

THE CAPTOR OF DECEBALUS  
A NEW INSCRIPTION FROM PHILIPPI

By MICHAEL SPEIDEL

(Plates XIII-XV)

A huge tombstone with two reliefs and a Latin inscription accidentally came to light in 1965 in the fields of Grammeni, a village to the north-west of the ancient Philippi in Macedonia (Pl. XIII).<sup>1</sup> The inscription represents the most detailed career of a Roman soldier so far known, providing new information on the structure and functioning of the Roman army. Its hero is revealed as the 'captor' of King Decebalus, one of imperial Rome's greatest antagonists,<sup>2</sup> and his spectacular deed is portrayed on one of the two reliefs. The new find deserves special attention and is published here for the first time.

The monument, of grey medium grained marble, is now in the Archaeological Museum of Kavalla. Its lower end has been broken off and is missing, but the preserved part stands almost nine feet high.<sup>3</sup> The rear and the sides are smooth. On the front, under a cornice, are the two reliefs and below these is the inscription of which a line or two is missing. The inscription is carefully carved in large letters and its text runs as follows :

T I · C L A V D I V S  
M A X I M V S · V E T ·  
s · V · F · C · M I L I T A V I T  
E Q V E · I N L E G · V I I · C · P · F · F A C  
5 T V S · Q V E S T O R · E Q V I T ·  
S I N G V L A R I S L E G A T I L E ·  
G I O N I S · E I V S D E M · V E X I L  
L A R I V S · E Q V I T V M · I T E M ·  
B E L L O D A C I C O · O B V I R T V  
10 T E D O N I S D O N A T V S · A B I M  
P · D O M I T I A N O · F A C T V S D V P L I  
A D I V O T R O I A N O · I N A L A S E C V D  
P A N N O N I O R V M · A Q V O E T F A  
T V S · E X P L O R A T O R I N B E L L O D A  
15 C I C O · E T O B V I R T V T E B I S D O N I S  
D O N A T V S B E L L O · D A C I C O E T  
P A R T H I C O E T A B E O D E F A C T V S  
D E C V R I O · I N A L A · E A D E · Q V O D  
C E P I S S E T D E C E B A L V · E T C A P V T  
20 E I V S · P E R T V L I S S E T E I · R A N I S S T O  
R O M I S S V S · V O L V N T A R I V S · H O  
N E S T A M I S S I O N E · A T E R E N T  
R I A N O · C O N S V L A R E  
— T V S P R O V I N C I A E N O V

The expanded text, as far as possible restored, reads :

Ti(berius) Claudius / Maximus, vet(eranus) / [s(e)] v(ivo) f(aciendum) c(uravit). Militavit / eque(s) in leg(ione) VII C(laudia) p(ia) f(ideli), fac<sup>3</sup>tus qu(a)estor equit(um), / singularis legati le/gionis eiusdem, vexil/larius equitum, item / bello Dacico ob virtu/<sup>10</sup>te(m) donis donatus ab im/p(eratore) Domitiano. Factus dupli(carius) / a divo Troiano (!) in

<sup>1</sup> The photographs (Pls. XIII and XV) were provided by Dr. Dimitrios Panderimalis of the Archaeological Institute of the University of Thessaloniki. It was through him and his good offices that I obtained permission to publish from Mrs. Ch. Koukoulis, of the Archaeological Museum of Kavalla, as well as information on the circumstances and find-spot from Mrs. E. Juri, of the Archaeological Museum of Thessaloniki. I gratefully acknowledge my indebtedness to these Greek scholars. Above all, I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. H. Nesselhauf who first directed my attention to the monument and who made valuable suggestions for the commentary.

<sup>2</sup> Actually Decebalus committed suicide to avoid

being captured alive (Dio 68, 14). Yet since he fell into the hands of the Romans as he was dying, official imperial propaganda, just like our inscription, held he was captured, cf. *SEG* IX, 101: και ο κύριος Νέρβας Τ[ραϊανός Σεβαστός τὸν τῶν Δακῶν μόναρ]χου (?) Δεκ[βαλλον] ἔλαβε . . . cp. J. Reynolds, 'Four Inscriptions from Roman Cyrene', *JRS* XLIX (1959) 96, n. 11.

<sup>3</sup> The exact measurements are as follows: height, 2.64 m; width at top, 0.83 m; width at bottom, 0.90 m; depth, 0.26-0.28 m; upper relief panel, 0.57 × 0.37 m; lower relief panel, 0.42 × 0.31 m; height of letters in line 1, 10 cm; line 2, 9.5 cm; lines 3-10, 6.3 cm; lines 11-23, 4.5 cm.

ala secu(n)d(a) / Pannoniorum, a quo et fa(c)/tus explorator in bello Da/<sup>15</sup>cico et ob virtute(m) bis donis / donatus bello Dacico et / Parthico, et ab eode(m) factus / decurio in ala eade(m), quod / cepisset Decebalu(m) et caput/<sup>20</sup> eius pertulisset ei Ranissto/ro. Missus voluntarius ho/nesta missione a Terent[io Scau]/riano, consulare [exerci]/tus provinciae noy[ae ?Mes/<sup>25</sup>opotamiae . . . . .].<sup>4</sup>

*Ti. Claudius Maximus vet(eranus) [s(e)] v(ivo) f(aciendum) c(uravit)*

The origin of Ti. Claudius Maximus is not known, but his name suggests recent citizenship, acquired perhaps by his father or grandfather through service in the *auxilia*.<sup>5</sup> Since Maximus retired to Philippi, he may have been born there, as veterans often return to their native community.<sup>6</sup> Philippi, founded as a Roman colony by the Caesarians after the battle in 42 B.C. and reinforced with new groups of veterans at various times,<sup>7</sup> had contributed recruits to the army,<sup>8</sup> as did other Roman colonies in the Greek East.

When was Maximus born? He was awarded the *dona militaria* by Domitian in the Dacian War which had ended in A.D. 89.<sup>9</sup> But before that, if we may trust the order of the inscription and Maximus' memory, he had already held the posts of *eques legionis*, *quaestor equitum*, *singularis legati legionis*, and  *vexillarius equitum legionis*, hardly all of them in less than five years.<sup>10</sup> Thus, he will have enrolled in the army sometime before A.D. 85 and consequently was born around A.D. 65—certainly not much earlier, since at least in the beginning of Trajan's Parthian War, in A.D. 114, he was still physically in fighting condition.

*militavit eque(s) in leg(ione) VII C(laudia) p(ia) f(ideli)*

A legionary recruit, generally, first became a foot-soldier and only through promotion after several years of service would he be *factus eques*.<sup>11</sup> Did Maximus suppress his first positions as *miles* and *discens equitum*, thinking them not worth mentioning? Hardly, since he otherwise gives such a detailed description of his career.<sup>12</sup> In order to be enlisted as a cavalryman right from the beginning, Maximus must either have met extraordinary high requirements<sup>13</sup> or in some other way have been able to bring merit and influence to bear; being a member of a family in which military service was a tradition may have helped.

The existence of legionary cavalry during the reign of Domitian is here attested on an inscription for the first time. This lays to rest the notion that between the reigns of Vespasian and Hadrian there was no legionary cavalry.<sup>14</sup>

The seventh Claudian legion in which Maximus enrolled had been transferred in A.D. 66 at the latest from Dalmatia to Viminacium in Moesia.<sup>15</sup> As a Moesian legion it

<sup>4</sup> At the end of line 11 the word *FACTVS* was repeated erroneously, then erased and replaced by the letters *DVPLI*. Because of the pitted surface the stops are not always easily distinguishable.

<sup>5</sup> When awarded citizenship during their period of service, soldiers tended to adopt the name of the ruling emperor. Cf. W. Wagner, 'Zur ala Pansiana, eine epigraphische Nachlese', *Germania* 41 (1963), 317-27, esp. p. 318 f. Also K. Kraft, *Zur Rekrutierung der Alen und Kohorten an Rhein und Donau* (Dissertationes Bernenses 1, 3 (1951)), 101 f.; M. Speidel, *Die Equites Singulares Augusti (Antiquitas 1, 11 (1965))*, 66.

<sup>6</sup> Grammeni, where the tombstone was found, apparently belonged to the *ager* of Philippi, as did the neighbouring Prossotsani, cf. P. Collart, *Philippe, Ville de Macédoine* (École française d'Athènes, travaux et mémoires, fasc. 5, 1937), pl. xxxiv and pp. 276 ff. For veterans of the *auxilia* see H. Nesselhauf, *CIL* xvi, 195. For the legions: G. Forni, *Il reclutamento delle legioni da Augusto a Diocleziano* (Milan, 1952), 41 and 145-51.

