Anatolica 33, 129-142. doi: 10.2143/ANA.32.0.2012551

ANATOLICA XXXIII, 2007

A CENTURION AND HIS SLAVE. A Latin Epitaph from Western Anatolia in the Rijksmuseum van Oudheden, Leiden

Julian Bennett[1]

Introduction

Among the items displayed in the Greek and Roman Antiquities section of the Rijksmuseum van Oudheden, Leiden, is a Latin epitaph that was bought in Smyrna (İzmir) in 1889 by a private collector and subsequently acquired on behalf of the museum by Conrad Leemans (Fig. 1).[2] The epitaph is carved on a slab of marbleized limestone with a face measurement of 30 x 32 cm. and an overall thickness of 4 cm. except towards the top, where a cantilevered upper margin 5 cm high terminates in a flat vertical border that is 4.5 cm. thick. The serif lettering used for the text of the epitaph is competently and finely carved, demonstrating a familiarity with the Latin script (although a letter is missing from one word), with characters that vary slightly in height between 2.3-2.4. The text reads:

Senilis · Q(uinti) · Atti · /
Celeris · (centurionis) leg(ionis) · IIII · /
Scyt<h>icae · servos [·] /
vixit · ann(os) · XX

In free paraphrase this may be translated as: 'Senilis, the slave of Quintus Attius Celer, a centurion in the *legio IIII Scythica*: he lived 20 years'. A date for the epitaph in the period *c*. AD 50-100 is suggested by two items of chronological value: the inclusion in the text of Celer's full *tri nomina*; and the lavish superscript tails supplied for the 'Y' in '*Scyticae*' and the 'X' in '*vixit*'.

Somewhat surprisingly, this text seems to have escaped notice by those scholars responsible for compiling the standard epigraphic corpora at the turn of the 19th and early 20th centuries. This lapse is even more extraordinary given that the inscription is noteworthy of wider interest in three specific ways. In the first place, it provides us with the name of a further centurion of the *legio IIII Scythica,* whose origins and period of military service can be established with a fair degree of certainty, thus making it of especial value with regard to the prosopographical record for the officers and men of that unit. Secondly, it supplies us with further textual information concerning slave ownership

[1] Department of Archaeology and Art History, Bilkent University.

[2] Inv. no. LKA 1153.

among members of the Roman army, a subject that has not received the attention it deserves. Finally, it forms a welcome addition to the limited number of Latin inscriptions recorded from Smyrna – if, that is, it does indeed come from that place. Before going any further, therefore, it is necessary to explore the matter of its original provenance.

The Epitaph's Provenance

The museum's records regarding the epitaph note that it was one of a group of ten inscriptions originally purchased at Smyrna in 1889 by Alfred Oscar van Lennep (1851-1913), the other nine all being Greek language funerary texts.[3] Alfred was the last active member of what had been a highly successful Dutch mercantile dynasty originally established at Smyrna during the early 18th century by his great-grandfather, David George van Lennep.[4] Indeed, by the mid 19th century, the Smyrnaean branch of the Van Lennep family controlled one of the leading and richest trading family concerns of both late Ottoman Smyrna and the Levantine World, specialising mainly in silk but also dealing to a large extent in the burgeoning Anatolian opium trade. The family was also active and munificent benefactors to their community: Alfred's own father, Charles David, for example, was highly prominent among those who sponsored and oversaw the construction of the great quay at Smyrna in 1867-75.[5] Consequently it comes as no surprise to learn that the successive heads of the family were customarily made resident Dutch Consul General for Smyrna and Anatolia, even though in Alfred's case he spoke no Dutch at all:[6] one can only assume this was the inevitable result of growing up in a family and society of expatriates who mutually favoured one or more of the usual international *lingua franca* over their own less widely-spoken native tongue.

As was common practice among the European trading community of 19th century Anatolia, the Van Lennep family embraced the pastime of antiquities collecting, with the significant difference that those so involved in this activity applied a skilled and critical eye towards the material that passed under their gaze. Indeed, their collection was of sufficient international importance that the Van Lennep name often occurs in the standard

[3] I am indebted to Dr R. Halbertsma, of the Rijksmuseum van Oudheden, Leiden for providing relevant details from the museum's records and for granting permission to publish the inscription. I also thank Professor A.R. Birley, for his valued comments on the text of the epitaph, and for providing many additional references (although he is of course blameless for the contents of this article). In addition, I thank B. Claasz Coockson, J. Morin, and T. Zimmerman, who provided invaluable assistance in certain ancillary but important matters; and J. Roodenberg, for his perceptive suggestions on how to improve the original draft of this article.

[4] The available information on the Smyrnaean branch of the Van Lennep family is somewhat contradictory, and I follow here a genealogy prepared by B. de Diesbach Belleroche, of Fribourg, with the assistance of the family's present-day descendants in the UK, the USA, and the Netherlands.

