad. D. Dečev* (1959) 317 ff. L. Botušarova. A. (Syria) May 12, 91. I.
5. *Klio* 37 (1959) 210 ff. B. Gerov. A (Syria) May, 12, 91. II (f) [w].
6. *Dacia și Pannonia inferior* (Bucharest, 1973) 102 ff. I. I. Russu. A (Moesia superior) August 14, 99. II (f) [w].
7. *Journal of Roman Studies* 50 (1960) 238, 14. R. P. Wright. A (Britannia) May 1 — July 17, 105. II (f). [w].
8. *Syria* 44 (1967) 339 ff. H.-G. Pflaum. A/C (Aegyptus) September 24, 105. I, II [W].
9. *Bayerische Vorgeschichtsblätter* 38 (1973) 124 ff. H.-J. Kellner. A (Raetia/Moesia inferior) 103/105. I (f).
10. *Bulletin d'archéologie marocaine* 4 (1960) 573. M. Euzennat, J. Marion. A (Mauretania Tingitana?) 100/107 II (f) [w].

11. *Antiquités africaines* 3 (1969) 115 ff. M. Euzennat. A (Mauretania Tingitana?) 82/109. II (f) [w].
12. *Bulletin archéologique du Comité des travaux historiques* 1955/6 (1958) 83. R. Thouvenot. A (Mauretania Tingitana?) 105/110? II (f) [w].
13. Unpublished. To be published in *Arheologija* 1977? A (Thracia) July 19, 114. I, II [W].
14. *Antiquités africaines* 3 (1969) 117, 2. M. Euzennat. A? (Mauretania Tingitana?) 98/117. I (f).
15. *Dacia și Pannonia inferior* (Bucharest, 1973) 83 ff. I. I. Russu. A? (Dacia superior?) 106/117. II (f) [w].
16. *Bulletin d'archéologie marocaine* 4 (1960) 582, 54. M. Euzennat, J. Marion. A. (Mauretania Tingitana,) c. 118? II (f) [w].
17. *Athenaeum N. S.* 36 (1958) 4 ff. G. Forni. S (Dacia superior) June 29, 120. I, II [W].
18. *Antiquités africaines* 3 (1969) 118 ff. 4. M. Euzennat. A (Mauretania Tingitana?) 90/120 II (f).
19. *Bulletin de l'institut d'archéologie bulgare* 27 (1964) 187 ff. C? S? (Uncertain) 121? II (f) [w].
20. *Dacia N. S.* 18 (1974) 155 ff. I. I. Russu. A (Dacia Porolissensis, Pannonia inferior) August 10, 123. I (f).
21. *Dacia N.S.* 16 (1972) 281 ff. C. Petolescu. A? (Uncertain) October 15, 123?? I (f).
22. *Bulletin d'archéologie marocaine* 2 (1957) 238, 40. M. Euzennat. A (Mauretania Tingitana?) 90/124. I (f).
23. *Germania* 39 (1961) 93 ff. A. Radnóti. A (Raetia) 121/125 I (f).
24. *Studii și Communicări* (Apulum) 4 (1961) 119 ff. I. I. Russu. A (Uncertain) 123/125 I (f).
25. *Acta Musei Napocensis* 2 (1965) 135 ff. C. Daicoviciu, L. Groza. S (Dacia superior) February 12 (or Jan. 31) 126. I, II [W].
26. *Thamusida* 1 (1965) 192, 818. J. P. Callu, J. P. Morel, R. Rebuffat, G. Hallier. A? (Mauretania Tingitana??) 126? II (f).
27. *Germania* 34 (1956) 75 ff. K. Kraft; *Germania* 47 (1969) 178 ff. H. U. Nuber. A (Raetia) 125/128. I (f).
28. Unpublished. A (Pannonia inferior) April 30, 129. II [W].
29. *Journal of Roman Studies* 51 (1961) 63 ff. C. Daicoviciu, D. Protase. A (Dacia Porolissensis) July 2, 133. I.
30. *Germania* 46 (1968) 118 ff. A. Radnóti. Uncertain. 135? II (f) [w].
31. *Bulletin d'archéologie marocaine* 7 (1967) 643 ff. R. Thouvenot. A (Mauretania Tingitana?) 117/138. I (f).
32. *Buciumi : Das Römerlager von Buciumi* (Cluj 1972) 118 ff. E. Chirilă, N. Gudea, V. Lucăcel, C. Pop. A (Dacia Porolissensis) 119/138. I (f).
33. *Klio* 37 (1959) 196 ff. B. Gerov. A (Dacia inferior) December 13, 140. I, II [W].
34. *Bulletin archéologique du Comité des travaux historiques* (1954) 59. R. Thouvenot. A? (Mauretania Tingitana?) 133/140? II (f) [w].
35. *Bayerische Vorgeschichtsblätter* 38 (1973) 127 ff. H.-J. Kellner. Uncertain. 133/140? II (f) [w].
36. *Bayerische Vorgeschichtsblätter* 31 (1966) 90 ff. H.-J. Kellner; *Germania* 47 (1969) 181 ff. H. U. Nuber. A (Raetia) 139/141. I (f).
37. *Journal of Roman Studies* 47 (1957) 196/7. D. Atkinson. (Britannia?) 141/147. II (f) [w].
38. *Studii și Communicări* (Apulum) 4 (1961) 123/124. I. I. Russu. Uncertain. 141/147. II (f) [w].
39. *Fundberichte aus Schwaben N. F.* 15 (1959) 73 ff. H. Nesselhauf A (Raetia) 153. I (f).
40. *Bulletin archéologique du Comité des travaux historiques* 1954 (1956) 63/64. M. Thouvenot. A (Mauretania Tingitana) December 28, 154. I (f).

41. *Bulletin Arch. Soc. Staline* 9 (1953) 61 ff. I. Venedikov. A (Moesia inferior) 146/154. I (f).
42. *Bayerische Vorgeschichtsblätter* 33 (1968) 95 ff. H.-J. Kellner. A (Raetia) 153/157. I (f).
43. *Dacia și Pannonia inferior* (Bucharest 1973) 90 ff. I. I. Russu. A (Dacia Porolissensis) September 27, 154/157? II (f) [w] cf. *CIL XVI* 110.
44. *Epigraphische Studien* 5 (1968) 1 ff. G. Alföldy. A (Germania inferior) 158. I (f).
45. *Bulletin archéologique du Comité des travaux historiques* 1955—56 (1958) 86 ff. R. Thouvenot. A (Mauretania Tingitana) 151/160. I (f).
46. *Publications du Service des Antiquités du Maroc* 9 (1951) 179, I, c. R. Thouvenot; *Antiquités africaines* 3 (1969) 122/3, 5. M. Euzennat. A (Mauretania Tingitana) 157/160. II (f) [w].
47. *Chiron* 2 (1972) 449 ff. B. Overbeck. A (Moesia superior) February 8, 161. I.
48. *Bulletin archéologique du Comité des travaux historiques* (1954) 52. R. Thouvenot. A (Mauretania Tingitana?) 138/161. I (f).
49. *Antiquités africaines* 3 (1969) 122/124, 6. M. Euzennat. A. (Mauretania Tingitana?) 136/161. I (f).
50. *Bayerische Vorgeschichtsblätter* 38 (1973) 129 ff. H.-J. Kellner. Uncertain. 138/161? I (f).
51. *Antiquités africaines* 3 (1969) 124/5, 7. M. Euzennat. A. (Uncertain) 138/161? I (f).
52. *Acta Archaeologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 9 (1958) L. Barckóczi. A (Pannonia superior) 163. I (f).
53. *Bayerische Vorgeschichtsblätter* 33 (1968) 92 ff. H.-J. Kellner. A? (Raetia?) 161/163. I (f).
54. *Materiale și Cercetari Arheologice* 2 (1956) 703 ff. I. I. Russu. A (Dacia Porolissensis) July 21, 164. I, II. [W].
55. *Buciumi : Das Römerlager von Buciumi* (Cluj 1972) 119. E. Chirilă, N. Gudea, V. Lucăcel, C. Pop. A (Dacia Porolissensis) July 21?, 164. I (f).
56. *Athenaeum N. S.* 36 (1958) 183 ff. G. Forni. A (Dacia Porolissensis) July 21? 164. I (f).
57. *Germania* 39 (1961) 103 ff. A. Radnóti. A (Raetia) 167/168. I (f).
58. *Dacia și Pannonia inferior* (Bucharest 1973) 101, 21 I. I. Russu. No details. Suggested Dacia Porolissensis Marcus/Verus. I (f).
59. *Bulletin d'archéologie marocaine* 4 (1960) 572. M. Euzennat, J. Marion. Uncertain. Mauretania Tingitana? 161/180? I (f).
60. *Bayerische Vorgeschichtsblätter* 31 (1966) 92/93. H.-J. Kellner. Uncertain. Raetia? Hadrian/Marcus? I (f).
61. *Bayerische Vorgeschichtsblätter* 38 (1973) 129 ff. H.-J. Kellner. Uncertain. Raetia? Hadrian/Marcus? II (f).
62. Unpublished. C. August 30, 212. I, II. [w].
63. *Živa Antika* 12 (1962—4) 380 ff. S. Dušanić, P. Petrović. P/UC January 7, 222. I, II. [W].
64. *Arheologija* (Sofia) 4, 4 (1962) 52 ff. D. Stoynova-Serefimova. P. January 7, 224. I.
65. Unpublished. P. January 7, 228. I?
66. *Arheologija* (Sofia) 13 (1971) 48 ff. Spas Mašov. P. January 7, 236. I, II. [W].
67. *Athenaeum N. S.* 38 (1960) 3 ff. M. Bizzarri, G. Forni. P. January 7, 306. I, II. [W].
68. *Dacia și Pannonia inferior* (Bucharest 1973) 101, 22. I. I. Russu. A (Dacia Porolissensis?) Undated. II (f).
69. *Germania* 47 (1969) 186 ff. H. U. Nuber. A? (Raetia?) Post 140. I (f).
70. *Alba Regia XI* (Székesfehérvár) (1971) 118, Taf. 49. E. Vágó. A? Uncertain. Perhaps Trajanic? II (f) [w].
- A. *Helinium* 4 (1964) 52 ff. M. E. Mariën. January 18, 108. II. [W].

LIST 2.

DIPLOMATA CORRESPONDING TO THE PERIODS OF TABLES AND INDICES

Period 1 AD 52 — 73/74

Diplomata 1—19, 25, + 1.¹

Witnesses extant for:

Diploma	Date	Province/legion/fleet ²
1. C.	52 Dec. 11	Misenum
2. A.	ante 54 Feb. 13	Illyricum
3. A.	54 Jun. 18	Syria?
5. A.	64 Jun. 15	Raetia?
(5) 7. L.	68 Dec. 22 a	I Adiutrix
8. L.	68 Dec. 22 b	I Adiutrix
9. L.	68 Dec. 22 c	I Adiutrix
10. L.	70 Mar. 7 a	II Adiutrix
11. L.	70 Mar. 7 b	II Adiutrix
(10) 12. C.	71 Feb. 9 a	Misenensis
14. C.	71 Apr. 5 b	Ravennas
15. C.	71 Apr. 5 c	Misenensis
16. C.	71 Apr. 5 d	Misenensis
18. P.	71/74 Mai. 30	
(15) 19.	64/74	Fragmentary. No complete name restorable.