<sup>7</sup> J. Schmidt, *RE* xix, 2233 f., s.v. Philippi. As shown by a wealth of inscriptions, even the rural communities in the region of Philippi spoke Latin, cf. Collart l.c., n. 6.

<sup>8</sup> Legionaries from Philippi: *CIL* III, 2717; 14933; 14507, I, a, (VII Cl.). *CIL* III, 2031 (XI Cl.). *CIL* III, 5636; IX, 4684 (VIII AUG.). *AE* 1934, 62 (VI Ferr.). All except *CIL* III, 14057

are from the first century, according to Forni, *Reclutamento* 165, 175. Decorated with *dona militaria* from Philippi: Dessau, 2127 and *AE* 1933, 87.

<sup>9</sup> For evidence, see C. Patsch, *Der Kampf um den Donauraum unter Domitian und Traian* (Sb. Akad. Wien, phil.-hist. Kl. 217, 1 (1937)), 27 ff.; R. Syme, *CAH* xi, 172.

<sup>10</sup> It seems that only the *dona* received in the Parthian War are not mentioned in chronological sequence, doubtless to avoid repeating *et ab eodem ob virtutem donis donatus in bello* for the third time.

<sup>11</sup> Vegetius 2, 21—a general statement to this effect. See also the excellent discussion of this rule by J. F. Gilliam, 'Dura Rosters and the *Constitutio Antoniniana*', *Historia* 14 (1965), 74-92 and the same, 'An Egyptian Cohort in A.D. 117', *Bonner Historia-Augusta-Colloquium 1964/65 (Antiquitas 1v, 3 (1966))*, 91-7.

<sup>12</sup> Other detailed careers mention the positions of *miles* and *discens equitum*, e.g. Dessau, 9090; *CIL* vi, 3409; *CIL* xi, 5646 = Dessau, 2081; *CIL* xii, 2602 = Dessau, 2118.

<sup>13</sup> SHA, *Max.* 2, 2; Herodian 6, 8, 1.

<sup>14</sup> This theory was first put forward by J. Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung* (3rd ed., 1881) vol. 2, 456, and was widely accepted; cf. e.g. recently A. Neumann in *Der Kleine Pauly* III (1968), 541 f., s.v. *legio*.

<sup>15</sup> cf. J. Wilkes, *Dalmatia* (1969), 96, n. 1.

belonged now to the eastern of the two recruitment districts into which the empire was divided, and one would expect Macedonian recruits in its ranks,<sup>16</sup> a further indication that Maximus may actually have been born in Philippi.

*factus qu(a)estor equit(um)*

A treasurer of the legionary cavalry is nowhere else attested in our sources. What fund did he administer? Since it seems that the *equites legionis* belonged to the same centuries as the foot-soldiers,<sup>17</sup> one would not have expected them to have a fund of their own; they could have received their pay from funds kept by the *signiferi* and deposited their savings with them, too.<sup>18</sup> Yet the post of *quaestor equitum* proves they had a special fund, earmarked certainly for horses and their upkeep,<sup>19</sup> and which may or may not have included the pay for the men.

Since the legionary cavalry had an administrative office<sup>20</sup> and funds of their own, and since they trained, marched and fought separately from the foot-soldiers,<sup>21</sup> they must have been organized more independently than has sometimes been supposed. In particular, they must have had a commander,<sup>22</sup> probably a centurion.<sup>23</sup>

*singularis legati legionis eiusdem*

A *singularis legati legionis* is attested here for the first time. We are surprised to learn that a legionary commander had a guard of *singulares* in addition to the *equites legionis*.<sup>24</sup> To judge from the fact that Maximus served in all other posts as a cavalryman, it even seems these *singulares* were mounted. If both legionary cavalry and *singulares* served as guards, as is likely,<sup>25</sup> what was the difference in their functions? Maximus' career shows the *singulares* ranked higher; therefore theirs must have been the more responsible duties. But exactly what these included, remains obscure. Nor do we know how many *singulares* a *legatus legionis* had. Yet judging from their higher rank there were less than 120, the likely number of *equites legionis* at the time.<sup>26</sup>

<sup>16</sup> Forni, *Reclutamento* 76 ff. assigns Macedonia to the eastern recruiting district, yet the dividing line was by no means rigid; Macedonians served in the *legio VII Claudia* even while it was still stationed in Dalmatia, cf. Wilkes 106 f., 464 ff.

<sup>17</sup> *BGU* 600 lists an *equus* as well as an *optio* who is not called *equus*, both in the same century. Other indications are *CIL* VIII, 2568 (as explained by D. Breeze, 'The Organization of the Legion', *JRS* 59, 1969, 50-5), but it may not refer to centuries; and *P. Gen. Lat.* 1, verso 5 (= Daris, *Documenti per la storia dell'esercito romano in Egitto* (Milan, 1964) no. 10), but it may refer to an auxiliary, not a legionary cohort, cf. Forni, *Reclutamento* 32 ff. (contra: R. Marichal, 'La solde des armées romaines d'Auguste à Septime-Sévère', *Ann. de l'Institut de Phil. et d'Hist. Orient. et Slaves*, 13, 1953, 399-421).

<sup>18</sup> Vegetius 2, 20; *PSI* 1003 = Daris no. 33, cf. J. F. Gilliam, 'An Egyptian Cohort in A.D. 117' (see note 11), 91-7. Also R. W. Davies, 'A Note on Loricitis', *BjB.* 168 (1968), 161-5.

<sup>19</sup> *Alae*, auxiliary cohorts and *numeri* had treasuries called *quaesturae*, administered by a *quaestor*: *P. Berl.* 6, 866 = Daris, *Documenti* 35, 49; *P. Dura* 60; *AE* 1912, 5; *AE* 1950, 16; *CIL* III, 798 = Dessau, 2429; *CIL* III, 1369 = Dessau, 2630. In one case, it seems, horses were bought with money from the *quaestura*: *P. Dura* 97. Cf. R. W. Davies, 'The Supply of Animals to the Roman Army and the Remount System', *Latomus* 28 (1969), 429-59, esp. p. 448 f. Perhaps *quaestor* is but a different name for the post otherwise known as *curator*, for which see E. Birley, *Libyca* 2 (1954), 123 f.

<sup>20</sup> *Tabularium*, cf. *AE* 1957, 85. The *actarius* in *CIL* II, 2663, it seems now, belonged to the office of the *equites legionis*, not to the office of the *legatus legionis*. Contra: A. von Domaszewski, *Die Rangordnung des römischen Heeres* (second ed. by B. Dobson, 1967 *Beihefte der Bonner Jahrbücher* 14), 39.

<sup>21</sup> *CIL* VIII, 2532, B = Dessau, 2487; Arrian,

*Ektaxis* 5; Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* 3, 120; Tacitus, *Ann.* 4, 73.

<sup>22</sup> D. Breeze, l.c., assumes they could have done without, which is certainly impossible.

<sup>23</sup> Their commander cannot have ranked lower than a centurion since their *exercitator* apparently was a centurion, see *AE* 1965, 223 with the commentary by J. Fitz, 'La Carrière de P. Aelius Proculinus', *Latomus* 24 (1965), 565-75. Domaszewski (*Rangordnung* 47) thought of the *tribunus sexmestris* as commander of the *equites legionis*, but the fragmentary inscription *CIL* II, 5682 he quotes proves nothing, and had it been such a high officer, Arrian (*Ektaxis* 5) would have mentioned him. As for Statius, *Silvae* 5, 1, 94, adduced by Domaszewski in this context, it probably refers to a legionary centurion, not to a tribune, cf. E. Birley, 'Promotions and Transfers in the Roman Army II: The Centurionate', *Carnuntum Jahrbuch* 8 (1963/64), 21-33, esp. p. 22. Perhaps *CIL* XIII, 8648 = Dessau, 2244 should be read [(centurioni)] *eq(uitum) leg(ionis)*; for a recent discussion of this stone see W. John, *RE* XXIV, 924 f., s.v. P. Quinctilius Varus.

<sup>24</sup> A. v. Domaszewski, 'Die Religion des römischen Heeres' (*Westd. Zeitschr.* 14 (1895), 89) assumed a legionary commander needed *equites legionis*, precisely because he had no *singulares*. In his *Rangordnung* p. 40, he ascribed the *singulares* to the *tribunus laticlavus* and made him mounted for that reason, but this is now proved to be wrong.