[5] For the family's connection with the opium trade: Schmidt 1998, Chapter 4; and for the Smyrna Quay project: Zandi-Sayek 2000.

[6] Cf. Gertrude Bell Archive, letter dated 3 March 1902 (www.gerty.ncl.ac.uk/letters): "The Van Lenneps are most kind … [but] They talk no tongue properly – Greek the best, I expect; English with the funny little clipped intonation of the Levant and French very fluently and uglily [*sic*].... Mr V.L. is Dutch by nationality, but he has never been to Holland, speaks no Dutch among his many languages and sees none of his European cousins."

epigraphic and numismatic publications of the late 19th and early 20th centuries,[7] and so it was doubtless inevitable that some of their acquisitions, such as the text we are concerned with here, should pass to the Rijksmuseum van Oudheden at Leiden.[8] Unfortunately, however, it seems that some of the family's members were not as careful or as thorough as they perhaps might have been when it came to the matter of establishing an accurate provenance for the items that came into their possession, for it has been shown that the declared original location of some of these artifacts is 'dubious and sometimes definitely incorrect'.[9] Consequently, even though Alfred Oscar at least was generally conscientious in his record keeping regarding an item's provenance,[10] we need to enquire more closely into the apparent provenance of the inscription we are concerned with here.

Such an enquiry must take as its starting point the simple observation that certain of the items in the Van Lennep collection, such as our inscription, were obtained from the local antiquities dealers of their home-town Smyrna. The problem is that by the mid 19th century, Smyrna had become "the centre" for the growing Anatolian antiquities trade.[11] One unfortunate result of this development was that the precise origin of many of the objects on sale at Smyrna to western collectors was quite likely to have been either forgotten or even unknown at the time of sale: and it was perhaps inevitable that if a local dealer was even questioned on the matter in such cases, he could quite austerely and emphatically name the first place that came to his mind, namely 'Smyrna' or some other site in the general region. Thus one explanation for why the alleged Smyrnaean provenance of some objects in the Van Lennep collection is 'definitely incorrect',[12] and from which it follows that at least certain of the other artifacts they assigned to or bought in Smyrna – such as the epitaph that forms the main subject of this article - may have well have come from somewhere else.

On the other hand, while it is true that the contemporary antiquities trade in Turkey did see some artifacts of exceptional aesthetic and extrinsic value journey travel considerable distances from their findspot to their initial point of sale,[13] it seems inherently unlikely that this was the case with our epitaph. After all, to all intents and purposes this is just yet another everyday inscription from classical Anatolia, albeit in Latin as opposed to the more usual Greek. When we consider that hundreds of such items still litter the classical sites of Anatolia, and that they were even more numerous – and more easily accessible – to those who collected such pieces in the region in the later 19th

[7] Pleket 1958, x-xi; and Cross 1996, 188 with n.5.

[8] Cf. Pleket 1958, x-xi, with further references. Not all of the items Van Lennep dispatched to the Rijksmuseum van Oudheden arrived safely at Leiden: see Cross 1996, and Özet 2003, 139-143.

[9] Cf. Pleket 1958, with Woodward 1959, 194.

[10] Pleket 1958, xiii; cf. Cross 1996, 191; and Özet 2003, 140-143.

[11] Cf. Pleket 1958, xiii.

[12] As note 9.

[13] As was the case, for example, with the superlative head of Aphrodite that was found at Satala in Armenia Minor but sold in İstanbul, and which is now in the British Museum: cf. Mitford 1974, especially 236.

century, we can safely assume that our inscription is more likely than not to have come from somewhere in western Anatolia. In which case it is unfortunate that it is carved on a slab of the dark grey marbleized limestone commonly used for funerary memorials in several parts of that region: in other words, without a detailed petrological examination, nothing can be said concerning where it might have been quarried. As a result, although the material used is visually similar to many other lapidary works on display at Smyrna, we must set against this observation the fact that Latin texts form only 5% of the nearly 1,000 or so classical-period inscriptions that are presently known from that place. On balance, therefore, the putative Smyrnaean provenance of this text has to be treated with a certain amount of scepticism, and we will content ourselves here with ascribing its original findspot to 'somewhere in western Anatolia'.