¹ In all tables and indices *CIL XVI* numbers are given without prefix. *Diplomata* not included in *CIL XVI* are indicated by + before the number; in these cases the number corresponds to the list on p. 301—303. Details of date and provenance are given only for *diplomata* in which the names of witnesses are preserved. Normally there were seven witnesses and the only variations from this are noted e.g. w9. If only part of a witness list has been preserved, because the diploma is fragmentary or damaged, the names that are still legible, in whole or in part, are indicated e.g. w3.

In every case where names of witnesses are preserved they appear on the outer face of the second tablet of the diploma. *CIL XVI* 25, of December 30, 72 (for date see H. Lieb, *Studien zu den Militärgrenzen Roms* 6 [Köln-Graz, 1967] 95, n. 19) was issued to a man from the second praetorian cohort but only the second tablet has survived. The outer face of this tablet is blank. This is the only known instance.

² The so-called legionary *diplomata* of AD 68 and 70 were issued to men who had served in the Italian Fleets before being drafted into formations which were later ratified as legions. They are really Fleet *diplomata*, modified to suit special circumstances, and are included as such in Table 1A.

Abbreviations used throughout: P = Praetorian cohort; UC = Urban cohort; L = Legion; A = Auxilia; S = Special grant; C = Classis.

Period 2 AD 73/74 — 134/138

Diplomata 20—24, 26—82, 88, 105, 158—173, 176,¹ + 2—+ 30, + 70, App.

Witnesses extant for:

Diploma	Date	Province/fleet
20. A.	74 Mai. 21	Germania
+ 2. A.	75 Apr. 28	Moesia
22. A.	78 Feb. 7 a	Moesia
23. A.	78 Apr. 15 b	Germania
(5) 24. C.	79 Sep. 8	Aegyptus
26. A.	80 Jun. 13	Pannonia
28. A.	82 Sep. 20	Germania/Moesia
29. A.	83 Jun. 9	Aegyptus
30. A.	84 Sep. 3	Pannonia

¹ A new date range (123/129) has been suggested for *CIL XVI* 176 by M. Euzennat, *Antiquités africaines* 3 (1969) 115 ff.

	Diploma	Date	Province/fleet
(10)	31. A.	85 Sep. 5	Pannonia
	32. C.	86 Feb. 17 a	Aegyptus
	33. A.	86 Mai. 13 b	Iudaea
	159. A.	88 Ian. 9 a	Mauretania Ting.
	35. A.	88 Nov. 7 b	Syria
(15)	+ 3. A.	88 Nov. 7 c	Syria
	36. A.	90 Oct. 27	Germania sup.
	+ 5. A.	91 Mai. 12	Syria
	37. C.	92 Iun. 14	Fl. Moesica
	38. A.	94 Iul. 13 a	Delmatia
(20)	39. A.	94 Sep. 16 b	Moesia sup.
	41. A.	97 Ian. —	Moesia inf?
	42. A.	98 Feb. 20	Pannonia
	+ 70. A.	c. 98?	w 4
	+ 6. A.	99 Aug. 14	Moesia sup.
(25)	46. A.	100 Mai. 8	Moesia sup.
	48. A.	103 Ian. 19	Britannia
	49. A.	105 Ian. 12 a	Moesia sup.
	50. A.	105 Mai. 13 b	Moesia inf.
	+ 7. A.	105 Mai. 1—Iul. 17 c	Britannia
(30)	+ 8. A.	105 Sep. 24 d	Aegyptus
	55. A.	107 Iun. 30 a	Raetia
	56. A/C.	107 Nov. 24 b	Mauretania Caes.
	+ 10. A.	100/107	Mauretania Ting?
	161. A.	109 Oct. 14	w 4
(35)	+ 11. A.	82/109	Mauretania Ting.
	163. A.	110 Iul. 2 a	Dacia
	164. A.	110 Iul. 2 b	Pannonia inf.
	160. A/S.	110 (106) Aug. 11 c	Dacia
	+ 12. A.	105/110?	Mauretania Ting?
(40)	+ 13. A.	114 Iul. 19 a	Thracia
	61. A.	114 Sep. 1 b	Pannonia inf.
	65. A.	98/117?	w 2
	+ 15. A?	106/117	w 3
	166. A.	118 Mar. 28	Mauretania Ting.
(45)	+ 16. A.	c. 118?	Mauretania Ting.
	68. S.	120 Iun. 29 a	w 2
	+ 17. S.	120 Iun. 29 b	Dacia sup.
	167. A.	100/120	Dacia sup.
	168. C.	121	Mauretania Ting?
(50)	+ 19. C?S?	121?	w 3
	69. A.	122 Iul. 17	Britannia
	70. A.	124 Sep. 16	Britannia
	+ 25. S.	126 Feb. 12 or Ian. 31	w 4
	72. C.	127 Oct. 11	Dacia sup.
(55)	74. C.	129 Feb. 18 a	Praet. Ravennas
	75. A.	129 Mar. 22 b	Praet. Misenensis
			Dacia inf.

	Diploma	Date	Province/fleet
(60)	+ 28. A.	129 Apr. 30 c	Pannonia inf?
	76. A.	133 Iul. 3	Pannonia sup.
	78. A.	134 Apr. 2 a	Moesia inf.
	79. C.	134 Sep. 15 b	Praet. Misenensis
	105. A.	128/134	Raetia?
	+ 30.	135?	w 1
	App. ²	108 Ian. 18	

² Bronze tablet... 'honestam missionem dedimus'. Similar to a diploma in size and shape, witnessed in the same manner.

Period 3 AD 138—212

Diplomata 83—87, 89—104, 106—136, 174—175, 177—188, + 31—+ 62, + 68, + 69.

Witnesses extant for:

	Diploma	Date	Province/fleet
(5)	83. A/C.	138 Feb. 28	Moesia inf.
	87. A.	139 Nov. 22	Syria Pal.
	177. C.	140 Nov. 26 a	Praet. Misenensis
	+ 33. A.	140 Dec. 13 b	Dacia inf.
	89.	133/140 a	w 4
	+ 34.	133/140 b	w 4
(10)	+ 35.	133/140? c	w 2
	178. A.	146 Iul. 19	Pannonia sup.
	+ 37.	141/147 a	Britannia?
	+ 38.	141/147 b	w 3
	95. P.	148 Feb. 29 a	w 2
	96. A.	148 Oct. 9 b	Pannonia sup.
(15)	179. A/C.	148 Oct. 9 c	Pannonia inf.
	180. A/C.	148 Oct. 9 d	Pannonia inf.
	97. A.	149 Iul. 5	Pannonia sup.
	99. A.	150 Aug. 1	Pann. inf./Maur. Caes.
	100. C.	152 Sep. 5	Praet. Ravennas
	102. C.	153 Dec. 24	
(20)	104. A.	154 Nov. 3	Pannonia sup.
	+ 43/110. A.	154/157? Sep. 27	Dacia Por.
	107. A.	157? Dec. 13	w 4
	108. A.	158 Iul. 8	Dacia sup.
	109.	146/158	Dacia sup.
	+ 46. A.	160	w 3
(25)	+ 54. A.	164 Iul. 21	Mauretania Ting.
	120. A.	165 Feb. 18	w 2
	121. A.	166 Mar. or. Apr.	Dacia Por.
	123. A.	167 Mai. 5	Moesia sup?
	126.	158/178	Raetia
	128. A.	178 Mar. 23	Pannonia inf.
(30)	188.	175/180	w 3
	127. C.	c. 185/190	Lycia Pamphylia
	133. UC.	192 Mar. 16	w 4
	136. P.	212	coh. XIII urb. Lugdun.
	+ 62. C.	212 Aug. 30	Pr. Ant. Misenensis

Period 4 AD 212—306

Diplomata 137—157, + 63—+ 67.

Witnesses extant for:

Diploma	Date	(5)	Diploma	Date
+ 63. P/UC.	222 Ian. 7		+ 66. P.	236 Ian. 7
189. P.	224 Ian. 7		147. P.	243 Ian. 7
143. P.	226 Ian. 7		155. P.	254 Ian. 7
145. P.	233 Ian. 7		+ 67. P.	306 Ian. 7

TABLE 1 A : Auxilia et Classes

Period I 52—73/74.

Diploma	1	3	10	11	12	14
Date	52	54	70 a	70 b	71 a	71 b
Found	Dec. 11 Stabii	Iun. 18 Moesia	Mar. 7 Thrace	Mar. 7 Herculanum	Feb. 9 Thrace	Apr. 5 Salona
Recipient	C	A	L	L	C	C
Origo of recipient	Bessus (Thrace)	Thrace?	Bessus (Thrace)	Desi- diati (Illyria)	Sappei (Thrace)	Maezii (Dalmatia)

Witnesses

O r i g o

Macedonia:

Thessalonica	7	
Dyrrachium	1—6	
Bessus		7
Philippi		
Apri		1—5
		7

1—7

Illyricum:

Salona		1, 3, 4	1, 5
Iader		2	3, 4, 7
Epidaurum			2
Risinium			6

Macedonia

Nedinum		6
None given	1—6	5, 7

S t a t u s

Eques Romanus			1, 2
Beneficiarius navarchi	1		
Beneficiarius tribuni	2, 3, 4		
Centurio	5, 6	1, 2	
Decurio			2
Miles			3, 4
coh. IV praet			
Miles		4	
coh. IX praet			
Veteranus		3, 6	
Missicius classis	7		
None given	1—7	5, 7	1, 3—7
			5—7

<i>Diploma</i>	2	5	7	8	9	15	19
<i>Date</i>	ante 54 Feb. 13	64 Iun. 15	68 a Dec. 22	68 b Dec. 22	68 c Dec. 22	71 c Apr. 5	64/74
<i>Found</i>	Sirmium	Noricum	Stabii	Stabii	Sardinia	Pompeii	Moesia
<i>Recipient</i>	A	A	L	L	L	C	?
<i>Origo of recipient</i>	Cornacati (Pan- nonia)	Helvetii	Phrygia	Syria	Sardinia	Syria	?
Witnesses							
<i>Origo</i>							
<i>Sardinia</i>				1, 2, 4, 5, 7			
<i>Sardinia</i>				3			
<i>Ma(e)onia</i>						1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9,	
<i>Caralis</i>						3	
<i>Sulci</i>							
<i>Asia Minor</i>				6			
Ephesus?							
<i>Syria</i>							
Apamea				1			
Antioch				2, 3, 4, 5		3, 5, 6	
Laodicea						1, 2, 7	
Caesarea							
Stratonis					4		
None given	1—7	1—9		6, 7	7		*
Status							
<i>Eques</i>							
Romanus						1	
<i>Veteranus</i>							
leg. I Adiutricis					7		
<i>Veteranus</i>							
None given	1—7	1—9	1—7	6, 7 1—5	1—6, 8, 9 2—7	**	

* unidentifiable origo . .]ens(is) given for two witnesses

** One of the incomplete names is followed by dec(urionis?)

TABLE 1 B Praetoriani

<i>Diploma</i>	18
<i>Date</i>	71/74 Mai. 30
<i>Found</i>	Sirmium
<i>Origo of recipient</i>	Savaria
<i>Origo of witnesses</i>	
<i>Siscia</i>	1, 2, 6, 7
<i>Sirmium</i>	3, 4, 5

TABLE 2

Period 2 AD 73/74 — 138

Names of witnesses appearing more than once and the order of signature¹

Name	Date:	74	78	78	79	80	82	83	84	86	88	88	90	91	92	94
		a	b								a	bc				a
P. Atinius Rufus		5	2	7	1	2	5	4	1							
M. Stlaccius Philetus				2	6											
C. Alfius Priscus			2	—	—	—	7?									
L. Pullius Speratus				3	1	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	5*
Q. Mucius Augustalis				4	—	1	1	2	—	—	1	1				
L. Pullius Verecundus				5	—	—	—	—	—	7	2	—	—	7*		
L. Pullius Ianuarius				6	7	—	—	—	—	—	—	7				
C. Pompeius Eutrapelus					3	2	2	—	—	—	5	4	3			
C. Claudius Sementivus					4	—	5	—	—	—	4					
C. Julius Clemens						3	—	4	—	—	—	5				
C. Lucretius Modestus						6	3	3	—	3	3	3	4			
P. Atinius Amerimnus						7	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	6*
M. Calpurnius Iustus										1	—	2	—	2	3?	
C. Julius Helenus										5	—	6				
Cn. Egnatius Vitalis														4?	3*	
Q. Orfius Cupitus														5?	2*	
Witnesses signing once or identification unsure		6	6	5	1	1	—	1	3	5	6	—	1	4	4	2
Names of witnesses missing		—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

¹ Restorations in *italics*. *Diplomata* of uncertain date or in very fragmentary condition omitted from this table are: + 70, + 10, + 11, + 12, 65, + 15, + 16, 167, 168, 105, + 30.