<sup>25</sup> *Equites legionis* as guards: Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* 3, 120. Arrian, *Ektaxis* 5; for *singulares*, cf. M. Speidel, *Die Equites Singulares Augusti* 87 ff. Both naturally may have served as messengers (for *singulares*, see *P. Oxy.* VII, 1022 = Daris, *Documenti* 4; Lydus, *De mag.* 3, 7). I cannot see, however, how Livy 37, 7 would show that the main purpose of the imperial *equites legionis* was to serve as mounted messengers, as D. Breeze, l.c., assumes.

<sup>26</sup> Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* 3, 120.



PHILIPPI: STELE OF TI. CLAUDIUS MAXIMUS

*Photograph by courtesy of the Institute of Archaeology, University of Thessaloniki. Copyright reserved*



TRAJAN'S COLUMN, SCENE CXLV: THE CAPTURE OF DECEBALUS

*Photograph by Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Rome. Copyright reserved*



I. PHILIPPI: DETAIL OF STELE, SHOWING DEATH OF DECEBALUS

*Photograph by courtesy of the Institute of Archaeology, University of Thessaloniki. Copyright reserved*



2. TRAJAN'S COLUMN, SCENE CXLVII: TRAJAN SHOWS DECEBALUS' HEAD TO THE ARMY

*Photograph by Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Rome. Copyright reserved*

It was formerly believed that only a commander-in-chief of a provincial army was entitled to *singulares*, and that whoever had *singulares* was necessarily such a commander-in-chief.<sup>27</sup> Since this has now proved to be wrong, the question whether praesidial procurators actually were commanders-in-chief of the army in their province needs reinvestigation. Indeed, the appearance of *singulares* in the headquarters of the *legio III Augusta* in Lambaesis in A.D. 198 has been taken to mark the date at which the legionary command there was changed into a regular provincial command.<sup>28</sup> Now that our inscription shows the commander in Lambaesis could have already had *singulares*<sup>29</sup> as *legatus legionis*, the question when the province of Numidia was established is again open.

### *vexillarius equitum*

The exact function of the *vexillarius equitum legionis* is yet unknown, since there are only a few short references to this post in the inscriptions and papyri.<sup>30</sup> Probably there were two or even three *vexillarii equitum* in a legion.<sup>31</sup> But there is no way of knowing whether each one carried the *vexillum* of a *turma* of legionary cavalry,<sup>32</sup> or whether they were jointly in charge of one *vexillum* common to the entire body of such cavalry.<sup>33</sup> In fact, it is not even known whether the legionary cavalry was subdivided in *turmae* at all.<sup>34</sup>

The rank of the *vexillarius equitum* may be inferred from the career of a soldier in the praetorian guard who rose through the posts of *optio equitum*, *vexillarius equitum*, *fiscus curator*, *evocatus*, *centurio*, etc.<sup>35</sup> The *vexillarius equitum*, therefore, must be a rank equal to or higher than *optio equitum*, contrary to Domaszewski's view that the *optio* was the top post among the legionary cavalry.<sup>36</sup> Yet it ranked lower than the *duplicarius alae*, as we learn from Maximus' career.

### *item bello Dacico ob virtute(m) donis donatus ab imp(eratore) Domitiano*

Maximus received the *dona militaria* as a *vexillarius equitum* of the *legio VII Claudia*. This is the first direct evidence for participation of the *legio VII Claudia* in Domitian's Dacian War, although from its location in Upper Moesia, the centre of the war-operations, it was clear even before that this legion must have had a share in the fighting.<sup>37</sup> Dio (67, 7, 2) alleges these *dona* were not really deserved, but were handed out by Domitian to support his false claim of having conquered Decebalus.

To mention in which war the *dona* were earned is a common practice, but more specific reasons are rarely given. If reasons are mentioned, then in the case of officers it is usually *ob res prospere gestas* or *ob victoriam* or *ob virtutem*.<sup>38</sup> In the ranks it is mostly *ob virtutem*<sup>39</sup> as in our case. It is the emperor who awards the *dona*, since all wars are fought

<sup>27</sup> Ph. Horovitz, 'Essai sur les pouvoirs des procureurs-gouverneurs', *Revue Belge* 17 (1938), 53-62, esp. p. 58 and H. G. Pflaum, *Les procureurs équestres sous le haut-empire Romain* (1950), 126.

<sup>28</sup> H. G. Pflaum, 'A propos de la date de création de la province de Numidie', *Libyca* 5 (1957), 61-75.

<sup>29</sup> *AE* 1957, 122 on which Pflaum based his conclusions, mentions *equites singulares*, not simply *singulares*, which does not, however, seem to make any difference for this question.

<sup>30</sup> *CIL* III, 4061 = Dessau, 2330; XIII, 6948; VIII, 16549 = Dessau, 2329; VIII, 2562 (?); *AE* 1957, 341; *BGU* 600.

<sup>31</sup> Domaszewski, o.c. (see n. 24) 88, commenting on *CIL* VIII, 2562.

<sup>32</sup> Thus Premerstein, 'Die Buchführung einer ägyptischen Legionsabteilung', *Klio* 3 (1903), 1 ff., esp. p. 27; W. Zwikker, 'Bemerkungen zu den römischen Heeresfahnen in der älteren Kaiserzeit', in 27. *Bericht der römisch-germanischen Kommission* (1937), 7-22, esp. p. 11. There is, however, no evidence for this, not even among the *equites praetoriani*, as Domaszewski (*Rangordnung* 23, n. 9) and M. Durry (*Les cohortes prétoriennes* (1968), 99) assume.

<sup>33</sup> Like the four *vex(illarii)* belonging to one

*turma* of the *cohortes XX Palmyrenorum*, *P.Dura* 100, col. 38 and 39.

<sup>34</sup> For *turmae* and decurions of the legionary cavalry, see A. Passerini, *Dizionario Epigraphico* 4, 610, styling *CIL* XI, 1526 'di dubbia autorità'. The *vexillum* mentioned in *CIL* XIII, 8276 = Dessau, 2324 seems to be a unit of veterans rather than legionary cavalry, cf. Premerstein, l.c. (see n. 32) 27, n. 7.

<sup>35</sup> *CIL* VI, 32709a = Dessau, 9190.

<sup>36</sup> *Rangordnung* 47. The fragmentary inscription *CIL* II, 5682 quoted there proves nothing. The *optio equitum* may have done duty at the *tabularium* (*AE* 1957, 85), compare *CIL* VIII, 18072 = Dessau, 2446; XIII, 5970 = Dessau, 2444.

<sup>37</sup> cf. E. Ritterling, *RE* XII, 1621 f., s.v. *legio*.

<sup>38</sup> *CIL* III, 1193 = Dessau, 2746; III, 6395 = Dessau, 2665 ('ob triumphos belli Dacici'); III, 14416 = Dessau, 7178; VI, 31856 = Dessau, 1327; VIII 217 = Dessau, 2658; XI, 395 = Dessau, 2648. One may speculate whether a good many higher officers did not receive *dona* more or less *honoris causa* as in *CIL* III, 14187, 4 = Dessau, 4081.

<sup>39</sup> e.g. *CIL* V, 7495 = Dessau, 2337. For the form *ob virtute* see *CIL* III, 1193 = Dessau, 2746.

under his auspices,<sup>40</sup> and with few exceptions *dona* are only given for campaigns commanded by the emperor himself.<sup>41</sup> It is surprising to find the name of Domitian mentioned here, after his *damnatio memoriae*.

*factus dupli(carius) a divo Troiano*

Maximus' promotion from *vexillarius equitum legionis* to *duplicarius alae* is in keeping with a tradition inherited from republican days of appointing legionary soldiers as lower officers in the *auxilia*.<sup>42</sup> Our sources being so scanty, however, only a few such promotions are on record: <sup>43</sup> this one is a valuable addition. It confirms the preference given to men of the guard or on the staff of the commanders.<sup>44</sup> Such men were the pick of the soldiers, and moreover went through a special training<sup>45</sup> so that they would be able to impart high and uniform standards of combat efficiency to the troops. There is nothing, however, in these promotions to suggest a deliberate attempt to provide the auxiliary regiments with a core of officers of Roman-Italian stock.<sup>46</sup> Whether or not the award of the *dona* more than ten years earlier had a bearing on Maximus' promotion is difficult to ascertain.<sup>47</sup>

The appointment by the Emperor himself is surprising, since, as far as we know, the right of promoting centurions and decurions in the auxiliary forces normally rests with the commanders of the provincial armies.<sup>48</sup> Also, as in our case, such transfers to auxiliary units are generally made within the same province.<sup>49</sup> We may assume, therefore, that Maximus' promotion came at a time when Trajan himself was with the Upper Moesian army, i.e. during the first or second Dacian War. The commander of the seventh legion in whose guard Maximus had served up to then may have been that Longinus who also, at the outbreak of the second war, fell into Decebalus' hands and committed suicide (Dio 68, 12; Patsch p. 101).