The Centurion…

The *nomen* and *cognomen* of our centurion suggest that he most probably originated in the Celtic parts of Western Europe. The *nomen* Attius, for example, apparently the Celticised version of an Italian name initially found in Etruria, is well recorded in Cisalpine Gaul and in Gallia Narbonensis.[14] The *cognomen* Celer, for 'quick' or 'nimble', is also especially common in Northern Italy and almost equally so in Iberia, although it occurs less frequently in Gallia Narbonensis.[15] As it is, given the period during which our Celer must have served with the Roman legions, an origin in either Cisalpine Gaul, Gallia Narbonensis, or Iberia, might in any case be expected for him, for prosopographical analysis reveals that until *c*. AD 100, a majority of Rome's legionary recruits came from those regions.[16] Indeed, the *nomen* Attius is to be found in its greatest concentration among serving legionaries of 1st and early 2nd century date in the Romanised areas of Celtic Europe. Consider, for example, Moguntiacum (Mainz) in Germania Superior, where we find Q. Attius Rufus of the *legio I Adiutrix*; L. Attius Nepos and C. Attius Maxsimus of the *IIII Macedonica*; and Attius Atrectus of the *XXII Primigenia*.[17] Moreover, analysis demonstrates that a large proportion of Celer's broadly contemporary colleagues in the *legio IIII Scythica* came from either Italy or from the immediately adjacent Romanised parts of Celtic Europe, most of them presumably having worked their way up through the ranks on merit alone.[18] There is, however, only one other record of a legionary with the same *nomen* and *cognomen* as our man, namely the

[14] For Attius as a Romanised version of a 'Celtic' name, and its distribution, cf. Weisberger 1968, 248-249; Dondin-Payre and Raepsaet-Charlier 2001, 359, 361, 409, 418 and 440; Schulze 1904, 68, 228 and 423; and Lõrincz and Redõ 2005, 90-91, with 299 Atti, 168 from Narbonensis and North Italy.

[15] Kajanto 1965, 248; and Lõrincz and Harl 1999, 47, with 158 Celer, 44 from North Italy and 36 from Iberia, but only 11 from Narbonensis.

[16] Mann 1983, 49-51, esp. 50.

[17] Rufus: *CIL* 13.6828; Nepos: *CIL* 13.6853; Maxsimus: *CIL* 13.11848; Atrectus: *CIL* 13.6994.

[18] Speidel 1998, 165-66, with 171 and 198: but see Bennett, in press, for a centurion of Flavian date in the *IIII Scythica* who most probably came from Ancyra, and another of the Flavian-Trajanic period who perhaps came from Cappadocian Caesarea.

centurion Attius Celer (*praenomen* unknown), who is reported on a building stone of probable Trajanic date from Deva (Chester) in Britannia, in which case he was most probably serving with the *legio XX Valeria Victrix* at the time[19] In fact, this man could just possibly be the same person as the Attius Celer on the Leiden inscription, for as we have seen, the Leiden text can be dated to the later 1st century, and it was not that uncommon for centurions to be transferred from one legion to another.

Whether or not we are dealing with the same two men is not especially relevant here, and in any case, it is impossible to prove one way or the other. On the other hand, if we are to place the Leiden inscription into its wider context, it is important to know something about the whereabouts of the *legio IIII Scythica* in the period the text belongs to, and fortunately, a variety of inscriptions and literary sources provide us with a wealth of information on this particular matter.[20] Thus, for example, the legion was certainly a part of the Moesian garrison in the 30's, when it was most probably based at Naissus (Niš).[21] It remained there until 56/57, when it was transferred to Syria in response to the developing crisis between Rome and Parthia over the matter of the Armenian succession. By the Flavian period, and probably from as early as 65/66, when the dispute over Armenia was resolved in Rome's favour, the *IIII Scythica* had established its official headquarters at Zeugma in Syria. Epigraphic and literary sources confirm that Zeugma remained the official headquarters for the legion until at least 249. However, the lack of any evidence for a purpose-built legionary fortress of the usual type at Zeugma itself suggests that many of its members were seconded on detached duty to several other localities. These certainly included the quarries at Arulis, for some detachments were apparently employed on an almost permanent basis there,[22] while others were probably billeted on the local civilian population throughout the region, a common practice in the east.[23] Finally, although not strictly relevant to this discussion, it remains to note that the legion is last heard of at Oresa (Tayibeh) in Syria, in the 390's, presumably having been posted there during the military reforms of Diocletian.

It might seem at first sight from this brief review that the most likely circumstance for Celer's presence in western Anatolia was that he and the *IIII Scythica* were transported to the region by ship in the initial stage of the unit's transfer from Moesia to the east in 56/57. After all, the Roman army did on occasion move whole armies this way, as was the case with the invasion of Britannia in 43, and so it is perfectly feasible that this may have been the case with a single legion. Indeed, the best explanation for the *legio V*

[19] *RIB* 471.

[20] Speidel 1998, 165-167 (cf. *ibid* 2000, 329-331) and 175-176.

[21] Cf. Mócsy 1974, 44, with further references, although Scupi (Skopje) cannot be excluded.

[22] Cf. Speidel 1998, 168.