Diplomata with witnesses who sign once only: + 2, 31, 33 (for dates and names see List 2 and Index 2).

* Witness appearing in other sections of table.

Name	94	97	98	99	100	103	105	105	105	107	107	108	b	a	bd	c	a	b	App.	
L. Pullius Speratus						4*	—	—	—	7										
L. Pullius Verecundus						—*	—	—	—	6	—	4	—	—	2	—	—	*		
P. Atinius Amerimnus						—*	—	—	—	—	—	5	4	4	4	—	—	*		
Cn. Egnatius Vitalis						5*														
Q. Orfius Cupitus						1*														
Q. Aemilius Soterichus						3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1		
P. Caulius Vitalis						7	—	—	—	—	4	—	7	7	3	—	6*			
P. Caulius Restitutus							4?	—	—	—	—	—	3	3						
T. Flavius Secundus								2	—	—	3									
Q. Pompeius Homerus								5	1	1	1	—	2	2	1	—	4			
Q. Apidius Thallus								3	—	—	—	—	—	6	—	—	2*			
A. Ampius Epaphroditus									2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1		
C. Julius Aprilis									4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	7		
C. Vettienus Modestus									5	5	3	—	—	7	—	—	*			
Ti. Claudius Menander									7	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	*		

	94	97	98	99	100	103	105	105	105	107	107	108
	b					a	bd	c	a	b		App.
Ti. Iulius Urbanus						1	1	1	—	—	—	*
L. Pullius Trophimus						6	—	—	—	—	—	*
C. Iulius Paratus						7	—	—	—	—	—	*
M. Iulius Clemens							5	5	—	—	—	*
Ti. Iulius Euphemus							6	6				
C. Tuticanus Saturninus									5	—	—	*
C. Iulius Eutuchus									2	—	—	*
P. Atinius Trophimus										3	—	
M. Iunius Eutychus										5	—	
Witnesses signing once or identification unsure	2	3	5	5	1	2	1	—	—	—	5	—
Names of witnesses missing	—	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

Name	109	110	110	110	114	114	118	120	121	121?	122
	a	b	c	a	b	ab					
L. Pullius Verecundus	—*	2	—	2	3	3	—	—	—	5	—*
P. Atinius Amerimnus	4*	3	—	3							
P. Caulius Vitalis	—*	—	—	—	2	7	4				
Q. Apidius Thallus	—*	—	—	—	—	4					
C. Vettienus Modestus	—*	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	*
Ti. Claudius Menander	—*	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1*
Ti. Iulius Urbanus	—*	—	—	—	1	6	1	—	—	—	3*
L. Pullius Trophimus	—*	4	—	5							
C. Iulius Paratus	5*	6	—	6	—	5	—	—	—	—	*
M. Iulius Clemens	7*										
C. Tuticanus Saturninus	6*	5	—	4							
C. Iulius Eutuchus	—*	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	*
P. Atinius Trophimus	—*	—	—	—	5						
M. Iunius Eutychus	—*	7	—	7	—	—	—	2			
P. Cornelius Alexander	1	—	1								
A. Cascellius Proculus	7	—	6	—	—	—	—	—	3?		
C. Vettienus Hermes		4	—	—	—	—	—	—	2?	—*	
C. Caesius Romanus						2	—	—	—	—	*
L. Vibius Vibianus						3	—	—	—	—	*
P. Atinius Crescens						7	7	7	7		
P. Atinius Florus						5	3				
L. Atteius Atteianus						1	—	—	—	—	*
Q. Fabius Bithus						4					
L. Pullius Anthus						5	5	—	7	*	
Ti. Claudius Eros						6	6				
L. Equitius Gemellus						4	—				*
L. Pullius Daphnus										4	*
Q. Lollius Festus										6	*
Witnesses signing once or identification unsure	—	—	6	—	1	2	1	—	—	2	2
Names of witnesses missing	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	—	—

Name	124	126	127	129 a	129 b	129 c	133	134 a	134 b	138
L. Pullius Verecundus	—*	—	—	6						
C. Vettienus Modestus	—*	—	—	5						
Ti. Claudius Menander	—*	—	5?	3	6	2	1	—	1	1*
Ti. Iulius Urbanus	5*	1	—	1	—	1				
C. Iulius Paratus	7*									
C. Iulius Eutuchus	—*	—	—	—	—	5				
C. Vettienus Hermes	—*	7	—	7	7	7	7	—	7	
C. Caesius Romanus	—*	2	3	2						
L. Vibius Vibianus	—*	3	1	—	1	3				
L. Atteius Atteianus	—*	—	—	5						
L. Pullius Anthus	—*	—	—	—	5	4				
L. Equitius Gemellus	—*	5	—	—	4					
L. Pullius Daphnus	—*	4	—	—	3	—	3	—	3	3*
Q. Lollius Festus	—*	6	2	—	2	—	6			
P. Attius Severus	6?	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	2	2*
P. Attius Festus							4	—	—	4*
T. Flavius Laurus							5	—	—	5*
T. Flavius Romulus								1	4	
Ti. Iulius Felix								2	5	6*
C. Iulius Silvanus							4	6	7	7*
Witnesses signing once or identification unsure	—	—	2	—	—	1	—	4	—	—
Names of witnesses missing	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

TABLE 2 A

Witnesses in the period 129—140

Name	Date:	129 b	129 c	133	134 a	134 b	138	139	140 a
Ti. Claudius Menander		6	2	1	—	1	1	1	1
P. Attius Severus		—	—	2	—	2	2	2	2
L. Pullius Daphnus		3	—	3	—	3	3	3	3
P. Attius Festus		—	—	4	—	—	4	4	4
T. Flavius Laurus		—	—	5	—	—	5	5	5
Ti. Iulius Felix		—	—	—	2	5	6	6	6
C. Iulius Silvanus		—	—	—	4	6	7	7	7
L. Vibius Vibianus		1	3						
Q. Lollius Festus		2	—	6					
L. Equitius Gemellus		4							
I. Pullius Anthus		5	4						
C. Vettienus Hermes		7	7	7	—	7			
Ti. Iulius Urbanus		—	1						
C. Iulius Eutuchus		—	5						
Q. Iulius Amandus		—	6						
T. Flavius Romulus		—	—	—	1	4			
T. Erredius Alcides		—	—	—	3				
D. Valerius Faustianus		—	—	—	5				
D. Valerius Saturninus		—	—	—	6				
Ti. Claudius Hermes		—	—	—	7				

TABLE 3

Period 3 AD 138—212

Names of witnesses and their order in diplomata with complete or restorable lists.

Name	138		149		150		157?		
	139		146		148		152		
	140	140	146	148	148	cd	153	154	158
a	b			b					
Ti. Cl. Menander	1	1							
P. Attius Severus	2	2	1						
L. Pullius Daphnus	3	3	2	1	1				
P. Attius Festus	4	4							
T. Fl. Laurus	5	5							
M. Servilius Geta			3	2	2	1	1	1*	
L. Pullius Chresimus			4	3	3	2	2	2	2*
M. Ulpius Blastus					4				
M. Sentilius Iasus		6	5	4	—	3	3	3*	
Ti. Iulius Felix	6	—	6	5	5	4	4	4	
C. Iulius Silvanus	7	7	7	6	6	5	5	5	
C. Bellius Urbanus								5*	
L. Pullius Velox						6			
C. Pomponius Statianus							6	6*	
P. Ocilius Priscus				7	7	7	7	7	7*

Diplomata omitted from this table because they are very fragmentary and/or the date depends wholly upon the witness lists are: 89, + 34, + 35, + 37, + 38, + 43/110, 109, + 46, 126.

Name	164		157? 165		166		167 178		c. 185/190		192	212
	158	158	158	158	158	158	158	158	158	158		
M. Servilius Geta	1*	1										
L. Pullius Chresimus	2*											
M. Sentilius Iasus	3*											
Ti. Iulius Felix	4*	2	1									
C. Bellius Urbanus	5*	3	2	1								
L. Pullius Primus		4	3									
L. Sentius Chrysogonus		5	4	2								
C. Pomponius Statianus	6*	6	5									
L. Pullius Zosimus		7	6									
P. Ocilius Priscus	7*	—	7									
Ti. Iulius Crescens					3							
L. Pullius Marcio					4	1	1	1				1
Sex. Vibius Romanus					5							
C. Publicius Lupercus					6	2	2	2				2
M. Iunius Pius					7	3	3	3				3
Ti. Cl. Cassander						4						4
Ti. Cl. Epinicus						5						5
Ti. Cl. Iulianus									4			5
L. Pullius Benignus						6	5	6				6
Ti. Iulius Dativus							7					7
C. Fannius Aresco (?)									6			
C. Fannius —f—									7			
Ti. —	—	—										7

INDEX 1

Period 1 AD 52—73/74

NOMINA SIGNATORVM: auxilia et Classes

- M. AEMILIUS Capito
- D. ALARIVS Pontificalis
- C. Alexander Magnus (sic)
- Sex. ANTIST(IV)S Marinus
- M. APVLEIVS Macer
- L. ARRIVS Rufus
- BETVEDIVS Primigenius, Valens
- P. CAETENNIVS Clemens
- C. CAISIVS Victor
- P. CARVLLIVS P. f. <G>al. Sabinus
- A. CASCELLIVS Successus
- C. CASSIVS Longinus
- Cn. CESSIVS Cn. f. Col. Cestus
- Ti. CLAVDIVS Chaerea; Demosthenes; Epaphroditus; Qui. Fidinus
- C. CORNELIVS Ampliatus
- Cn. CORNELIVS Florus, Ionicus
- L. CORNELIVS Optatus, Simo
- Appius DIDIVS Praxia
- C. DVRRACHINVIS Anthus
- T. FANIUS Celer
- Ti. FONTEIVS Cerialis
- L. GRAECINVIS Felix
- P. GRALTIVS P. f. Aem. Provincialis
- T. GRATIVS Valens
- M. HELENIVS Primus
- C. HELVIVS Lepidus
- C. HERENNIVS Faustus
- C. HERENNVLIEIVS Chryseros
- C. IVLIVS Agathocles; Agrippa; Aquila; Charmus; C. f. Col. Libo; Cornel. Niger; Sace[rd?jos]; Senecio; Theopompus
- Ti. IVLIVS Fab. Cestianus; Pardala; Pudens
- T. IVLIVS Rufus
- D. LIBVRNIVS Rufus
- L. LICINIVS Pudens
- L. LVCILIVS Aristo; Chresimus; Proculus
- P. LVCRETIVS P. f. Vol. Apulus
- P. LVRIVS Moderatus
- Q. LVSIVS Saturninus
- Sex. MAGIVS Rufus
- C. MARCIVS Proculus
- L. MESTIVS L. f. Aem. Priscus
- N. MINIVS Hyla
- M. NASSIVS Phoebus
- L. NOVELLIVS Crispus
- L. NVMERIVS Lupus
- L. NVTRIVS Venustus
- C. OCLATIVS Macer
- C. PACILIVS Priscus
- Q. PETRONIVS Musaeius
- M. PONTIVS Pudens
- T. POMPONIVS Epaphroditus
- L. POMPONIVS Hyginus
- P. POPILLIVS Rufus
- Q. POBLICIVS Crescens¹

¹ In Both 70 b and 71 b most witnesses have a Dalmatian origin. This is probably the same man, who came from Iader (71 b).