The spelling *Troiano* is a variant for *Traiano*, several examples from the Latin-speaking West are known. Our inscription conforms to the rule that where the Emperor is called *divus*, the other parts of his name and title are dropped.<sup>50</sup>

Did this promotion involve a pay-raise? The former appointments of Maximus could hardly all have meant promotion on the pay scale: that would necessitate too many steps on the ladder.<sup>51</sup> Transfer from the legion to the *auxilia*, however, is quite a decisive step and is therefore likely to be accompanied by a pay-raise.<sup>52</sup>

<sup>40</sup> In A.D. 20, however, the proconsul of Africa still had the right to award *dona*, cf. Tac., *Ann.* 3, 21.

<sup>41</sup> cf. P. Steiner, 'Die *dona militaria*', *Bonner Jahrbücher* 114-15 (1906), 1-98, esp. p. 89. For *dona* earned in other campaigns: *CIL* XI, 395 = Dessau, 2648 (Claudius/Nero); *CIL* V, 7425 = Dessau, 2720 (Nerva).

<sup>42</sup> cf. Suetonius, *de Gramm.* 9, 'corniculo, mox equo meruit'; Caesar, *BG* I, 23. Domaszewski, *Rangordnung* 54.

<sup>43</sup> *CIL* III, 8438; v, 522; 8185; VIII, 2354; *AE* 1917/18, 74/75; *P.Mich.* III, 164, etc. See also above, n. 42 and below, 44. cf. J. F. Gilliam, 'The Appointment of Auxiliary Centurions', *TAPA* 88 (1958), 155-68.

<sup>44</sup> *Equites legionis*: *CIL* III, 7449; 647 (?); *P.Mich.* III, 164 (2). *Stratores*: *CIL* VIII, 9002 (?), 9370; X, 7580; *AE* 1958, 156. *Beneficiarii*: *CIL* VIII, 17619; II, 2554, with *AE* 1910, 1. *Cornicularius*: *AE* 1917, 74. It is ironical that Domaszewski's contention (*Rangordnung* 54), that they all must have been former 'tactical ranks' of the legions, is borne out by none of the inscriptions he cites, but by ours that he could not know. For analogies in the legions cf. E. Birley, 'Promotions and Transfers in the Roman Army II: the Centurionate', *Carnuntum Jahrbuch* 8 (1963/64), 21-33, esp. p. 22.

<sup>45</sup> For the training of the *equites legionis*, see Speidel, o.c. (n. 5), 59.

<sup>46</sup> Suggested by Domaszewski, *Rangordnung* 72. But *equites singulares Augusti* and *equites singulares consularis*, generally of non-Roman origin, are

trained and promoted in the same way, as I hope to show in a study on the decurions. See also G. L. Cheesman, *The Auxilia of the Roman Imperial Army* (1914), 38.

<sup>47</sup> cf. Domaszewski, *Rangordnung* 69 and *CIL* VIII, 8438 = Dessau, 2597.

<sup>48</sup> *AE* 1917-18, 74; *BGU* II, 696 (= Daris, *Documenti* 9), 16-18. *P.Mich.* III, 164 (= Daris, *Documenti* 27), 5-7.

<sup>49</sup> E. Ritterling, *RE* XII, 1558, s.v. legio. E. Birley, o.c. (n. 23), 26.

<sup>50</sup> For *Troianus*, *CIL* XIV, 3626 = Dessau, 2742; *RIB* 2263 = *CIL* VII, 1163; *JRS* LVI (1966), 219, no. 9. For the omissions, see P. Kneissl, *Die Siegestitulatur der römischen Kaiser* (1970), 89 f.

<sup>51</sup> Domaszewski, *Rangordnung* 71, assumes there were only four pay-grades in the legions below the centurion, the *vexillarius* being the second lowest. The papyri of the *auxilia* hint at there being only three pay-grades below the decurion, i.e. the *duplicarius*, the *sesquiplarius* and basic. cf. J. F. Gilliam, 'The Moesian Pridianum', in *Hommages à A. Grenier* (Collection Latomus 58, Brussels, 1962), 747-56.

<sup>52</sup> Without question assumed by Domaszewski, *Rangordnung* 72; Cheesman, *Auxilia* 35; G. Webster, *The Roman Imperial Army* (1969), 260; G. Watson, 'The Pay of the Roman Army, The Auxiliary Forces', *Historia* VIII (1959), 372-8, esp. p. 377; P. A. Brunt, 'Pay and Superannuation in the Roman Army', *PBSR* 28 (1950), 50-71, esp. p. 64.



If this is true, then the long disputed question whether the *auxilia* received one-third or five-sixths of the legionary pay<sup>53</sup> can be finally answered. After the pay-raise by Domitian, a legionary received 300 *denarii* a year. If the *auxilia* got only one-third of this, then a *miles cohortis* was paid 100 *denarii*, and presumably an *equus cohortis* 150, an *equus alae* 200, and a *duplicarius alae* 400 *denarii*.<sup>54</sup> However, a *vexillarius* in a legion received almost certainly pay-and-a-half, i.e. 450 *denarii*,<sup>55</sup> and a *vexillarius equitum* must have received even more, 'cum naturaliter equites a peditibus soleant discrepare'.<sup>56</sup> Thus Maximus' appointment as *duplicarius alae* would have meant a demotion—which is unlikely in view of the way he mentions it, and unlikely for one who had received the *dona ob virtutem*. The *auxilia*, it follows, must have received considerably more, i.e. five-sixths of the legionary pay, as the papyri indicate.<sup>57</sup> The *miles cohortis*, then, was paid 250 *denarii* a year, and correspondingly—if a conjecture is allowed—the *equus cohortis* 300, the *equus alae* 350, and the *duplicarius alae* 700 *denarii*.

### *in ala secu(n)d(a) Pannoniorum*

This regiment had belonged to the army of Upper Moesia since about A.D. 88<sup>58</sup> and was stationed in the neighbourhood of the *legio VII Claudia*.<sup>59</sup> Maximus' promotion, therefore, involved no distant transfer. We knew that the *ala* participated in the conquest of Dacia, since it reappears together with a great number of Upper Moesian regiments in the garrison of the new province.<sup>60</sup> Whether it fought in both wars or only in the second is unknown. We now learn that it detached one of its *duplicarii* to the *exploratores* of the expeditionary forces in the second war.

The fact that the *ala*—or at least a vexillation of it<sup>61</sup>—went to the East for the Parthian War, comes as a surprise.<sup>62</sup> It may have been led by the 'praefecto vexillationum equitum Moesiae inferioris et Daciae eunti in expeditione Parthica',<sup>63</sup> and was certainly reckoned among the troops on whose fighting experience Trajan relied: 'cognitis militibus hostem Parthum contemnentibus, sagittarum ictus post ingentia Dacorum falcibus inlata volnera despiciatui habentibus'.<sup>64</sup> After a share in the fighting, where Maximus earned his *dona*, the *ala*—or the vexillation—seems to have been incorporated into the army of the new province of Mesopotamia.<sup>65</sup>

After the eastern conquests were lost, the *ala* went back to Dacia,<sup>66</sup> and conceivably it was rushed there by Hadrian who himself went to the Danube in A.D. 118: 'audito dein tumultu Sarmatarum et Rhoxolanarum praemissis exercitibus Moesiam petit'.<sup>67</sup> Our inscription, then, increases the number of units which Trajan thought could be spared from the Dacian garrison for use in the East and which Hadrian had hurriedly to bring

<sup>53</sup> One-third was suggested by Domaszewski, 'Der Truppensold der Kaiserzeit', *Neue Heidelberger Jahrbücher* 10 (1900), 225; R. Marichal, l.c. (n. 17); Watson, l.c. For five-sixths: M. A. C. Johnson, *Roman Egypt* (Baltimore, 1936), 670, 673; A. Passerini, *Le coorti pretorie* (Rome, 1939), 101, n. 2; Forni, o.c. (n. 6), 32 f.