[23] The regularity with which the Roman army in the east billeted troops on civilian homes is attested in a sermon on virginity allegedly delivered by Basil of Ancyra: *Liber de Vera Virginitatis Integritate* 700d-701a (= *PG* 30, 669-810). For other literary evidence for the practice, see Lib. *Or*. 47, *De patrociniis* (referring to soldiers billeted in groups of villages in the territory of Antioch) and Veg. *Ep.rei Milit*. 3.8.1 (on how an army unit might be based in an urban centre).

Macedonica 'languishing' in Pontus in 61/62, at a later stage in Nero's eastern campaigns, was that it had been directly dispatched there from its permanent home at Oescus (Gigen) on the Middle Danube in Moesia.[24] However, the fact is that when a legion was moved from one base to another, the usual practice was for it to march overland by the shortest route possible. In which case, we might expect that the transfer of the *IIII Scythica* from Moesia to the east involved an initial march from Naissus to Byzantion via the road that directly connects these two places, and then a second trek along the route across northern Anatolia by way of Ancyra, the usual itinerary taken by those armies travelling to the eastern frontier in the imperial period.[25]

Having effectively excluded the possibility that Celer may have been in western Anatolia in connection with the transfer of the *IIII Scythica* from Moesia to the east, then his presence there during the second half of the 1st century can best be explained in one of two ways. The first is that he was a veteran who was passing through or who had settled thereabouts at the time that his slave Senilis died. Indeed, some might think his ownership of a slave would directly point to such a conclusion, although as will be shown, slave ownership was certainly not incompatible with military status in the imperial Roman army. That aside, it could, of course, be immediately objected that Celer is in any case unlikely to have been a veteran simply because the inscription does not describe him as such. There again, it seems to have been the case that legionary centurions generally held on to their rank in retirement, just as senior officers in the British and American military often do so today. Such might be deduced from the comparatively numerous funerary texts recording men with the rank but who were of such an age at death that makes it highly improbable that they were on active duty at the time. More tellingly, however, there is apparently no single and undisputed example of a tombstone – or any other inscription for that matter – that describes a legionary centurion as a veteran.[26]

Nonetheless, while it has to be conceded that we cannot entirely dismiss the possibility that Celer was in western Anatolia simply because he was a veteran who chose to settle there on retirement, there are good reasons for doubting that this may have been the case. To begin with, it does, on the face of it, seem highly unlikely that a time-served legionary centurion who originally came from the Romanised parts of Celtic Europe should make his home in a predominately Greek-speaking Anatolian *polis* such as Smyrna or its neighbours, even though Roman citizen communities are known to have existed in some urban centres in the region.[27] Indeed, the fact is that as far as it can be

[24] Tac. *Ann.* 15.9 and 26.

[25] See for example those inscriptions recording the march through Ancyra of troops on their way east in 114/115 for Trajan's Parthian War, and that marking their return on their way west in 117, with Hadrian at their head: Bosch 1967, 122-130, nos. 105 and 106, and 141-147, no. 117.

[26] Cf. Richier 2004, 112. There are, nonetheless, a few rare cases in which retired auxiliary centurions are labeled in this way, as with *IDR* 3/2.366 and 369 = *CIL* 3.1471 and 1472, the tombstones of two different auxiliary centurions describing them as veterans.

[27] E.g., at Smyrna itself: cf. Q. Cassius Saturninus, *Romilia tribus, domo Smyrna*, a centurion of Trajanic date who served in the *IIII Scythica* and the *V Macedonica*: Speidel 1998, 188-189, no. 44.

demonstrated, those time-served legionaries who did not return to their hometown on leaving their legion chose to settle either at a veteran colony (at least until the early 2nd century, when these ceased to be created), or in the informal civil settlement (*canabae legionis*) that so often developed next to the headquarters of the legion they retired from.[28]

Consequently, we should look to the other likely explanation for Celer's presence in western Anatolia, namely that he was there in some official capacity while still on active service. If so, one possibility is that he had been seconded for duty with the appropriate provincial governor, for the legions often supplied centurions for this purpose. But it is clear that in such cases, then where there was no legion stationed in the province itself, as was the situation in all of Rome's western Anatolian territories, the usual practice was to supply a man from the closest available source. For example, when Pliny needed a legionary centurion for policing duty in Byzantion in Pontus and Bithynia, one was seconded from a legion in Moesia Inferior, the nearest province with a legionary garrison.[29] Likewise when the governor of Galatia required assistance of this kind, the men chosen for this duty invariably came from one of the two legions in the adjacent province of Cappadocia.[30]

In other words, we can conclude that Celer was most likely not on detached duty in western Anatolia. If a man of his rank and status was indeed required in the region for some kind of official purpose, then such a person would likely come from the legionary garrison of Moesia Inferior and most certainly not far-off Syria. Therefore, if Celer was in western Anatolia while still on active service, then this is more likely to have been while he was in transit to or from one or another place, most probably in the process of being transferred from one legion to a different one. Indeed, it is exceedingly tempting to muse on the possibility that our Celer was the same man as the centurion of that name who was serving in Deva with the *XX Valeria Victrix* in the Trajanic period, and conclude that he was in western Anatolia on his way to join his new post when Senilis died: if only that could be shown to be so.