Q.	PVBLICIVS	Crescens; ¹ Macedo
L.	PVBLICIVS	Germullus
L.	RENNIVS	Oriens
L.	RVFINVS	Chaerea
C.	SABINIUS	Nedymus
C.	SALLVSTIVS	Crescens
L.	SECVRA	Alexandrus
P.	SERVILIVS	Adiutor
T.	SEXTIVS	Primus
M.	SLAVIVS	Putiolanus
M.	TITINIVS	Macer
L.	VALERIVS	Acutus; Herma; Verus; Volsenus
M.	VALERIVS	Alex(s)and(er); Diodorus; Firmus
L.	VELINA (?)	Nauta
C.	VETIDIVS	C. f. Vol. Rasinianus
P.	VIBIVS	Maximus
Q.	VIBIVS	Sauricus
L.	VITELLIVS	Sossianus

COGNOMINA SIGNATORVM

Date¹

L. Valerius	ACVTVS	70 b
P. Servilius	ADIVTOR	ante 54
C. Iulius	AGATHOCLVS	71 c
C. Iulius	AGRIPPA	68 b
M. Valerius	ALEX(S)AND(ER)	71 d
	ALEXANDER MAGNUS (sic)	71 d
L. Secura	ALEXANDRVS	68 b
C. Cornelius	AMPLIATVS	52
C. Durrachinus	ANTHVS	52
P. Lucretius	APVLVS	70 a
C. Iulius	AQVILA	70 a
L. Lucilius	ARISTO	64
M. Aemilius	CAPITO	68 c
T. Fanias	CELER	71 b
Ti. Fonteius	CERIALIS	68 a
Cn. Cessius	CESTVS	71 c
Ti. Iulius	CESTIANVS	71 d
Ti. Claudius	CHAEREA	68 b
L. Rufinius	CHAEREA	71 d
C. Iulius	CHARMVS	68 a
L. Lucilius	CHRESIMVS	64
C. Herennuleius	CHRYSEROS	71 a
P. Caetennius	CLEMENS	71 b
Q. Poblicius	CRESCENS	71 b
Publicius		70 b
C. Sallustius	CRESCENS	71 a
L. Novellius	CRISPVS	70 a
Ti. Claudius	DEMOSTHENES	71 c
M. Valerius	DIODORVS	68 b
Ti. Claudius	EPAPHRODITVS	71 c
T. Pomponius	EPAPHRODITVS	52
C. Herennius	FAVSTVS	68 c
L. Graecinius	FELIX	68 c
Ti. Claudius	FIDINVS	68 a
M. Valerius	FIRMVS	54
Cn. Cornelius	FLORVS	71 a
L. Publicius	GERMVLLVS	70 b

¹ See Table I A for details of date and diploma number.

L. Valerius	HERMA	68 c
L. Pomponius	HYGINVS	64
N. Minius	HYLA	52
Cn. Cornelius	IONICVS	64
C. Helvius	LEPIDVS	70 b
C. Iulius	LIBO	68 a
C. Cassius	LONGINVS	54
L. Numerius	LVPVS	54
Q. Publicius	MACEODO	70 b
Sex. Apuleius	MACER	54
C. Oclatius	MACER	68 c
M. Titinius	MACER	54
	ALEXANDER MAGNUS (sic)	71 d
C. Antist(iu)s	MARINVS	ante 54
P. Vibius	MAXIMVS	71 b
P. Lurius	MODERATVS	71 b
Q. Petronius	MVSAEIVS	70 b
L. Velina?	NAVTA	68 b
C. Sabinius	NEDYMVVS	52
C. Iulius	NIGER	71 d
L. Cornelius	OPTATVS	68 b
L. Rennius	ORIENS	64
Ti. Iulius	PARDALA	68 a
M. Nassius	PHOEBVS	70 b
D. Alarius	PONTIFICALIS	68 c
Appius Didius	PRAXIA	71 c
L. Betuedius	PRIMIGENIVS	71 a
M. Helenius	PRIMVS	ante 54
T. Sextius	PRIMVS	64
L. Mestius	PRISCVS	52
C. Pacilius	PRISCVS	64
L. Lucilius	PROCVLVS	64
C. Marcus	PROCVLVS	71 b
P. Graltius	PROVINCIALIS	68 a
Ti. Iulius	PVDENS	70 a
L. Licinius	PVDENS	71 d
M. Pontius	PVDENS	70 a
M. Slavius	PVTIOLANVS	68 c
C. Vetidius	RASINIANVS	70 a
M. Arrius	RVFVS	68 a
T. Iulius	RVFVS	71 b
D. Liburnius	RVFVS	71 a
Sex. Magius	RVFVS	54
P. Popillius	RVFVS	71 a
P. Carullius	SABINVVS	70 a
C. Iulius	SACE[RD?]OS	68 b
Q. Lusius	SATVRNINVS	64
Q. Vibius	SAVRICVS	ante 54
C. Iulius	SENECIO	68 c
L. Cornelius	SIMO	71 c
L. Vitellius	SOSSIANVS	ante 54
A. Cascellius	SVCESSVS	ante 54
C. Iulius	THEOPOMPVS	71 c
L. Betuedius	VALENS	71 a
T. Grattius	VALENS	ante 54
L. Nutrius	VENVSTVS	52
L. Valerius	VERVS	71 d
C. Caisius	VICTOR	68 c
L. Valerius	VOLSENVS	54

INDEX 2

Period 2 AD 73/74 — 134/138

NOMINA SIGNATORVM:

Q.	AEMILIVS Soterichus
C.	ALFIVS Priscus
L.	ALLIVS ——————
A.	AMPIVS Epaphroditus
P.	ANNIVS Trophimus
Q.	APIDIVS Thallus
Q.	AQVILIVS C. f. Vol., Campanus
L.	ARRIVS Iustus
P.	ATINIVS Amerimmus; P. f. Vel., Augustalis; Crescens; Florus; Hedonicus; Rufus(trib.) Pal.; Trophimus; ——————(2)
L.	ATTEIVS Atteianus
P.	ATTIVS Festus*; Severus*
L.	AVRELIVS Potitus
L.	CAECILIVS Flaccus; L. f. Quir., Iovinus
Q.	CAECILIVS Victor
C.	CAESIVS Romanus
Sex.	CAESONIVS Callistus
M.	CALPVRNIVS Iustus
L.	CANNVTIVS Lucullus Clu., Tuder
A.	CASCELLIVS Proculus
P.	CAVLIVS Gemellus; Restitutus; Vitalis; ——————(1)
C.	CLAVDIVS Sementivus
Ti.	CLAVDIVS Erastus; Eros; Felix; Hermes; Iustus; Menander*; Vitalis
L.	CLENAVIVS Firmus
P.	COELIVS Q. f. Fal., Brutus Rufus
D.	CONSIVS Alcimus
P.	CORNELIVS Alexander; Verecundus
Sex.	CORNELIVS Epagatus
C.	CVRTIVS Niger
L.	DOMITIVS L. f. Col., Verus
Cn.	EGNATIVS Vitalis
M.	EGNATIVS Celer
M.	EGNATIVS Rufus
Sex.	ELEIVS Pudens
L.	EQUITIVS Gemellus
T.	ERREDIVS Alcides
Q.	FABIVS Bithus
C.	FICTORIVS Politicus
T.	FLAVIVS Abascantus; Laurus*; Romulus; Secundus; ——————(1)
A.	FVLIVS Iustus
C.	HOSTILIVS Martialis
Q.	IVLIANIVS Amandus
C.	IVLIVS Aprilis; Clemens; Eutychus; Helenus; Longinus; Maximus; Paratus; Saturninus; Severus; Silvanus*; Valens; ——————(2)
L.	IVLIVS C. f. Silvinus, Carthag.
M.	IVLIVS Clemens
Q.	IVLIVS Lentulus
Sex.	IVLIVS C. f. Fab., Italicus, Rom.
Ti.	IVLIVS Euphemus; Felix*; Fronto; Urbanus
M.	IVNIVS Eutychus
C.	IVNIVS Primus
Q.	IVNIVS Sylla
A.	LAPPIVS ——————

—————() number of signatures lacking cognomina.

* Name which appears in indices and tables of periods II and III.

A.	LARCIVS	Phronimus
M.	LOLLIVS	Fuscus; Rufus
Q.	LOLLIVS	Festus; Pietas
Sex.	LOSSIVS	T. f. Gal., Apollinaris
T.	LOSSIVS	T. f. Gal., Severus
C.	LVCRETIVS	Modestus
P.	LVSCIVS	Amandus
C.	MAECIVS	—————
M.	MAECIVS	Eupator
Sex.	MANLIVS	Cinnamus
P.	MANLIVS	Laurus
P.	M ILIVS	————— (MANLIUS or MANILIVS?)
Cn.	MATICIVS	————— (cf. Cn. EGNATIVS)
Q.	MVCIVS	Augustalis
L.	NAEVIVS	Vestalis
L.	NONIVS	Victor
C.	NORBANVS	Primus
—	NVMERIVS	Capito
Q.	ORFICIVS	————— (cf. Q. ORFIVS)
Q.	ORFIVS	Cupitus
C.	PAPIVS	Eusebes
P.	PETRONIVS	Paullus
C.	POMPEIVS	Eutrapelus
Q.	POMPEIVS	Homerus
Cn.	POMPEIVS	Maximus
C.	POMPTINIVS	Hyllus
Sex.	PRIVERNIVS	Celer
L.	PVLLIVS	Anthus; Daphnus;* Epaphroditus; Heraclia; Ianuarius; Speratus; Trophimus; Verecundus; ——— (4)
C.	QVINTIVS	Philetus
P.	QVIRINIVS	Pothus
P.	SALLIENVS	Philumenus
M.	SALVIVS	Norbanus Fab.
C.	SEMPRONIVS	Secundus
P.	SERTORIVS	Celsus
L.	SESTIVS	Maximus
P.	SILIVS	Hermes
M.	STLACCIVS	Iuvenalis; Philetus
C.	TERENTIVS	Natalis; Philetus
M.	TETTIVS	—————
A.	TITINIVS	Iustus
L.	TVRRANIVS	Maximus
C.	TVTICANIVS	Helus; Saturninus
L.	VALERIVS	Basterna
D.	VALERIVS	Faustianus; Saturninus
P.	VALERIVS	Rufus
C.	VETTIENVS	Hermes; Modestus
Q.	VETTIVS	Octavus
M.	VETVRIVS	Montanus
L.	VIBIVS	Vibianus
T.	VIBIVS	Zosimus
T.	VILLIVS	Heraclida
A.	VOLVMNIVS	Expectatus

Fragmentary, lacking *praenomen* and *cognomen*

—	ATINIVS	—————	(cf. P. Atinius Amerimus)
—	-AVLIVS	—————	(cf. P. Caulius Restitutus; Gemellus; Vitalis)
—	CAVLIVS	—————	(2) (cf. P. Caulius Restitutus; Gemellus; Vitalis)
—	FVLVIVS	—————	(cf. A. Fulvius Iustus)
—	PVLLIVS	—————	(cf. L. Pullii)

COGNOMINA SIGNATORVM

First and last dates of known signatures are given.