<sup>54</sup> Watson, l.c. We assume a *duplicarius alae* really got double pay, as is probable from Arrian, *Tact.* 41.

<sup>55</sup> cf. Domaszewski, *Rangordnung* 49 and 71. For the rank of *vexillarius*, see above. In the *cohors XX Palmyrenorum* at Dura-Europos the *vexillarius*, though not a permanent post, is reckoned among the pay-grades of the *duplicarii*, cf. R. O. Fink in: *The Excavations at Dura-Europos*, ed. by A. Perkins, *Final Report* v, 1: *The Parchments and Papyri* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1959), 32 f.

<sup>56</sup> Vegetius 2, 21. Equites had to pay, at least in part, for their horses, see R. W. Davies, 'The Supply of Animals' (above n. 19), 448.

<sup>57</sup> cf. the works cited in note 53. Brunt, o.c., assumes three-fifths: that, too, could be reconciled with Maximus' career, but hardly with *AE* 1967, 410 (a legionary promoted to *signifer numeri*).

<sup>58</sup> Nesselhauf, *CIL* xvi, 35, p. 33, n. 1.

<sup>59</sup> Wagner, *Die Dislokation der römischen Auxiliarformationen* (1938), 60 ff.

<sup>60</sup> *CIL* xvi, 163 with the surname *Veterana* added. cf. Nesselhauf's remarks *CIL* xvi, p. 45.

<sup>61</sup> *IGRR* 1, 824 mentions a former prefect of the *ala II Pannoniorum* who had earned *dona* in Dacia and, it seems, Parthia; if he did so while commanding this regiment (contra: Domaszewski, *Rangordnung* 138), then the entire *ala*, not just a vexillation, must have been in the eastern war.

<sup>62</sup> For the list of *auxilia* known so far as participating in that war, R. Paribeni, *Optimus Princeps* (1927) II, 287 f.

<sup>63</sup> *CIL* vi, 32933 = Dessau, 2723. See also *IGRR* III, 173 for a possible stay in Ancara.

<sup>64</sup> Fronto, *Princ. hist.* 9 (= C. R. Haines' edition (1920) II, 204).

<sup>65</sup> It is possible, though, that Maximus got his *missio* from the commander there, while still belonging to the *exercitus Daciae*, cf. Nesselhauf, *CIL* xvi, 99.

<sup>66</sup> It is attested there from A.D. 143 onward, cf. *AE* 1906, 112; *CIL* xvi, 110 (see Wagner, *Dislokation* 38 f.); xvi, 185. For the identity with the *ala II Gallorum et Pannoniorum*, see C. Daicoviciu, 'Un nouveau diplôme militaire de Dacia Porolissensis', *JRS* 51 (1961), 63-70, esp. p. 66, n. 29.

<sup>67</sup> SHA, *Hadr.* 6, 6.

back to stave off trouble on the Danube. Hadrian, so far from giving up Dacia, may actually have increased its garrison.<sup>68</sup>

*a quo et factus explorator in bello Dacico*

In every operational unit of the Roman army some men, it seems, were assigned the job of reconnoitring.<sup>69</sup> A fully-fledged field army, however, had a special corps of mounted *exploratores* under a commander of its own.<sup>70</sup> In enemy territory they rode at the head of the marching column, and in the camp their lines were near the gate.<sup>71</sup> In the army described by 'Hyginus', comprising three legions with their *auxilia* and led by the emperor, they numbered 200 men.<sup>72</sup> Because of the importance of their function, the army-commander (in our case the emperor himself) chose 'fidelissimos argutissimosque cum equis probatissimis'<sup>73</sup> as *exploratores*. Later in the second century detachments from the national *numeri* served as *exploratores*,<sup>74</sup> yet for Trajan's army they were selected from among the regular *auxilia* as we now gather from Maximus' career. Presumably the men still belonged to their former *alae* and *cohorts* and were carried in their rosters, just as were men detached for duty as *singulares consularis*.<sup>75</sup>

The *exploratores* in the armies described by Arrian and 'Hyginus', therefore, are not to be confused with the national *numeri*,<sup>76</sup> and the national contingents in 'Hyginus' army need not be thought of as varying in strength from 900 to 200 men, but as keeping within the more plausible limits of 900 to 500.<sup>77</sup>

Maximus does not indicate his rank as *explorator*, most likely because it remained the same as it was before; he was *duplicarius exploratorum*, second in command of a troop. The *exploratores*, then, were probably organized in *turmae*. Yet even if they did not follow the standard pattern of organization, Maximus was put in charge of some detachment. For he must have been the leader of that reconnoitring party who captured Decebalus; had someone else been commander it would have been he who brought the King's head to Trajan.

*et ob virtute(m) bis donis donatus bello Dacico et Parthico*

Maximus was decorated twice in the Dacian Wars and once in the Parthian War,<sup>78</sup> thus being one of the most decorated Roman soldiers known. What decorations did he get? On the lower one of the two reliefs two *torques* (necklaces) and two *armillae* (arm-rings) are shown, the latter in the popular form of snakes, known from other soldiers' tombstones.<sup>79</sup> *Torques* as well as *armillae* were generally awarded in pairs as in our case.<sup>80</sup>

<sup>68</sup> A decrease was assumed by A. Stein, *Die Reichsbeamten von Dazien* (Diss. Pann. Ser. 1, 12 (1944)), 18. No decrease: R. Syme, *JRS* 36 (1946), 159-68 (review of Stein, *Dazien*), and G. Forni, 'Contributo alla storia della Dacia Romana', *Athenaeum*, N.S. 36 (1958), 183-218, esp. p. 197.

<sup>69</sup> *P.Dura* 100 (A.D. 219) of the *cohors XX Palmyrenorum* lists more than 15 *exploratores*, among them at least five foot-soldiers. See also *P.Brit.Mus.* 2851 (Hunt's Pridianum) ed. R. O. Fink, *JRS* 48 (1958), 102-16 (A.D. 105/6) of the *cohors I Hispanorum*, detaching several horsemen under a centurion *exploratum*. For an *explorator* in an *ala* see *CIL* VIII, 21516.

<sup>70</sup> Arrian, *Ektaxis* 1, 1. Their commander seems to have been a *praepositus*, since Arrian mentions ordinary centurions by their proper title. The centurions in *CIL* III, 3254 and 3648 = 10422 may have led the *exploratores* of a smaller force. Centurions, of course, could command mounted units; contra: Fiebiger, *RE* VI, 1690-3, s.v. *exploratores*. See also Caesar, *BG* I, 21 and 22.

<sup>71</sup> Arrian, *Ektaxis* 1, 1. 'Hyginus', *De mun. castr.* 24. cf. Vegetius 3, 6.

<sup>72</sup> 'Hyginus', 30. This work belongs to the second century, cf. Speidel, o.c. (n. 5) 12 f. E. Birley, 'The Epigraphy of the Roman Army', *Actes du deuxième congrès international d'épig. grecque et latine*, Paris, 1952, 227-39, esp. p. 234.

<sup>73</sup> Vegetius 3, 6. See also *Dig.* 49, 16, 3 and 5,

providing especially severe punishment for their failing in service; cf. Fiebiger, l.c.

<sup>74</sup> The first known instance is from around A.D. 172 (*AE* 1956, 124). See E. Stein, *Die kaiserlichen Beamten und Truppenkörper im römischen Deutschland unter dem Prinzipat* (1932), 233 ff. The remarks of H. Callies, 'Die fremden Truppen im römischen Heer des Prinzipats', 45. *Bericht der Römisch-Germanischen Kommission* (1964), 130-227, are here lacking in clarity.

<sup>75</sup> cf. *P.Br.Mus.* 2851 (see above, n. 69); *P.Dura* 100, 101. Also inscriptions such as *CIL* XIII, 8185 = Dessau, 4743: 'Ulpus Acutus, du[p(licarius)] al(ae) Sulp(iciae), sing(ularis) co(n)s(ularis)'.

<sup>76</sup> E. Ritterling, 'Zur Erklärung von Arrians "Εκταξίς κατ' Ἀλανῶν," *Wiener Studien* 24 (1902), 359-72, esp. p. 370. Stein, *Beamten* 235. H. T. Rowell, *RE* XVIII, 1327 ff., s.v. *numerus*, was right.

<sup>77</sup> cf. 'Hyginus', 30; contra: Stein, *Beamten* 236.