…and his Slave

As might be expected, much less can be said about Celer's slave Senilis, except that as was usual for a slave he had a single name, followed on the epitaph by the names of his master in the genitive to show that Senilis 'belonged' to him. Consequently, just as would be the case with a wife or a child, the beginning of the inscription should be read in the sense of 'Senilis, who belongs to Q. Attius Celer', with the word '*servos*' (a common variant of the more correct *servus*) inserted after Celer's name to clarify the precise relationship between the two. Such aside, given that our Senilis was no more than 20 years old at the time of his death, some might think it somewhat odd that he bore a name that at

[28] Cf. Tac. *Ann* 14.27, and Mann 1983, 58-63.
[29] Pliny *Ep*. 10.77.
[30] Bennett, in press.

first sight seems to have been taken from a Latin word meaning 'old' or 'aged', or even 'old man'. In fact, while it is true that individual slaves were occasionally named on the basis of some mental ability or disability, or some other highly personal characteristic, the particular name 'Senilis' lacks any parallel amongst the 8,579 Latin or Latinised slave names recorded at Rome, the largest single assemblage of such names for the entire Roman Empire.[31]

In which case we might reasonably doubt that the name 'Senilis' was intended in an 'ageist' sense, and so an alternative explanation should be sought for its origins, most obviously that it is more likely than not to be the Latinisation of an autochthonous name that began with Sen-. This is a nominative prefix found in personal and tribal names and as a toponymic in Celticised Europe,[32] and so it follows that our slave Senilis was quite probably of 'Celtic' origin - and indeed our centurion Celer could well have bought him simply because they shared a common homeland, it being a common practice for soldiers to draw their personal slaves from among their own *ethnos*.[33] Yet while slaves were often regarded simply as a piece of property, mere *instrumenti genus vocale*, or 'talking tools', in the words of Varro,[34] the existence of this particular funerary text, with its record of Senilis' name and even his age at death, signifies a certain level of emotional attachment between our centurion and his slave. The epitaph, therefore, demonstrates something for which we have so little evidence in the literary record, the depth of feeling that a member of the Roman legions – a class of men not known for their success at making familial attachments - might feel for his personal slave, his closest daily companion, even though he was a man who came from an entirely different social class altogether.[35]

Slave Ownership in the Roman Army

Having shown that Celer was most probably still on active service at the time his slave Senilis died, it is logical to complete our discussion of this epitaph with a brief survey of the evidence available for slave-ownership among serving members of the Roman army. This is a subject that has been relatively ignored in studies of the Roman army,[36] although it can be said at the outset that in both the Republican and the Imperial periods, the Roman army was regularly provided with numbers of men (some of them certainly slaves) whose duties were to liberate the soldiers from a wide range of manual tasks while on campaign. These men are referred to in the literature by a variety of names, most usually as *calones* and *lixae*, although the terms *serviti*, *muliones* and *vexillarii* also

[31] Despite the popular belief that all Roman slaves had Greek names, five of the ten most common slave-names at Rome are Latin in origin, while the 8,579 Latin or Latinized slave names from the city comprise 8,579 (32%) of the 28,000 or so total: Solin 1996, 680.

[32] Cf. Holder 1904, cols. 1463-1504; also Weisberger 1968, 116, 179 and 185, and Dondin-Payre and Raepsaet-Charlier 2001, 641, and 645, for its use as a personal name. Lõrincz and Harl 2002, 66, show that the prefix Sen- is more common in Belgica and the Germanies, while 'Latin' *nomina* with the same root are known: e.g., Schulze 1904, 228, 'Senilius'.

[33] Speidel 1989, 246.

[34] Varro *Rerum Rustica* 1.17.1.

[35] On the general unsuitability of legionary veterans as family men, see Tac. *Ann.* 14.27.