T.	Flavius	ABASCANTVS	98
—	—	AGATHOPVS	97
T.	Erredius	ALCIDES	128/134?—134
D.	Consius	ALCIMVS	86
P.	Cornelius	ALEXANDER	(106) 110—110
Q.	Iulianus	AMANDVS	129
P.	Luscius	AMANDVS	110
P.	Atinius	AMERIMNVS	82—110
—	—	AMPLIATVS	128/134?
L.	Pullius	ANTHVS	120—129
Sex.	Lossius	APOLLINARIS	75
C.	Iulius	APRILIS	100—108
L.	Atteius	ATTEIANVS	120—129
P.	Atinius	AVGVSTALIS	75
Q.	Mucius	AVGVSTALIS	79—90
L.	Valerius	BASTERNA	98
Q.	Fabius	BITHVS	120
P.	Coelius	BRVTVS RVFVS	75
Sex.	Caesonius	CALLISTVS	98
Q.	Aquilius	CAMPANVS	75
—	Numerius	CAPITO	86
M'.	Egnatius	CELER	78
Sex.	Privernius	CELER	78
—	—	CELER	83
P.	Sertorius	CELSVS	86
—	—	CHARITO	121?
Sex.	Manlius	CINNAMVS	94
C.	Iulius	CLEMENS	82—90
M.	Iulius	CLEMENS	105—109
P.	Atinius	CRESCENS	118—121
Q.	Orfius	CVPITVS	92—94
L.	Pullius	DAPHNVS*	122—148
Sex.	Cornelius	EPAGATVS	86
A.	Ampius	EPAPHRODITVS	100—108
L.	Pullius	EPAPHRODITVS	98
Ti.	Claudius	ERASTVS	86
Ti.	Claudius	EROS	120—121?
M.	Maecius	EVPATOR	114
Ti.	Iulius	EVPHEMVS	105
C.	Papius	EVSEBES	103
C.	Pompeius	EVTRAPELVS	80—91
C.	Iulius	EVTYCHVS	107—129
M.	Iunius	EVTYCHVS	108—120
A.	Volumnius	EXPECTATVS	94
D.	Valerius	FAVSTIANVS	134
Ti.	Claudius	FELIX	110—c. 100/120?
Ti.	Iulius	FELIX*	128/134?—167
P.	Attius	FESTVS*	133—140
Q.	Lollius	FESTVS	122—133
L.	Clevanius	FIRMVS	88
L.	Caecilius	FLACCVS	85
P.	Atinius	FLORVS	118—120
Ti.	Iulius	FRONTO	88
M.	Lollius	FVSCVS	91
P.	Caulius	GEMELLVS	105
L.	Equitius	GEMELLVS	121?—129
P.	Atinius	HEDONICVS	103
C.	Iulius	HELENVS	86—88

C.	Tuticanius	HELVS	110
L.	Pullius	HERACLA	94
T.	Villius	HERACLIDA	107
Ti.	Claudius	HERMES	134
P.	Silius	HERMES	86—97?
C.	Vettienus	HERMES	114—134
—	—	HERMES	97 (cf. P. Silius Hermes)
Q.	Pompeius	HOMERVS	98—108
C.	Pomptinius	HYLLVS	107
—	—	HYPATVS	c. 100/120
L.	Pullius	IANVARIVS	79—90
L.	Caecilius	IOVINVS	74
Sex.	Iulius	ITALICVS	74
L.	Arrius	IVSTVS	88
Ti.	Claudius	IVSTVS	114
M.	Calpurnius	IVSTVS	86—92
A.	Fulvius	IVSTVS	122
A.	Titinius	IVSTVS	78
M.	Stlaccius	IVVENALIS	78
T.	Flavius	LAVRVS*	133—140
P.	Manlius	LAVRVS	80
Q.	Iulius	LENTVLVS	75
—	—	LEONA	118
C.	Iulius	LONGINVS	85
L.	Cannutius	LVCVLLVS	74
—	— au —	MACER	86
C.	Hostilius	MARTIALIS	86
C.	Iulius	MAXIMVS	86
Cn.	Pompeius	MAXIMVS	78
L.	Sestius	MAXIMVS	84
L.	Turranius	MAXIMVS	78
Ti.	Claudius	MENANDER*	103—140
C.	Lucretius	MODESTVS	82—91
C.	Vettienus	MODESTVS	100—129
M.	Veturius	MONTANVS	78
C.	Terentius	NATALIS	86
C.	Curtius	NIGER	88
M.	Salvius	NORBANVS	74
—	—	NYMPHODOTUS	97
Q.	Vettius	OCTAVVS	90
C.	Iulius	PARATVS	105—124
P.	Petronius	PAVLLVS	88
C.	Quintius	PHILETVS	86
M.	Stlaccius	PHILETVS	79—80
C.	Terentius	PHILETVS	110
P.	Sallienus	PHILVMENVS	86
A.	Larcus	PHRONIMVS	107
Q.	Lollius	PIETAS	78
C.	Fictorius	POLITICVS	110
P.	Quirinius	POTHVS	110—c. 100/120?
L.	Aurelius	POTITVS	78
C.	Iunius	PRIMVS	98
C.	Norbanus	PRIMVS	107
C.	Alfius	PRISCVS	78—83?
—	—	PRISCVS	83 (cf. C. Alfius Priscus)
A.	Cascellius	PROCVLVS	110—128/134?
Sex.	Eleius	PVDENS	85
P.	Caulius	RESTITVTVS	97?—105
—	—	RESTITVTVS	97 (cf. P. Caulius Restitutus)
C.	Caesius	ROMANVS	118—129
T.	Flavius	ROMVLVS	134

P.	Atinius	RVFVS	74—84
P.	Coelius	BRVTVS RVFVS	75
M.	Egnatius	RVFVS	88
M.	Lollius	RVFVS	78
P.	Valerius	RVFVS	85
C.	Iulius	SATVRNINVS	94
C.	Tuticanius	SATVRNINVS	107—110
D.	Valerius	SATVRNINVS	78
T.	Flavius	SECVNDVS	98—103
C.	Sempronius	SECVNDVS	74
C.	Claudius	SEMENTIVVS	80—88
P.	Attius	SEVERVS*	124?—146
—	—	SEVERVS	124 (Cf. P. Attius Severus)
C.	Iulius	SEVERVS	85
T.	Lossius	SEVERVS	75
C.	Iulius	SILVANVS*	134—154/157?
L.	Iulius	SILVINVS	74
Q.	Aemilius	SOTERICHS	94—107
L.	Pullius	SPERATVS	79—100
Q.	Iunius	SYLLA	84
Q.	Apidius	THALLVS	99—114
P.	Annius	TROPHIMVS	107 (cf. P. Atinius Trophimus)
P.	Atinius	TROPHIMVS	108—114
L.	Pullius	TROPHIMVS	105—110
C.	Iulius	VALENS	85
P.	Cornelius	VERECVNDVS	84
L.	Pullius	VERECVNDVS	79—129
L.	Domitius	VERVS	75
L.	Naevius	VESTALIS	78
L.	Vibius	VIBIANVS	118—129
Q.	Caecilius	VICTOR	85
L.	Nonius	VICTOR	122
P.	Caulius	VITALIS	94—118
Ti.	Claudius	VITALIS	100
Cn.	Egnatius	VITALIS	92—94
Ti.	Iulius	VRBANVS	105—129
Ti.	Vibius	ZOSIMVS	79

INDEX 3

Period 3 AD 138—212

NOMINA SIGNATORVM:

P.	ATTIVS Festus; Severus
C.	BELLIVS Urbanus
Ti.	CLAVDIVS Cassander; Epinicus; Iulianus; Menander
C.	FANNIVS Aresco (?); —f—
T.	FLAVIVS Laurus
Ti.	IVLIVS Crescens; Dativus; Felix
C.	IVLIVS Silvanus
M.	IVNIVS Pius
P.	OCILIVS Priscus
C.	POMPONIVS Statianus
C.	PVLICIVS Lupercus
L.	PVLLIVS Benignus; Chresimus; Daphnus; Marcio; Primus; Velox; Zosimus
M.	SENTILLIVS Iasus
L.	SENTIVS Chrysogonus
M.	SERVILIVS Geta
M.	VLPIVS Blastus
Sex.	VIBIVS Romanus

COGNOMINA SIGNATORVM

First and last dates of known signatures are given.

C.	Fannius	ARESCO(?)	192
L.	Pullius	BENIGNVS	c. 185/190—212
M.	Ulpianus	BLASTVS	148
Ti.	Claudius	CASSANDER	c. 185/190—212
L.	Pullius	CHRESIMVS	146—158
L.	Sentius	CHRYSOGONVS	164—178
Ti.	Iulius	CRESCENS	178
L.	Pullius	DAPHNVS	122—148
Ti.	Iulius	DATIVVS	c. 185/190
Ti.	Claudius	EPINICVS	c. 185/190
Ti.	Iulius	FELIX	134—167
P.	Attius	FESTVS	133—140
M.	Servilius	GETA	146—166
M.	Sentilius	IASVS	140—158
Ti.	Claudius	IVLIANVS	192—212
T.	Flavius	LAVRVS	133—140
C.	Publicius	LVPERCVS	178—212
L.	Pullius	MARCIO	178—212
Ti.	Claudius	MENANDER	103—140
M.	Iunius	PIVS	178—212
L.	Pullius	PRIMVS	164—167
P.	Ocilius	PRISCVS	148—167
Sex.	Vibius	ROMANVS	178
P.	Attius	SEVERVS	124?—146
C.	Iulius	SILVANVS	134—157?
C.	Pomponius	STATIANVS	154—167
L.	Pullius	VELOX	149—153
C.	Bellius	VRBANVS	157?—178
L.	Pullius	ZOSIMVS	164—167
C.	Fannius		192
		F	

INDEX 4

COHORTES PRAETORIANAE ET VRBANAЕ

NOMINA SIGNATORVM

C.	ACONIVS Maximus (Sisc(ia))
P.	AELIVS Alexander; Bassanus; Carus; Iulianus; Rufianus; Stratullinus; Vitalis
T.	AELIVS Senilianus
L.	ANTONIUS Saturninus
P.	APPEIVS Marcellinus
M.	ASCANIUS Domesticus
C.	ATTICIVS Valens
M.	AVRELIVS Aelianus; Amandus; Augustalis; Diogenes; Dionysius; Dizes; Longinus Ma(c)rinus; Maximus; Mucapor; Mucianus; Nepotianus; Quintianus; Sabinianus; Tesibus; Valens; Valerius; Vithus
T.	AVRELIVS Secundus
L.	AVRELIVS Simplicius
P.	BELLICIVS Vicentius
C.	CAELIVS Germanicinus
Ti.	CLAVDIVS Aurelianus
T.	CLAVDIVS Barbarus; Bassus; Mucianus; Surio
C.	CVRTIVS Secundus Sirm(ium)
L.	DIGITIVS Valens
C.	EQUITIVS Rufinus