<sup>78</sup> The word *bis* in this line does not mean twice in the Dacian War as well as twice in the Parthian War: in such a case one would expect the word *quater*. cf. *CIL* II, 4461 = Dessau, 2661: 'ter donis donato ab imp. Traiano torquibus, armillis, phaleris, corona vallari bis in Dacia, semel in Parthia.'

<sup>79</sup> cf. A. Büttner, 'Untersuchungen über Ursprung und Entwicklung von Auszeichnungen im römischen Heer', *Bonner Jahrbücher* 157 (1957), 127-80, pl. 13, fig. 2.

<sup>80</sup> P. Steiner, o.c. (n. 41), esp. p. 22; 28.

One would expect that Maximus also received *phalerae* (decorative plaques), which during the reign of Trajan were still awarded to the ranks.<sup>81</sup> Yet they are not found on our monument. Does this indicate that the supposed abolition of the *phalerae* as *dona* for the ranks had already happened by the later part of Trajan's reign? <sup>82</sup> True, if *phalerae* were still awarded to men of his rank, Maximus should have got them at least once. But they may have been shown below the inscription on the part of the stone now broken off.

No safe conclusion can be reached in this respect and nothing can be inferred, therefore, from this stone as to the suppression of the *phalerae*. The fact that Maximus does not list his *dona*, as soldiers usually do, is easily explained by their being engraved on the stone.

*et ab eode(m) factus decurio in ala eade(m)*

Maximus, it seems, still belonged to the *ala secunda Pannoniorum*, ranking as a *duplicarius*, when he was promoted to the decurionate in that same *ala*. Such promotions from *duplicarius* to *decurio* within the same *ala* are known elsewhere, as well,<sup>83</sup> and so are promotions as a reward for brave deeds.<sup>84</sup> Other men, however, advanced to the decurionate directly from the rank of *equus legionis*,<sup>85</sup> or went on to the legionary centurionate.<sup>86</sup> Thus, in view of his rapid start, his many *dona* and his spectacular deed, Maximus' career is strikingly slow. Perhaps he lacked qualities other than bravery and quickness in action,<sup>87</sup> or he was already near retirement age when he became *decurio*.

*quod cepisset Decebalu(m) et caput eius pertulisset ei Ranisstoru*

The great feat is shown on the upper relief (Pl. XV, 1). Maximus is galloping towards an enemy, holding in his left hand two spears and a round or oval shield, while in his right he wields a sword, drawn and ready for action. He wears the light cloak of the cavalryman, and on his right side we see the empty sheath of his sword. His face is badly weathered, but the brim of the helmet is visible: thus he certainly wore body armour, too. Indeed, the lower part of a shirt of chain mail is visible just below the sword. Maximus, strangely, does not seem to hold the bridle, and his left foot appears under the belly of the horse in an awkward way far too much in front. Since our man is going to cut off the King's head with the sword, he is not portrayed spearing the prostrate foe in the usual fashion of cavalry tombstones.

The enemy, characterized as a Dacian chieftain by trousers, an hexagonal shield, sickle-sword, and pointed Dacian cap, can be no other than Decebalus himself. He has just cut his own throat and now sinks back, mortally wounded, the sword falling from his right hand, his left pressing his stomach, his mouth open from heavy breathing. This vivid portrayal of Decebalus reproduces the King's main features as known from Trajan's column: <sup>88</sup> the full beard, the large, fleshy lips and nose, the strong eyebrows and the deep eyes with their powerful expression. Since many Dacians on Trajan's column have almost the same features, this need not be a true portrait of Decebalus, but rather a standardized rendering of a Dacian chieftain. Yet Decebalus must have looked at least similar to this truly impressive image.

A valuable piece of Roman *Soldatenkunst*, our monument adds another item to the

<sup>81</sup> *CIL* XI, 5646 = Dessau, 2081, an *equus praetorianus*.

<sup>82</sup> Domaszewski, *Rangordnung* 68, assumed they were discontinued by Hadrian. New finds, however, may show that they were not discontinued, especially since centurions continued to be awarded *phalerae* (e.g. *CIL* III, 7334 = Dessau, 2080; *CIL* VIII, 217 = Dessau, 2658) but only that almost no *dona* are recorded for men of the ranks after Trajan's reign. Other instances where *torques* and *armillae* were awarded without *phalerae*: *CIL* V, 4365 = Dessau, 2272; *CIL* XIII, 2230 = Dessau, 2313; Dessau, 9492.

<sup>83</sup> cf. *CIL* VIII, 2354 = Dessau, 305; transfer seems to be involved in *P.Mich.* III, 164, 11, edited by J. F. Gilliam, o.c. (n. 45).

<sup>84</sup> cf. *CIL* III, 14416 = Dessau, 7178.

<sup>85</sup> *CIL* III, 7449; *P.Mich.* III, 164 (= Daris, *Documenti* 27), 2 and 14.

<sup>86</sup> *CIL* VIII, 2354 = Dessau, 305, a close parallel to Maximus in career and time. For other decurions reaching the centurionate, cf. *CIL* II, 1681; III, 11213; VIII, 21567.

<sup>87</sup> He must have been literate, though, as is clear from his having been *quaestor*.

<sup>88</sup> In scenes LXXV; XCIII; CXXXV; CXLV as numbered by C. Cichorius, *Die Reliefs der Trajanssäule* (Berlin, 2nd. ed., 1927). cf. E. Panaitescu, 'Il ritratto di Decebalo', *Ephemeris Dacoromanae* I (1923), 387-413, esp. p. 407.

much-disputed question of the historical accuracy of the reliefs on Trajan's column.<sup>89</sup> For the 'capture' of Decebalus is one of the most dramatic scenes represented there (Pl. XIV). Ti. Claudius Maximus is again shown galloping towards the King, but instead of brandishing the sword he stretches out his hand, trying to grasp the King's arm to prevent him from suicide. The tombstone, which might have been made to Maximus' own specifications, gives the less dramatic version and therefore may well be closer to reality. If so, the artist of the column will have dramatized the event by showing Maximus as coming very close to capturing the King alive. This may be explained by the fact that the artist, who could not have been present at this scene,<sup>90</sup> had to rely on an official report that was bound to be more dramatic than the truth, as may be suggested also by the word *cepisset* in our inscription. Yet, even so, the event portrayed on the column is not only correct in the main outlines, in that it shows auxiliary horsemen closing in on the King, but so precise in tactical details that Cichorius, acute interpreter that he was, was led to recognize in them 'eine bestimmte, etwa besonders gut berittene Abteilung'. This is now splendidly confirmed by our inscription, in which they are called *exploratores*.<sup>91</sup>

The topography of the Dacian Wars gains a new name from our monument. Trajan's furthest camp may not, in fact, be either Napoca or Porolissum<sup>92</sup> but Ranisstorum, and although this place is unknown otherwise, there is now hope that linguistics or archaeology will locate it one day. The name *Ranisstorum* is a welcome addition to our knowledge of Dacian place-names. *Ranis*, the meaning of which is yet to be found, occurs in the Thracian name of Apollo Ῥανισκεληνός.<sup>93</sup> *Sturum* probably means '-place' and occurs in other place-names as well, e.g. Durostorum, Getystyrum.<sup>94</sup>

In Ranisstorum the King's head was displayed before the army (Pl. XV, 2) 'by two auxiliaries', as the commentators of the column say.<sup>95</sup> What is more attractive than to assume one of the two is Maximus? Yet closer inspection reveals a fact of great importance: the tunics, recognizable by their folds, show that it is the emperor and one of his *comites* who present Decebalus' head to the troops in the final *adlocutio*, signifying the end of the war.<sup>96</sup> The importance of the event was such that Trajan will have received his sixth imperial acclamation on this occasion. The capture of Decebalus had been the goal of the war just as much as the conquest of Transylvania.<sup>97</sup> Had the King escaped, the Dacian question would not have been settled. Nor would the glory of the victory have been complete without the supreme trophy of the captured King.<sup>98</sup> Since he could not be taken alive to be led in triumph through the streets of Rome, the second best thing was to parade

<sup>89</sup> For a recent discussion see H. Daicoviciu, 'Osservazioni intorno alla colonna Traiana', *Dacia* 3 (1959), 311-28; M. Turcan-Deleani, 'Les monuments représentés sur la colonne Trajane', *Mélanges d'arch. et d'hist. de l'école française de Rome* 70 (1958), 147-76.