[36] But note Welwei 1988, 81-112, and Speidel 1989.

occur.[37] Moreover, in addition to these generic names we occasionally find these men referred to by some ostensibly quite specific titles. Thus we find the occasional reference to the *σκενοφόραι* or *skenothorai*, groups of baggage-handlers who were also (it seems) responsible for managing the spare horses and the various beasts of burden found with a campaigning army.[38] Then there were the *ὑπασπισται*, or *upaspistai*, the 'shield-bearers', who may have also carried and supplied replacement weapons when a unit was involved in battle.[39] Finally there were those men designated as the *galearii*, the 'helmet-men',[40] who seem to be expressly associated with auxiliary cavalry troopers, indicating that they probably served as grooms, but who are also to be found in at least one legionary base, where they could have performed the same function with regard to the senior officers of the legion and that legion's small mounted element.[41]

What is not clear, however, is the precise civic status of any of the individuals and groups of men.[42] On the one hand, it does seem certain that some of them were state-owned slaves, as is most obviously probably so with those named as *serviti*:[43] on the other hand, those groups referred to by the other names may well have been slaves in some cases and state-employed civilians in others, while it seems that these terms might even on occasions be extended to cover simple camp-followers and sutlers. However, as already indicated, there has been hardly any research directed at understanding which of these groups was slave and which were free:[44] but neither, for that matter, has the issue of personal slave ownership by individual full-time members of Rome's armed forces been examined in any detail, even though there is a comparative abundance of literary and epigraphic evidence on the subject. More to the point, this is a topic that is especially germane to the question of whether or not Celer's ownership of a slave has any bearing at all on his military status at the time of Senilis' death.

[37] *Calones*: Livy 23.16.8; Caes *BG* 2.24.2, and *BC* 1.51.6; Tac. *Hist.* 2.87, and 3.33; and Suet *Galba* 20.2; *lixae*: Liv 23.16.8; Sal. *Jug*. 44.5; Caes *BA* 75.3; Tac. *Ann*. 2.62; Quint. *Inst*. 8.6.42; Suet. *Galba* 20.2; and Speidel 1980 and 1981; *serviti*: Caes *BA* 85-1-2; *muliones*: Caes *BG* 7.54; *vexillarii*: *De Munit. Cast.* 3 and 30 (see Petrikovits 1975, 47, for the interpretation of the term as used in this text to indicate non-military personnel).

[38] E.g., Jos. *BJ* 3.69 and 125, and 5.49; Dio 79.26.5-6.

[39] E.g., Dio 79.26.5-6.

[40] The term *galea* strictly means a helmet made of leather (cf. Isid. *Etym.* 18.14, with 19.21.3 and 30.5), but was presumably used for a helmet made of any type of material.

[41] E.g., Veg. *De Rei Milit*. 1.10 and 3.6; and Bagnall 1976, 17-18, with no. 18, 58-59; also Fink 1971, no. 9.4, 106-114, a 'duty roster' of the *legio III Cyrenaicia* in Egypt, dated to *c*. 90-96, which refers to a legionary whose duties included supervising the *galeariato*: the logical interpretation of the term is 'the place of the *galearii*', rather than the alternative 'the place where the helmets were kept', as legionaries (and auxiliaries) kept their field and parade kit with them: hence the *arma* or weapons store to be found in each troop section of a Roman army barrack block.

[42] Cf. Petrokovits 1975, 57-58.

[43] Cf. the group of slaves that Hadrian received while in Cappadocia in 129 for allocation 'to the camps' (*a Cappadociubus servitia castris profurtura suscepit: HA Had.* 13.7). These men were quite probably provided for serving the needs of the Roman army in that province, but it cannot be excluded that they were freed for direct enlistment into the *auxilia* to make up for a shortage of free-born volunteers: cf. the discussion in Bennett 2002, 306.

[44] Cf. note 35, above.

To begin with, it can be at once stated how contemporary legal texts demonstrate that the private ownership of slaves by serving members of the Roman army was not an uncommon practice. The *Digest*, for example, reports in one place a mid-2nd century decision that a soldier could have slaves as part of his *peculium*, his personal property.[45] The *Codex*, on the other hand, reports a law of Constantine of the year 326 stating that a cavalry recruit who supplied his own horse and slave (*servos*) should be immediately be promoted to the rank of *circitor* (patrol officer),[46] presumably as a reward for relieving the state from the obligation of having to supply him with a state-owned slave to serve as his groom. The *Codex* also supplies us with an edict of Theodosius, Honorius and Arcadius, dating to 406, and allowing slaves to volunteer for the army in return for their freedom and a financial reward for their masters, and which seems to have been especially aimed at those soldiers with personal slaves (*servi*) on the grounds that these men were already familiar with army life and the nature of warfare.[47] Indeed, personal slave ownership by members of the military evidently continued at least until the end of the 6th century: a military treatise of that date notes how those soldiers who could not afford their own slaves should be provided with these by the state, at the rate of one for every three or four soldiers.[48]