L.	FESCENNA	Priscus
T.	FLAVIVS	Festus Sisc(ia); Maximianus
M.	GALLIUS	Priscianus
C.	IVLIVS	Celer
Sex.	IVVENTIVS	Ingenuus Sirm(ium)
M.	LCVILIUS	Saturninus Sisc(ia)
G.	MASILIVS	Ingenuus
M.	MOLLIVS	Agatopus
G.	POPILIVS	Fortunatus
M.	RVTILIVS	Hermes Sisc(ia)
P.	SEPTIMIVS	Bassus
M.	STATORIVS	Sabinus Sirm(ium)
.	VALERIVS	Albanus; Gaianus; Ianuarius; Traianus; Valens; Victor; Vitalianus; Vitalis
C.	VALERIVS	Gaianus; Victor
M.	VLPIVS	Cepianus; Marcianus
.	VLPIVS	Po'n'tens
C.	VLPIVS	Valens

COGNOMINA SIGNATORVM

			Date
M.	Aurelius	AELIANVS	243
M.	Mollius	AGATOPVS	236
.	Valerius	ALBANVS	306
P.	Aelius	ALEXANDER	148
.	—	ALEXANDER	212
Ti.	Claudius	AVRELIANVS	243
M.	Aurelius	AMANDVS	145
M.	Aurelius	AVGVSTALIS	222
.	—	AVLVSANVS	212
T.	Claudius	BARBARVS	224
P.	Aelius	BASSANVS	254
T.	Claudius	BASSVS	236
P.	Septimius	BASSVS	236
P.	Aelius	CARVS	226
M.	Aurelius	DIOGENES	236
C.	Iulius	CELER	148
M.	Ulpianus	CEPIANVS	226
M.	Aurelius	DIONYSIVS	233
M.	Aurelius	DIZES	236
M.	Assanius	DOMESTICVS	148
T.	Flavius	FESTVS	71/74
G.	Popilius	FORTVNATVS	236
.	Valerius	GAIANVS	306
C.	Valerius	GAIANVS	226
C.	Caelius	GERMANICINV	254
M.	Rutilius	HERMES	71/74
.	Valerius	IANVARIVS	306
C.	Aelius	IVLIANVS	243
Sex.	Iuentius	INGENVVS	71/74
G.	Masilius	INGENVVS	236
M.	Aurelius	LONGINV	226
M.	Aurelius	MA(C)RINV	254
P.	Appieius	MARCELLINV	254
M.	Ulpianus	MARCIANVS	224
T.	Flavius	MAXIMIANVS	222
C.	Aconius	MAXIMVS	71/74
M.	Aurelius	MAXIMVS	224
M.	Aurelius	MVCAPOR	224
M.	Aurelius	MVCIANVS	243
T.	Claudius	MVCIANVS	233

M.	Aurelius	NEPOTIANVS	222
.	Ulpianus	PO'NTENS	233
M.	Gallius	PRISCIANVS	224
L.	Fescenna	PRISCVS	148
M.	Aurelius	QVINTIANVS	254
M.	Aurelius	SABINIANVS	233
P.	Aelius	RVFINIANVS	226
C.	Equitius	RVFINVS	148
M.	Statorius	SABINVS	71/74
.	-----	SABINVS	212
L.	Antonius	SATVRNINVS	148
M.	Lucilius	SATVRNINVS	71/74
T.	Aurelius	SECUNDVS	222
C.	Curtius	SECUNDVS	71/74
T.	Aelius	SENILIANVS	222
L.	Aurelius	SIMPLICIVS	254
P.	Aelius	STRATVLLINVS	222
T.	Claudius	SVRIO	243
M.	Aurelius	TESIBVS	224
.	-----	THRASVS	212
.	Valerius	TRAIANVS	306
C.	Atticius	VALENS	243
M.	Aurelius	VALENS	226
L.	Digitius	VALENS	148
.	Valerius	VALENS	306
C.	Ulpianus	VALENS	233
M.	Aurelius	VALERIVS	222
P.	Bellius	VICENTIVS	254
.	Valerius	VICTOR	306
C.	Valerius	VICTOR	243
.	Valerius	VITALIANVS	233
P.	Aelius	VITALIS	224
.	Valerius	VITALIS	306
M.	Aurelius	VITHVS	226
.	-----	-----ARIS(gen.)	212
.	-----	-----S---IS (gen.)	212
.	-----	-----ERIANVS	212

INDEX 5

Imperial names among the witnesses 73/74 — 133/134

	First signature	Interval between latest possible grant and first signature, in years	Last signature
C. IVLII			
Clemens	82	42	90
Longinus	85	45	
Severus	85	45	
Valens	85	45	
Helenus	86 a	46	88 b
Maximus	86 a	46	
Saturninus	94 b	54	
Aprilis	100	60	108 (App.)
Paratus	105 a	65	124
Eutychus	107 b	67	129
TI. IVLII			
Fronto	88 a	51	
Euphemus	105 b	68	105 d
Urbanus	105 a	68	129 c

	First signature	Interval between latest possible grant and first signature, in years	Last signature
TI. CLAVDII			
Eraustus	86 b	18	
Vitalis	100	32	
Menander	103	35	140
Felix	110 b	42	c. 100/120?
Iustus	114 b	46	
Eros	120 b	52	121?
T. FLAVII			
Abascantus	98	2	
Secundus	98	2	103
Laurus	133	37	140
Romulus	134 a	38	134 b

Imperial names among the witnesses 133/134 — 212

TI. IVLII			
Crescens	178	141	
Dativus	c. 185/190	148	
Felix	134 a	97	167
TI. CLAVDII			
Cassander	c. 185/190	117	212
Epinicus	c. 185/190	117	
Hermes	134 a	66	
Iulianus	192	124	212
M. VLPPII			
Blastus	148 cd	31	

Imperial names among witnesses of diplomata issued to praetoriani

T. FLAVIVS Festus	71/74	c. 2	
P. AELIVS Alexander	145	7	
C. IVLIVS Celer	145	105	

INDEX 6

Recurring nomina among witnesses after 73/74

	First signature	Last signature
PVLLII*		
L. P. Verecundus ¹	79	129 a
L. P. Speratus	79	100
L. P. Ianuarius	79	90
L. P. Heracla	94	
L. P. Epaphroditus	98	
L. P. Trophimus	105 a	110 c
L. P. Anthus	120 a	129 c
L. P. Daphnus	122	148 c
<i>PVLLII who first signed after 133/134.</i>		
L. P. Chresimus	146	158
L. P. Velox	149	153
L. P. Zosimus	164	167
L. P. Primus	164	167

* *Nomina* which appear before and after the late Hadrianic reorganisation.

Nomina whose recurrence is of doubtful significance — *IVNII*, *POMPEII* and *VIBII*, are omitted.

¹ Length of service suggests two men involved.

	First signature	Last signature
L. P. Marcio	178	212?
L. P. Benignus	c. 185/190	212
ATINII		
P. A. Rufus Pal.	74	84
P. A. P. f. Vel. Augustalis	75	
P. A. Amerimnus	82	110 c
P. A. Hedonicus	103	
P. A. Trophimus	108 (App.)	114
P. A. Crescens	118	121?
P. A. Florus	118	120 ab
ATTII*		
P. A. Severus	124	146
P. A. Festus	133	140 b
CAECILII		
L. C. L. f. Quir. Iovinus	74	
L. C. Flaccus	85	
Q. C. Victor	85	
CAVLII		
P. C. Vitalis	94 b	118
P. C. Restitutus	97?	105 c
P. C. Gemellus	105 a	
EGNATII		
M. E. Celer	78	
M. E. Rufus	88	
Cn. E. Vitalis	92	94
LOLLII		
M. L. Rufus	78	
Q. L. Pietas	78	
M. L. Fuscus	91	
Q. L. Festus	122	133
LOSSII		
Sex. L. T. f. Gal. Apollinaris	75	
T. L. T. f. Gal. Severus	75	
MAECII		
C. M. — — —	91	
M. M. Eupator	114 b	
MANLII		
P. M. Laurus	80	
Sex. M. Cinnamus	94 a	
STLACCII		
M. S. Iuvenalis	78	
M. S. Philetus	79	80
TTICANII		
C. T. Saturninus	107	110 a
C. T. Helus	110 b	
VALERII (i)		
P. V. Rufus	85	
L. V. Basterna	98	
VALERII (ii)		
D. V. Faustianus	134	
D. V. Saturninus	134	
VETTIENI		
C. V. Modestus	100	129 a
C. V. Hermes	114 a	134 b

Period 1.

Before Vespasian's reform, half the extant witness lists give the status of all or some of the signatories (**Table 1 A**, p. 307-8). Three are *equites Romani*; all the rest are veterans or serving soldiers. They do not however seem to have any close relationship to the unit concerned; two of the witnesses to a grant, found in Moesia, to a cavalryman in 54 were members of the fleet, while conversely the witnesses of the first two fleet *diplomata* of 71 included two cavalry *decuriones* and a serving *miles praetorianus*. Two thirds of the extant lists also give the *origo* of some or all of the witnesses. They usually came from the same province as the recipient, but not always; the witnesses to a Phrygian's grant in 68 (a) are six Sardinians and one 'Ipesius', probably Ephesian.

It has sometimes been assumed that these grants were witnessed in the provinces concerned, and explanations have been advanced to explain the legality of witnesses certifying a true copy of a tablet exhibited in Rome which they had not seen. There are no good grounds for this assumption, and strong evidence against it. In theory, the *milites cohortium praetorianorum* IV and IX, both with *origo* at Philippi, who signed grants to Thracians in March 70 and February 71, might have been in Thrace at these dates, but their proper and more probable place was at Rome. Similarly, the two *classicii* of 54, one a veteran, the other serving, might have been members of the Moesian flotilla, but more probably belonged to one of the Italian fleets. Moreover, though the witnesses came from the same province, they were not always near neighbours; in 52, the Macedonian signatories came from Dyrrachium and Thessalonica, some 250 km. distant from each other, and in 68 (b) the Syrians came from Antioch and Caesarea Stratonis, some 600 km. apart. But the most striking indication that the witnesses personally inspected the lists exhibited in Rome is that it is only in this period that precise references are given, as e.g., *CIL XVI* 16 (71 AD) *tab(ula) III, pag(ina) VI, loc(o) XIX*, with similar wording in half of these early documents (*CIL XVI* 5 and 9—14). Since such exact reference was not deemed necessary in later periods, when the witnesses were clearly clerks living in Rome, it is most improbable that it was made by remote provincials who had never seen the lists. With 17,000 urban troops in Rome, as well as a large floating population of provincial soldiers in the *castra peregrinorum* and numerous veterans, plenty of fellow provincials are likely to have been available in the City for each veteran discharged. Since all texts are 'certified a true copy' (*descriptum et recognitum*) it is probable that at all times the signatories personally verified the lists exhibited. It may be that the custom of choosing witnesses from the same province as the recipient was a legacy from an earlier period, before Claudius, when grants may have been issued locally; and that Vespasian discontinued the custom because the trouble of seeking out men from the right province proved a bothersome nuisance.

Period 2.