<sup>90</sup> That the artist was with Trajan in Transylvania has been suggested by I. A. Richmond, 'Trajan's Army on Trajan's Column', *PBSR* 13 (1935), 1-40, esp. p. 3. The other differences between the two pictures seem to be less important: on the tombstone Maximus wears the *sagum*, on the column not; here the King's shield is pointed on the long sides, there not. But why is the King's shield shown in both scenes? Only to mark him as a defeated warrior?

<sup>91</sup> o.c. vol. 2, p. 361 (a remarkable inference, though he was referring only to the men to the right of the tree). cf. Vegetius 3, 6: 'exploratores—cum equis probatissimis'.

<sup>92</sup> As thought by Cichorius, o.c., p. 368 ff. If we retain his suggestion that it was one of the later legionary fortresses, Apulum is the likeliest: it changed its name, Th. Mommsen, *CIL* III, p. 183, and 'Apulum' may reflect Apollo Raniskelēnos. Yet this is no more than a guess. C. Patsch, *Der Kampf um den Donauraum*, 119 thinks of *Praetoria Augusta* as Trajan's last camp, and tentatively equates it with modern Inlăceni. Dr. C. Daicoviciu, in a letter, suggests Hoghiz (Heviz) and thinks of Ranisstorum as a civilian settlement near the camp of *Praetoria Augusta*.

<sup>93</sup> D. Detschew, *Die thrakischen Sprachreste* (Oest. Akad. Wiss., *Schriften der Balkankommission* 14, (1957)), 389 (= *IGBR*, IV, 1923). Comparison with other such names, like Σαδοκεληνός (*IGBR* II, 540) shows that the -s- belongs to *Ranis-*, thus the double -s- in our inscription is fully justified, and the explanation of W. Tomaschek (*Die alten Thraker*, II, *Sprachreste* (Sb. Akad. Wien, vol. 130, 1893), 68) that it is an ethnicon from Rani-skelos (thus quoted by Detschew) cannot be entirely correct.

<sup>94</sup> Detschew, *Sprachreste* 480.

<sup>95</sup> Cichorius, *Reliefs* 368 ff.; E. Petersen, *Trajans dakische Kriege* vol. 2 (1903), 119; K. Lehmann-Hartleben, *Die Trajanssäule* (1926), 11.

<sup>96</sup> The folds are recognizable above the heads of the soldiers who stand in front of the two men presenting the King's head. On the reliefs of the column, only the emperor and his *comites* wear the tunic together with the *sagum*. This interpretation can be mentioned here only in passing; detailed evidence will be set forth elsewhere.

<sup>97</sup> cf. *CIL* VI, 1444 = Dessau, 1022, 'Imperator Caesar Nerva Traianus [Augustus Germanicus] Dacicus gentem Dacor(um) et regem Decebalum bello superavit', an inscription sponsored by Trajan himself and therefore not just the historian's pre-occupation with great leaders as it is found, e.g., in Pliny, *Ep.* 8, 4 or Eutropius 8, 6, 2 ('bellum Decebali').

<sup>98</sup> For the wide publicity given to the 'capture' of Decebalus see *SEG* IX, 101, cf. above, n. 2.

his head. Trajan sent it to Rome and had it thrown on the Gemonian stairs, for the public to gloat over and for the *fasti* to report it for posterity.<sup>99</sup> Maximus may have been lauded by the emperor for his spectacular deed before the army on parade, as is suggested by the subjunctive mood of the lines *quod cepisset Decebalu(m) et caput eius pertulisset ei Ranisstoru*.<sup>100</sup>

*missus voluntarius honesta missione*

Maximus received his honourable discharge as a *voluntarius*, which must mean he served longer than his regular term.<sup>101</sup> Indeed, since he enrolled in the army sometime before A.D. 85 and did not get his discharge before A.D. 115 (as will be shown below), he served beyond the *emerita stipendia*, regardless of whether the 20-year term of a legionary or the 25-year term of an auxiliary applied to him. Thirty or more years of service are not altogether uncommon for auxiliaries or even for legionary cavalry, especially in times of war.<sup>102</sup>

*Voluntarius* as a technical term of the imperial army, denoting soldiers who continue their service as volunteers after completion of their term, was unknown up to now. It sheds light on the disputed origin of the *cohortes voluntariorum*:<sup>103</sup> they may have been formed from men of the legions, or from the *auxilia*, who were willing to put off their discharge. That would explain the large number of such cohorts, their Roman citizenship (preserved by recruiting citizens to fill the thinning ranks), and the quick disappearance of some of these cohorts that were apparently not supplied with new recruits.<sup>104</sup>

*a Terent[io Scau]riano, consulare [exerci]tus provinciae nov[ae] . . . . .*

Soldiers are discharged by the Emperor, but through the agency of the provincial governor. The proper word is *per*, yet the less correct *a/ab* is also used, sometimes even on official documents.<sup>105</sup> Decimus Terentius Scaurianus is known as the first governor of the newly conquered province of Dacia and *patronus* of its new capital, Sarmizegethusa.<sup>106</sup> The task of organizing the province was a formidable one, not only because of the changes in population and land-holding caused by the defeat of the Dacians and the large influx of settlers from other parts of the empire, but also because it was to be made an important bulwark of defence against the peoples beyond. Thus it called for one of Trajan's ablest men. Scaurianus governed the province from as early as August A.D. 106 till at least July 110.<sup>107</sup> Yet what became of him later was unknown, except that an altar from Dura-Europos with the inscriptions θεοῦ Σασσάδου εὐξάμενος Σκαυριανὸς Μαξιμίμου suggested he was with Trajan in the East at the time of the Parthian War.<sup>108</sup> Our inscription without doubt

<sup>99</sup> Dio 68, 14, 3; *Fasti Ostienses* ad A.D. 106: 'Decebali [caput . . . in scallis Gemoni[is] iacuit].' The form *Decebalus* is found more often than the form *Decibalus* on Latin inscriptions, cf. A. Stein, *PIR*<sup>3</sup> III, 4 f. Contra: A. Degrossi, *Inscr. It.* XIII, p. 226.

<sup>100</sup> Cf. *AE* 1956, 124: 'ab imp(eratore) Antonino Aug(usto) coram laudato et equo et phaleris et armis donato, quod manu sua ducem Naristarum Valaonem interemisset.'

<sup>101</sup> Cf. Livy 3, 57, 9: 'emeritis etiam stipendiis pars magna voluntariorum ad nomina danda praesto fuere'. For a full discussion of the various meanings of the term *voluntarius*, see Kraft, *Rekrutierung* 87-95.

<sup>102</sup> G. Alföldy, 'Zur Beurteilung der Militärdiplome der Auxiliarsoldaten', *Historia* 17 (1968), 215-27, makes the point that the actual duration of service in the *auxilia* was fixed at 25 years by Trajan in his later years. His evidence needs to be supplemented by the data known for the *equites singulares Augusti* (29 and 27 years as late as A.D. 138, cf. Speidel, o.c. (above, n. 5), 7) and for the *cohors XX Palmyrenorum* (27 and 26 years in A.D. 219, cf. R. O. Fink, o.c. (n. 55), 33) as well as by individual tombstones like *CIL* III, 14217, 34 (34 years) or Dessau, 9492 (*equus legionis*, 35 years).

<sup>103</sup> Cf. Kraft, *Rekrutierung* 82-100. Kraft objected

to Mommsen's theory that the *cohortes voluntariorum* were recruited by Augustus from former slaves (Macrobius, *Sat.* I, 11, 32). One would wonder in that case why Augustus left them the same legacy as the legionaries received (Tac., *Ann.* I, 8). Mommsen's view is upheld by U. Schillinger-Häfele, 'Eine neue Inschrift aus Stettfeld, Ldkrs. Bruchsal', *Badische Fundberichte* 22 (1962), 85-8, on the grounds that otherwise the *cohortes ingenuorum* could not be explained. See also A. Neumann, *RE* Suppl. IX, 886-90, s.v. *voluntarii*.

<sup>104</sup> See the list of *cohortes voluntariorum* in C. Cichorius, *RE* VI, 351-6, s.v. *cohors*.

<sup>105</sup> Mommsen-Nesselhauf, *CIL* XVI, p. 161.

<sup>106</sup> *CIL* XVI, 57 = Dessau, 2004; XVI, 160; XVI, 163; *CIL* III, 1443; III, 1081 = Dessau, 3594. The date of his consulate is lacking. For a sketch of what is known about him see E. Groag, *RE* VA, 669-72. Also R. Syme, l.c. (n. 68). For the earlier career of Scaurianus, Syme adduces *CIL* XII, 3169, and Groag *CIL* III, 14387; see below, note 118.