These legal and associated texts aside, epigraphy provides us with several examples of men in military service with personal 'servants' who were either certainly or probably of slave status. As it is, many of the proven cases are associated with auxiliary cavalrymen and the like, such as the slave Cronio, manumitted in the will of Antonius Silvanus of the *ala I Thracum Mauretana* in Aegyptus; the slave Victor, dignified in death with a tombstone erected by the trooper Numerianus of the *cohors I Asturum* in Britannia; and the 17 year old *servus* Privatus, whose death at Apamea in Syria was commemorated by the *eques singularis* Ulpius Verecundus.[49] It seems reasonable to assume from their owner's service status that these particular slaves were most likely employed as grooms. Indeed, there is a well-known series of figured tombstones for deceased Roman cavalrymen that show the dead man at rest or in battle, and with one or sometimes more attendants who can almost certainly be identified in this way because they are either holding his horse, or wearing or carrying his helmet (cf. the *galearii* reported above), or holding two or more spears or other weapons or even shields.[50] True, it has to be admitted that the precise status of the 'attendants' on these tombstones cannot be determined – except, that is, in a single case. This is the funerary text of the *eques singularis* M. Ulpius Maturis, who manumitted his two slaves Aelius and Quarto at the

[45] *Dig*. 49.17.6 (Ulpian).
[46] *Cod. Theod.* 7.22.2.2.
[47] *Cod. Theod.* 7.13.16.
[48] Maur. *Strat*. 1.2.70.
[49] Cronio: Riccobono 1943, 47; Victor: *RIB* 1064; Privatus: Speidel 1994, 375. For other cases associated with the *equites singulares Augusti*, cf. Speidel and Panciera 1989, 119-126.
[50] E.g., for *auxilia*: Galsterer 1975, nos. 246, 247, 253, 255, 256, and Selzer 1988, nos. 74, 86, 87, 88, 89, 91; and for the *equites singulares Augusti*: Speidel 1994, nos. 80, 83, 86.

time of his death, and whose memorial directly associates the name 'Quarto' with one of the attendants shown thereon.[51]

As might be expected, however, slave ownership by full-time serving members of the Roman military is best attested among those who had reached a higher-paid rank, akin to a section or company officer in a modern army, or who served in the ranks of the better-remunerated Urban Cohorts at Rome and the Praetorian Guard. After all, not only did these men have the disposable income to indulge in such luxuries in the first place, but they also had the spare cash to commemorate their slaves on their death if they so wished. That said, in some cases we actually learn of the facts of such slave ownership from monuments erected by the slaves themselves after manumission, while the literary record also provides the odd example. Sources of evidence apart, we might simply note here the two slaves owned by a centurion of an auxiliary cohort in Judaea;[52] the *optio* of the *legio IIII Flavia* who memorialized his freedman, a silversmith;[53] a centurion with the *legio XV Apollinaris* whose death was marked by an inscription erected by his freedman,[54] and one of the *legio V Macedonica*, similarly honoured by two of his;[55] and that centurion of the *legio IIII Flavia* who owned a minimum of nine slaves at the time of his death.[56] Several similar examples can be provided from among serving members of the Roman navy and, of course, amongst members of the Urban Cohorts and the Praetorian Guard.[57] However, all in all, the examples quoted make it abundantly clear that Celer's ownership of a personal slave is most certainly not incompatible with his inferred military status at the time of his slave's death.[58]

[51] *CIL* 6.3304 = Speidel 1994, 115-116.

[52] *Act. Apost.* 10.7.

[53] *CIL* 3.1652.

[54] French and Summerly 1987, 18-21, no. 3.

[55] Mitford 1988, no. 12, 176-178, with Strobel 1990, 39-42.

[56] *CIL* 3.8143.

[57] Examples in the navy are provided by Starr 1960, 82, with *CIL* 10.3354, 3355, 3401 and 3577. For examples among the Urban Cohorts, see Freis 1967, 52, with *CIL* 5.2388; and 6.2880 (= 2115), 2907 (= *ILS* 2110), 2935, and 2936; and 8.5230. And for examples among the Praetorian Guard, Durry 1938, 281 (noting that simple soldiers had one slave, while junior officers had two or more), with *CIL* 6.2532, 2634, 2656, 2726, 2743, 32664, and 32709.

[58] For other cases in which, as with Celer, the exact service status of a military slave-owner is not always clear see, e.g., *CIL* 13.11836; *SEG* 32.1276, and *SEG* 33.1188.

Bibliography

Bagnall, R.S., 1976 – The Florida Ostraca (Durham NC).

Bennett, J., 2002 – The Cappadocian Frontier: from the Julio-Claudians to Hadrian. In: Freeman et al., 2002, 301-312.

Bennett, J., in press – New Evidence from Ancyra for the *Collegia Veteranorum* and the *Albata Decursio*, *Anatolian Studies* 56 (2006).

Bosch, E., 1967 – Quellen zur Geschichte der Stadt Ankara im Altertum (Ankara).

Cross, R., 1996 – The Wreck of the S.S. Castor (1870-1894) and the Recovery of Part of the Ship's Cargo, *Archaeologia Cantiana* 116, 183-293.

Dondin-Payre, M., and M.-Th. Raepsaet-Charlier, 2001 – Noms, identités culturelles et romanisation sous le haut-empire (Brussels).