Vespasian's innovation was to transfer the responsibility for certifying the accuracy of the texts from individuals to clerks in a government department. The change coincided with 73/74, and the *diploma* of 21 May 74, issued before the end of the census, shows the process of change. Six of the seven witnesses follow the old method; they signed no other known *diploma*, and, though they name no military ranks, five of them give their names in the fashion peculiar to the army, with tribe and/or *origo* given after the cognomen. But one of them, Atinius Rufus, was the first witness to sign numerous grants, in his case eight known texts over a period of ten years. He was plainly the first of the clerks. At about the same time, some alterations were made to the wording of *diplomata*; their significance is discussed by Géza Alföldy in *Historia* 17 (1968) 215 ff. and by John Mann in *Epigraphische Studien* 9 (1972) 233 ff.

Period 3.

The transition to Hadrian's system is separately set forth in **Table 2A**. It effectively began with the Pannonian *diploma* of 2 July 133. It may have been introduced regionally, since the seniority there established is, in the known *diplomata*, broken only by the Moesian *diploma* of 2 April 134, attested by new witnesses, none of whom had signed previously, while the fleet *diploma* of 15 September 134 shows only one variation from the strict seniority which is otherwise consistently maintained from 133 onward.

The sharp and sudden change pinpoints one among Hadrian's well attested administrative reforms. Aurelius Victor, (*Epitome de Caesaribus* 14, 10—12), writing soon after 360, stated that Hadrian 'established public and palatine, as well as military appointments in the pattern which has persisted, with a few changes by Constantine, until to-day'. Hadrian's reforms of the civil service, at equestrian level, have been discussed by H.-G. Pflaum, and in the military sphere by Eric Birley.¹

The most informative guide to the organisation and standing of senior civil service clerical grades of the late empire is contained in the Codes. Their evidence, whith other sources, has been brought together by A.H.M. Jones.²

It is fullest for the fifth century, eighty or more years after Victor's time, but the principles, if not all the detail, were well established by his day, and accord well with the evidence of the *diplomata* for Hadrian's innovations.

Each office (*scrinium*) had a fixed number of established civil servants (*statuti*), and a considerably larger number of non-established supernumeraries. 'Promotion was strictly by seniority, each clerk (*exceptor*) rising step by step until he became... *proximus*, the senior member of his *scrinium*... As the *proximus* of each *scrinium* retired... he could sell the vacancy thus created at the bottom of the list for the fixed price of 250 *solidi* to the senior supernumerary, and if he refused, to the next, and so on till a willing purchaser was found. Seniority among the supernumeraries was not fixed exactly by date of enrolment, for those who worked in the office might be moved up the list... over the heads of those who did not. ... Those who acquired an

established post had also to pay... an entrance fee.' (LRE 576). 'When a vacancy arose by the death of an established officer (*statutus*) it was similarly offered to the senior supernumerary, but in this case the 250 *solidi* went to the heirs or assigns of the deceased *statutus*.' (SRG 169—170).

The sums specified, and perhaps also the titles, are not relevant to earlier centuries; and in the late empire, to accelerate promotion of the swelling mass of supernumeraries, the head of the office was obliged to retire, after three years in the fourth century, one year in the fifth century, a compulsion not yet in force in the second century. But the late empire system of seniority closely corresponds to seniority of signing *diplomata* introduced in Hadrian's time. Either he first introduced the distinction between a fixed establishment of *statuti* and the supernumeraries, or else restricted signature to *statuti*; previously, since Vespasian's census, all or most of the large staff had signed. From Hadrian, whenever the head of the office retired, he was succeeded by the second senior signatory, and most others moved up one step, creating a vacancy for the senior supernumerary. But about a third of the newcomers, whose names are indented in Table 3, did not begin at the bottom, as, between 140 and 146, Geta and Chresimus replaced Festus and Laurus, over the heads of three previous signatories. They correspond to senior supernumeraries who bought their posts from the heirs of deceased predecessors.

One detail of the witness lists is not explained by the late empire evidence. Among over 200 signatures after 134, there are four instances, marked with a dash (—) in **Table 3**, where the normal witness is absent but later returns. Two of them are readily explained. Cassander, absent in 192, signed again in the same place in 212 as in 185/190, if the witness list is rightly restored. Of three *diplomata* issued on the same day in 148, one for Pannonia superior, was signed by the normal fourth witness, Iasus, but in the other two, for Pannonia inferior, he is missing, and the fourth witness was Blastus, otherwise unrecorded. Since it is probable that the witnesses personally inspected and checked the list from which they excerpted names, if Iasus or Cassander were absent, through illness, injury or any other reason, when the list was checked, the senior supernumerary was the proper person to replace them, for that occasion only.

The two other instances are not so easily explained. Iasus' first signature, in December 140, in sixth place, replaced Felix, who had first signed six years earlier, and signed for 27 years more, eventually heading the list. But Iasus continued to sign, from 146, before and not after Felix. Similarly, from 164 to 167 Zosimus replaced Priscus as seventh witness, but signed before him in sixth place in 167. Neither of them replaced a deceased colleague. The common factor is that both abnormal promotions coincided with the retirement of the first witness, when everyone else went up one step; and both concerned the bottom two places. Another apparent anomaly concerns Julianus, the temporary replacement for Cassander, who signed in this capacity above Benignus in 192, although the latter had moved up from sixth to fifth place on the retirement of Epinicus. In 212 Julianus once more signed above Benignus, this time replacing him in fifth place and Benignus retiring to sixth position.

A variety of explanations might be guessed in all three cases, such as loss of seniority through prolonged absence, and it may be that future discoveries

will clarify the reason. But the cause is plainly a trivial detail of office routine, and three exceptions in two hundred prove the rule, that Hadrian's reform of this department closely resembles the organisation of late empire offices.

The names and descriptions of witnesses give strong evidence of their changing status. Before Vespasian's censorship, the soldiers and veterans who witnessed their colleagues' grants varied from private soldier to *Eques Romanus*. One of them, the Pannonian Flavius Festus, who signed a grant to a *praetorianus* in 71/74, was evidently a recently enfranchised auxiliary, possibly promoted to the *praetoriani* for distinguished services in 69. Under the Flavians and Trajan many of the signatories were of relatively low social standing. The three T. Flavii of 97 and 98 were almost certainly imperial freedmen, and so perhaps was Ti. Claudius Erastus of 86. Upwards of a dozen *nomina* recur with up to half a dozen different individuals, sharing the same *praenomen* (**Index 6**, p. 324-5), the tribe and affiliation of the two Lossii of 75 suggest that they were brothers. P. Atinius Rufus (74) adds after his name, as though it were an *origo*, Pal(atina), one of the four tribes into which the poorer citizens of Rome were commonly enrolled; he looks like a relative of P. Antinius P. f. Vel. Augustalis (75), perhaps a freedman's son, taking the tribe of his father's patron. There are a high proportion of Greek *cognomina*, not yet common among citizens of standing; and also of Latin and provincial *cognomina* that were normally confined to humbler folk, Augustalis, Cinnamus, Expectatus, Pietas, Verecundus and the like.

There was a significant shift under Trajan. There are no Ulpiai, except for Blastus in 148, and no other imperial *nomina* later than Flavius. Except for the two Attii of 124 and 133, there are no new recurring *nomina* after 107, and no more humble Latin *cognomina*. After 114, until the middle of the second century, Greek *cognomina* are confined to men with *nomina* already attested, including Flavii, Claudi and Iulii, except for Alcides in 133. In 114 the practice of abbreviating *diplomata* texts was also initiated.

After 134, these tendencies hardened and accelerated. There are no recurring *nomina*, except for the entrenched Pullii. The only imperial *nomina*, apart from Blastus, are two Ti. Iulii and three Ti. Claudi, all of them men whose citizenship dated back five generations (**Index 5**, p. 323-4). Except among them and the Pullii, there are only a couple of Greek *cognomina*, in the middle and later second century proportionately fewer than senators from the Greek speaking provinces, no longer a mark of lowly origin. With few exceptions, the names would pass unremarked among a list of senators and *equites*. In theory of course any man with such a name might be a freedman of a patron with the same nomen. Tribe and filiation were not given after 75, and bare names cannot by themselves prove conclusively anything about status. Their most striking feature is the total absence of men with recent imperial *nomina*, who might have been imperial freedmen. It is not probable that a government office which contained no imperial freedmen included freedmen of private persons. The overall impression is that from Hadrian onwards the signatories were men of substance, probably *scribae*, or men of similar standing; and from the late republic onwards *scribae* ranked upon the fringes of the equestrian order (references in Jones SRG 154 ff.). Their status was probably not dissimilar to that of their late empire successors, who in the late fourth

century retired with the titles of *vicarii* and *consulares*, in the fifth century as *clarissimi* and *comites consistorii* (Jones LRE 577—578).

It is not possible to identify with confidence the office in which these signatories worked. Their business was to supply soldiers with authentic copies of citizenship grants. They might have belonged to a secretariat which dealt with the army, or with citizenship, or both. The most likely guess is that they formed a department within the office of *ab epistulis*. His title describes his basic function, to send out letters emanating from the emperor, on matters military and civil, for which purpose he had in the second century an associate *ab epistulis graecis*. His responsibilities are most fully set forth in Statius, *Silvae*, 5, 1, illuminated by Suetonius, *Divi Vespasiani*, 4, 1. His major concerns were army appointments and ensuring the despatch of corn supplies from Africa and Egypt. It is therefore possible that the man who is recorded in an inscription from Amalfi (ILS 1671) as:

Ti. Claudius divi l(ibertus) Erastus scribiarius ab epistulis signed the *diploma* of 86 in fourth place. The term *scribiarius*, denoting all members of the office, including the approximate equivalents of the later superunumeraries, accords with the large number of witnesses who signed under the Flavians.

As well as illustrating the structure of second century administration, the study of the witnesses helps to date fragmentary *diplomata*. The indices here provided may help the editors of future discoveries; they also give greater precision to a few already published. A single instance must here serve as example. *CIL XVI* 127 is dated 13 May, '*Severo et Pompeiano cos.*' *CIL*, following the original publication (*Notizie degli Scavi* 1898 p. 41, where there is an excellent photograph) gives the year as 173, *Severo II et Pompeiano II consulibus ordinariis*. Apart from the witnesses, this date is virtually impossible, for two reasons; all known *diplomata* are meticulously accurate in terminology, so that the omission of the iteration figure would make this fragment unique in its error, if the year were 173; and it is not conceivable that in the 170s the *ordinarii* could have remained in office as late as May. A known *diplomata* are dated by the consuls in office on the day of issue, not by the *ordinarii* of the year, after *suffecti* succeeded them. Several Severi and Pompeiani are known to have been *suffecti* in the later second century, but the year of this pair is not yet known. From the witness list (**Table 3**, where the date bracket c. 185/190 is suggested) it is clear that the date is not much earlier than 192, when the first three witnesses are identical and the fifth has moved up one step, and since five of its witnesses also survived to sign in 212, if the restoration of the names in that year is correct. But the date is well after 178, since the first three witnesses of that year had retired or died, and the fourth, sixth and seventh signatories of 178 had become the first three of *CIL XVI* 127.