<sup>107</sup> *CIL* XVI, 160, 163. That he was the first governor is probable, but for a possible doubt see Syme, l.c.

<sup>108</sup> P. V. C. Baur and M. I. Rostovtzeff, *The Excavations at Dura-Europos, Third Season, Preliminary Report* (1932), 60 = *CRAI* 1930, 272. cf. E. Groag, l.c.

refers to the same D. Terentius Scurianus, the only *consularis* of this name.<sup>109</sup> If our restoration is correct, he is described as commander of consular rank in a province the

name of which is lost. All that remains is —NOV which must read *nov[ae]*:<sup>110</sup> Scurianus, then, was commander in a new province.

Trajan had added five provinces to the empire: Dacia, Arabia, Armenia, Mesopotamia, Assyria.<sup>111</sup> Maximus' discharge, however, came after service in the Parthian War, that is in A.D. 114/115 at the earliest, and by that time neither Dacia nor Arabia, both conquered in 105/106, could still be called new. The province in question, therefore, must be one of the three conquered in the Parthian War: Armenia, Mesopotamia or Assyria.<sup>112</sup> Were the end of our inscription not missing, it would tell us in which of the three provinces Scurianus commanded; as it is, we cannot establish his province with certainty, though Mesopotamia seems most likely. Armenia was governed by L. Catilius Severus in A.D. 116<sup>113</sup> and in all likelihood he had been there since 114, thus being the first and only governor of that province.<sup>114</sup> Assyria (Babylonia), conquered only in 116 and lost soon after (it was given up to Parthamaspatēs, the Parthian client King), was so short-lived as a province that there was hardly time or occasion to discharge soldiers from an *exercitus Assyriae*—if one ever existed. Mesopotamia, on the other hand, was conquered partly in 114 and consolidated in 115; there was time to build roads, complete with milestones, and to erect triumphal arches.<sup>115</sup> Thus Maximus could have been discharged in A.D. 115, when the military situation was favourable.

The title given to Scurianus, *consularis exercitus provinciae*, if correct, is puzzling. *Consularis* is the unofficial, popular term for *legatus Augusti pro praetore*,<sup>116</sup> but one would expect *consularis provinciae*, governor of the province, not just commander of the provincial army. The unusual command lends itself to different interpretations: either the presence of the emperor removed the need for the judicial and other duties of the governor,<sup>117</sup> or Scurianus headed at the time another province,<sup>118</sup> commanding the army of the new province in addition,<sup>119</sup> or finally and most likely, the new province was not yet fully established, but a garrison was already assigned and put under the command of the man designated to be the future governor.<sup>120</sup> In any case, the command of the army of Mesopotamia or Assyria or Armenia at this time was one of the most responsible tasks the emperor could confer on anyone. To Scurianus it meant the peak of his career, a repeated consular

<sup>109</sup> The only other Terentius of consular rank during Trajan's reign was Scurianus' son, D. Terentius Gentianus, for whom see E. Groag, *RE* v A, 656–62, s.v. Terentius.

<sup>110</sup> The reading *No[ricum]* is impossible, since the remnant of the last letter on the stone cannot belong to an R. Nor was Noricum ever a consular province.

<sup>111</sup> For evidence see R. Hanslik, *RE* Suppl. x, 1035–1102, s.v. M. Ulpius Traianus.

<sup>112</sup> For the conquest and subsequent loss of these provinces see F. A. Lepper, *Trajan's Parthian War* (1948), with bibliography, and the review of that work by M. I. Henderson, *JRS* 39 (1949), 121–32. 'Assyria' apparently was Babylonia, annexed as a province, as is argued persuasively by A. Maricq, 'La Province d'Assyrie, créée par Trajan', *Syria* 36 (1959), 254–63; cf. also Tacitus, *Ann.* 2, 62.

<sup>113</sup> *CIL* x, 8921 = Dessau, 1041; Dio 75, 9, 6 = Exc. Urb. 16. *PIR*<sup>2</sup> II, p. 127 f., n. 558 (*non vidi*).

<sup>114</sup> Thus Lepper, *op. cit.*, 208. For a doubt see R. Syme, *Tacitus* 1 (1958), 243.

<sup>115</sup> *AE* 1927, 161. S. Gould, *Dura-Reports* iv, 56 ff.

<sup>116</sup> See, e.g., A. Stein, *Die Reichsbeamten von Dazien* *cit.*, p. 54. A. Dobo, *Die Verwaltung der römischen Provinz Pannonien* (1968), pp. 41 and 129, quoting the inscription *Acta. Univ. Debr.* vi (1959/60), 201 f. (Savaria) of L. Neratius Priscus, *cos.* (A.D. 103–6)—which shows, together with our inscription, that the title was already in use in Trajanic time.

<sup>117</sup> Thus, E. Ritterling, 'Die Statthalter der

pannonischen Provinzen' (*Arch. -Ep. Mitth.* 20 (1897)), 2–40, conceived of the generals under Agrippa or Tiberius as *legati pro praetore exercitus*.

<sup>118</sup> Syria? See E. Groag, *RE* v A, 669–72. *CIL* III, 14387 d = *AE* 1934, 177 could indeed refer to Scurianus. The best edition of this inscription remains that by A. v. Premerstein, 'C. Iulius Quadratus Bassus, Klient des jüngeren Plinius und General Trajans' (*SB Bayer. Akad. Wiss., Phil. -hist. Abt.* 1934), 51 f. The edition by J. P. Rey-Coquais, *IGLS* vi, 2775, is seriously defective.

<sup>119</sup> As L. Vitrasius Flamininus may have done, *CIL* x, 3870: 'leg. pr. pr. Italiae Transpadanae et provinciae Moesiae superioris et exercitus provinciae Dalmatiae'; cf. J. Fitz, 'Contribution à la carrière d'un proconsul d'Afrique', *Latomus* 27 (1968), 45–74.

<sup>120</sup> J. Guey, *Essai sur la guerre parthique de Trajan* (1937) 78 f., ingeniously interprets the coin legend *Armenia et Mesopotamia in potestatem p. R. redactae*, as referring to this status (more than *capta*, less than a *provincia*) with a reference to P. Strack, *Untersuchungen zur römischen Reichsprägung* 1 (Stuttgart, 1931), 223 (*non vidi*). A less likely possibility would be that Mesopotamia was already lost, and its army on the retreat in Syria in A.D. 117. The two Germanies, before they were formally constituted as provinces by Domitian (see E. Stein, *op. cit.* (n. 74), 10 f.), were likewise governed by *legati consularis exercitus*; the difference is, however, that Scurianus is here (incorrectly?) called *consularis exercitus provinciae*.

command for a *vir militaris* being as glorious as an iterated consulate or the proconsulate of Asia and Africa.<sup>121</sup> In settling the new province, Scaurianus' formidable experience in successfully creating the new province of Dacia would have been very valuable.

Before this, Scaurianus was perhaps *comes Traiani* and commander of some section of the expeditionary army, which included units familiar to him from his Dacian command, such as the *ala II Pannoniorum*, which must then have been assigned to his new province. What became of him afterwards is not known for certain, but a conjecture may be permitted. On the inscription from Dura-Europos, mentioned above, he is named 'son of Maximus'. Polyonymy being common, *Maximus* may well have been part of Scaurianus' own name. Thus he may be that mysterious 'consularis vir exercitum ducens', known only as Maximus, who lost battle and life defending Mesopotamia against the Parthian counter-attack in A.D. 116.<sup>122</sup>

*University of Hawaii, Honolulu*

<sup>121</sup> R. Syme, 'Governors of Pannonia Inferior', *Historia* xvi (1965), 359.

<sup>122</sup> Dio 68, 30. Fronto, ed. Haines 2, 22. Fronto, *Princ. Hist.* 16. Perhaps the name Scaurianus underlies the 'mindestens sechs ziemlich schattenhafte Buchstaben' read in Fronto, *Princ. Hist.*, 16 as *SANTRA* by E. Hauler, 'Zu Frontos Principia historiae', *Wiener Studien* 38 (1916), 166-75. But cf. R. Syme, o.c., 347 for other available candidates.

Scaurianus could even have been identical with the general Maximus of the First Dacian War who captured Decebalus' sister (Dio 68, 9, 4). If he lived on, Hadrian may have reckoned him among the hostile marshals, no longer entrusting him with a great command, just as his son, D. Terentius Gentianus, went without an armed province: *CIL* III, 1463 = Dessau, 1046. cf. R. Syme, *Tacitus* I, 245, n. 7.