Durry, M., 1938 – Les cohortes prétoriennes (Paris),

Fink, R.O., 1971 – Roman Military Records on Papyrus (Cleveland).

Freeman, P.W., J. Bennett, Z.T. Fiema, and B. Hoffman, (eds.), 2002 – Limes XVIII (Oxford).

Freis, H., 1967 – Die Cohortes Urbane (Cologne).

French, D.H., and J.R. Summerly, 1987 – Four Latin Inscriptions from Satala, *Anatolian Studies* 37, 17-22.

Galsterer, B. and H., 1975 – Die römische Steininschriften aus Köln (Cologne).

Holder, A., 1904 – Alt-celtischer Sprachsatz II (Leipzig).

Kajanto, I., 1965 – The Latin Cognomina (Helsinki).

Kennedy, D. (ed.), 1998 – The Twin Towns of Zeugma on the Euphrates: rescue work and historical studies (Ann Arbor).

Le Bohec, Y., and C. Wolff, (eds.), 2000 – Les Légions de Rome sous le haut-empire (Paris).

Lõrincz, B., and O. Harl, (eds.), 2002 – Onomasticon Provinciarum Europae Latinarum IV (Vienna).

Lõrincz, B., and F. Redõ, (eds.), 2005 – Onomasticon Provinciarum Europae Latinarum I, (Vienna).

Mann, J.C., 1983 – Legionary Recruitment and Veteran Settlement During the Principate (London).

Mitford, T.B., 1974 – "Bilotti's Excavations at Satala", *Anatolian Studies* 24 (1974), 221-244.

Mitford, T.B., 1988 – Further Inscriptions from the Cappadocian Limes, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 71, 167-178.

Mócsy, A., 1974 – Pannonia and Upper Moesia (London).

Özet, M.A. (ed.), 2003 – Yitik Mirasın Dönüş Öylüsü (Ankara).

Petrikovits, H. von, 1975 – Die Innenbauten römischer Legionslager während des Prinzipatszeit (Opladen).

Pleket, H.W., 1958 – The Greek Inscriptions in the Rijksmuseum van Oudheden at Leyden (Leiden).

Richier, O., 2004 – Centuriones ad Rhenum. Les centurions légionnaires des armées romaines du Rhin (Paris).

Riccobono, S. (ed.), 1943 – Fontes iuris Romani antejustiniani III (Florence).

Schmidt, J., 1998 – From Anatolia to Indonesia: Opium Trade and the Dutch Community of Izmir, 1820–1940. PIHANS LXXXII (Istanbul and Leiden).

Schulze, W., 1904 – Zur Geschichte Lateinischer Eigennamen (Berlin).

Selzer, W., 1988 – Römische Steindenkmäler. Mainz in römischer Zeit (Mainz).

Solin, H., 1996 – Die stadtrömischen Sklavennamen. Ein Namenbuch I (Stuttgart).

Speidel, M.A., 1998 – Legio IIII Scythica, its movements and men. In: Kennedy 1998, 163-204.

Speidel, M.A., 2000 – Legio IV Scythica. In: Le Bohec and Wolff 2000, 327-337.

Speidel, M.P., 1980 – Lixa of the Third Thracian Cohort in Syria, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 38 (1980), 146-148 (= Speidel 1984, 203-205).

Speidel, M.P., 1981 – Marcus Titius, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 42 (1981), 272 (= Speidel 1984, 206-207).

Speidel, M.P., 1984 – Roman Army Studies I (Amsterdam).

Speidel, M.P., 1989 – The Soldier's Servants, *Ancient Society* 20 (1989), 239-248.

Speidel, M.P., 1994 – Die Denkmäler der Kaiserreiter (Bonn).

Speidel, M.P., and S. Panciera, 1989 – From the North and Black Sea Shores: two new gravestones for boys of the Equites Singulares Augusti, *Chiron* 19, 119-126.

Starr, C.G., 1960 – The Roman Imperial Navy 31 BC-AD 324 (Cambridge).

Strobel, K., 1990 – Ein neues Zeugnis für die Truppengeschichte des Partherkrieges Trajans, *Epigraphica Anatolica* 12 (1990), 39-42.

Zandi-Sayek, S., 2000 – Struggles over the Shore: building the quay of Izmir, 1867–1875, *City and Society* 12/1, 55-78.

Weisberger, J., 1968 – Die Namen Der Ubier (Cologne).

Welwei, K.-H., 1988 – Unfreie im antiken Kriegsdienst III: Rom (Stuttgart).

Woodward, A.M., 1959 – Review of Pleket 1958, *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 79 (1959), 194-196.

Figure 1. Inscription no. LKA 1153
at the Rijksmuseum van Oudheden, Leiden
(Drawing/Photo by B.Claasz Cookson)