The changes in the witnesses to military *diplomata* describe the evolution of one small detail of Roman administration. From the earliest known text, issued in 52 AD, the wording was inscribed in standardised wording, in a standard form, either by government clerks, or possibly by personnel of the provincial command concerned. At first, they were certified by military men connected with the units involved, perhaps chosen from those in Rome, at the *castra peregrinorum*, at the time. Vespasian transferred the certification

to a government office, staffed in the main by men of relatively low origins; but for two generations that office observed no protocol or standard procedure in selecting which of its clerks took responsibility for certifying the accuracy of the grant. Hadrian imposed a strict seniority, and enhanced the standing of established posts, whose ordering closely resembles the administrative practice of the late empire. By themselves, the *diplomata* do not show whether these changes concerned only their own small office, or the whole or larger part of the administrative offices of the central government of the empire. The evidence of Aurelius Victor and of the Codes and other late texts suggests Hadrian's reforms, and perhaps also Vespasian's, concerned the whole of the administration. If that is so, then the changes revealed by a study of *diploma* witnesses should, at least in outline, be paralleled in other offices. They may serve as a yardstick for the interpretation of the more fragmentary evidence, largely epigraphic, that concerns other government departments.

¹ A convenient summary of the work of H.-G. Pflaum concerning equestrian ranks in the civil service, with the latest views of the Hadrianic reforms, may be found in *Abrégé des procureurs équestres* (adapted by S. Ducroux and N. Duval) Paris (1974), especially pp. 6—9; military reforms have been discussed by E. Birley, *Roman Britain and the Roman Army* Kendal (1961) 133 ff. and Car-

nuntum Jhb. 1957 (1958) 13 ff. Some of the Constantinian changes referred to by Victor must be related to the separation of civilian and military careers.

² *The Later Roman Empire* (LRE) Oxford (1964) 565 ff.; *Studies in Roman Government and Law* (SRG) Oxford (1968) 151—175 (= *Journal of Roman Studies* 39 (1949) 35—55).

PRIČE NA RIMSKIH VOJAŠKIH DIPLOMAH

Povzetek

Rekrutacija za pomožne enote rimske vojske je potekala predvsem med *peregrini* in je v največji meri temeljila na prostovoljnem vpisu, zadosten dotok prostovoljcev pa je zagotavljala ugodnost, da so si pridobili rimske državljanstvo in *conubium*. Da so ta privilegij lahko izkazali, so vojaki pomožnih enot in veterani rimske flote dobivali od Klavdija dalje *diplomata militaria*, na katerih so bile pridobljene pravice uradno zapisane. Tekst je bil napisan na notranji strani oben ploščic in ponovljen na zunanjji strani le ene, medtem ko je druga zunanjja stran nosila podpise sedmih prič, ki so potrjevale točnost kopije, ekscerpirane iz originala v Rimu.

Enaka *diplomata*, ki so zagotavljala le pridobitev pravice do *conubium*, so bila izdana veteranom mestnih enot Rima (Praetoriani, Urbani) in jih od drugod ne poznamo (izjema je CIL XVI 133).

Tekst *diplom* je preprost: »Cesar z datumom *tribunicia potestas* in drugimi naslovi podeljuje rimske državljanstvo in pravico poroke onemu, ki služi (ali je služil) v tej in tej enoti« in se nadaljuje s podatki o prejemniku ter datumom podelitve.

Diplomata, izdana vojakom pomožnih enot po l. 193, niso znana, veteranom rimske flote so jih izdajali najmanj do l. 250, veteranom mestnih enot pa do l. 306.

Glede na število vojakov, ki so dopolnili službeno dobo, je bilo izdanih od flavijške do sredine antoninske dobe samo za vojake pomožnih enot letno najmanj 2000 diplom. Število diplom vseh vrst, izdanih od Klavdija do Dioklecijana, znaša računamo, od 250 do 500 tisoč. Od teh se jih je ohranilo zelo malo. 257 je objav-

ljenih v *CIL XVI* (1936) in suplementu XVI (1955). Kar je bilo najdenih po objavi suplementa, objavlja avtor na **seznamu 1**. Imena prič so ohranjena vsega na 120 diplomah (**seznam 2**).

Povprečno se je na 3–4000 prič ohranila imensko po ena, vendar je njih sestava tako dosledna, da je morala biti analogna na vseh izgubljenih. Vrstni red in označbe prič pa kažejo določene spremembe.

V prvem obdobju (do 73/74) so vse priče vojaški tovariši in rojaki prejemnika, vendar seznammi kažejo, da niso imele nikakršne zveze z vojaško enoto prejemnika. Res je, da so vse v vojaški službi in da so večinoma iz iste province kot prejemnik, niso pa vse iz istega rodu vojske in niti niso bližnji sosedje. Domnevna, da so bile diplome izdajane v provincah, ne more biti ne ovržena in ne potrjena. Precizne reference, znane le iz tega obdobja, kažejo, da so priče same preverjale original oz. kopijo. Ob številnih vojakih v samem Rimu ni bilo težko najti primerne osebe za podpis. Navado, da so podpisniki izhajali iz iste province kot prejemnik, je odpravil Vespazijan.

Z Vespazijanovo reformo se prenese odgovornost overjanja diplome na pisarje državnega urada. Reforma se krije z letom 73/74. *Diploma* z dne 21. maja 74 že nosi ime priče (Atinius Rufus), ki je nato v obdobju desetih let podpisala osem znanih diplom in je moral imeti funkcijo pisara. Vendar pa podpisniki diplom vse do Hadrijanove reforme ne podpisujejo v nikakršnem utrjenem zaporedju. V istem času se premeni tudi tekst diplom (cf. Géza Alföldy v *Historia* 17 [1968] 215 in John Mann v *Epigraphische Studien* 9 [1972] 233).

Tretje obdobje (od 133/138 naprej) označujejo Hadrijanove reforme, prehod v to fazo je posebej prikazan na **tabeli 2A**. Najbolj očitna sprememba je strogo določen vrstni red podpisovanja prič po stopnjah, ki jih imajo *statuti in scrinium*.

Aurelius Victor (*Epitome de Caesaribus* 14, 10–12) navaja, da je vzpostavil Hadrijan sistem imenovanja, tako v civilni kot v vojaški sferi, ki velja še v njegovem času. Reforme v civilni sferi obravnava H. G. Pflaum, v vojaški sferi pa Eric Birley. Najbolj informativni so glede stopenj v administraciji kodeksi in najbolj pregledno je te podatke zbral A. H. M. Jones.²

V pozmem imperiju ima *scrinium* določeno število nameščencev, *statuti in supernumerarii*, s tem da ima vsak pisar (*exceptor*) možnost napredovanja po stopnjah, dokler ne postane *proximus* in načeluje *scrinium*. Z njegovim odhodom se vsi *statuti* povzpnejo za stopnjo navzgor, izpraznjeno najnižje mesto pa je ponujeno najstarejšemu med *supernumerarii*. Ta sistem se sklada z razvrstitevijo prič na diplomah. Tretjina znanih seznamov prič (**tabela 3**) pa kaže, da so včasih lahko *supernumerarii* preskočili nekaj mest in se pojavili kot priče pred nekaj starimi statutimi.

Vprašanja, kateremu uradu so pripadali podpisovalci diplom, se ne da popolnoma rešiti; najverjetnejše so pripadali oddelku v uradu *ab epistulis*, čigar kompetence je najpopolneje navedel Statius, *Silvae*, 5, 1, in pojasnil Suetonius, *Divi Vespasiani*, 4, 1.

Analiza imen in podatkov prič na diplomah izkazuje še drugačne spremembe. Pred Vespazijonom so bile vse priče vojaške osebe, katerih status je segal od načavnih vojakov do *Eques Romanus*. Priče iz flavijskega in Trajanovega časa so, kot kažejo imena, izvirale iz nižjih slojev. Številna so grška *cognomina*, tedaj še redka med premožnejšimi osebami, ter latinska in provincialna *cognomina*, običajno vezana, na nižje sloje (Augustalis, Cinnamus, Expectatus, Pietas, Verecundus ipd.). Že v Trajanovem času pride do pomembne spremembe. Nič več se ne pojavljajo cesarska *nomina*, po l. 107 se ne pojavljajo več nova *nomina in cognomina* nižjih slojev, grška *cognomina* pa so vezana na že znana *nomina*. Po l. 134 se te tendence še okrepijo. Novih cesarskih *nomina* takoreč ni in grška *cognomina* so redka. Z redkimi izjemami bi bila imena tedanjih prič lahko na seznamih senatorjev in *equites*. Teoretično bi bile te osebe lahko osvobojeni, vendar odsotnost cesarskih *nomina* izključuje to možnost. Najverjetnejše so bile priče, podpisane na diplomah, od Hadrijana dalje, osebe z uglednim družbenim položajem, verjetno *scribæ*. Njih status pa se verjetno ni mnogo razlikoval od statusa njih naslednikov v pozmem imperiju, z nazivi *vicarii*, *consulares* (4. stol.) in *clarissimi*, *comites consistorii* (5. stol.).

Analize diplom kažejo razvoj malega dela rimske administracije. Same po sebi diplome ne kažejo, v kakšnem obsegu so spremembe, ki so jih zadevale, zajemale celotno rimsko administracijo, vendar pa navedbe Aurelija Viktorja, kodeksov in poznejših tekstov kažejo, da so Hadrijanove in verjetno tudi Vespazijanove reforme zajele celotno administracijo. Če je tako, potem kažejo spremembe pri diplomah vsaj okvirno na vzporedne spremembe v drugih uradih. Analize diplom lahko tako služijo analizam bolj fragmentarnih, predvsem epigrafskih spomenikov, seveda pa tudi preciznejši določitvi novo odkritih in že objavljenih diplom (primer *CIL XVI* 127).

Documentum recessum deponens qui portat la croise ou le symbole en forme de fer à cheval. Il se peut que ce document soit célébré aussi à ex-voto ministre de la guerre à l'occasion de la construction du château de Lubiana, lors de travaux d'aménagement de la place. **LE PREFET DE LA PROVINCE MILITIAIRE SOUS AEMONIA TRAJANIS.** La situation est toutefois tout à fait dans une autre nature lorsqu'il s'agit de la première pleine et historique émission de rares touches.

Accordant à ce qu'il a été dit ci-dessus, il faut 5 documents à Acco. Trois d'entre eux sont donnés et analysés (probablement à l'initiative de l'empereur Trajan) et une à Oescus, près de Savaria (aujourd'hui Szombathely, Veszprém, Hongrie) et une à Oescus, près de Sardica (aujourd'hui Szombathely). Voici les termes fidèles et très courtois des deux derniers documents accompagnant le décret de la Dioclétienne. En 1611, il fut ordonné que tous les citoyens de la province militaire de Szombathely (Oescus) devraient faire leur déclaration à l'administration municipale de Szombathely pour qu'ils puissent être libérés de tout service militaire et de tout autre service public. Les documents de Dioclétien sont les seuls de l'empereur à être connus sous le nom des magistrats. Ce sont ces documents qui sont les plus importants pour nous, car ils sont destinés à servir de modèles pour les autres. Il y a donc deux types de documents : ceux qui sont destinés à servir de modèles pour les autres et ceux qui sont destinés à servir de modèles pour nous. Ces deux types de documents sont destinés à servir de modèles pour nous.

Il est plus difficile de répondre à la question de savoir si les documents de Dioclétien sont destinés à servir de modèles pour nous ou pour les autres. Cependant, il est clair que les documents de Dioclétien sont destinés à servir de modèles pour nous, car ils sont destinés à servir de modèles pour nous. Ces documents sont destinés à servir de modèles pour nous, car ils sont destinés à servir de modèles pour nous. Ces documents sont destinés à servir de modèles pour nous, car ils sont destinés à servir de modèles pour nous. Ces documents sont destinés à servir de modèles pour nous, car ils sont destinés à servir de modèles pour nous.