

<https://doi.org/10.71390/arctos.162335>

CHIARA CENATI: *Miles in Urbe: Identità e autorappresentazione nelle iscrizioni dei soldati di origine danubiana e balcanica a Roma*. Epigrafia e Antichità 49. Carocci editore, Roma 2023. ISBN 978-99-290-1875-8. 501 pp. EUR 55.10.

This book is the result of a “rielaborazione” of a doctoral thesis which the author, who has already published extensively on Latin epigraphy, often (but not solely) with a focus on metrical inscriptions and on the Balkans, defended at the University of Vienna in 2020. This study covers the first three centuries (p. 13), Late Antiquity thus being excluded. By “Danubian and Balkanic” lands the author means Raetia, Noricum, the Pannonias, the Moesias, Dacia, Dalmatia, Thracia and Macedonia (p. 16f.), and with the addition of “a Roma” the author indicates that the inscriptions she is going to study are those from the city of Rome (for an exception in Ch. III, 3.8 see below). The identities of (say) Thracian soldiers attested outside the capital are thus not the object of this study, and it must be admitted that there is a point in concentrating on just Rome with its abundant epigraphic material. And although there may not have been much in common between soldiers recruited from Dalmatian cities in the first century and semi-barbarians recruited from (say) Thrace in the third, this book is in any case an interesting contribution to the study not only of the soldiers of the NE origin based in the capital but also of the garrison of Rome in general.

The book consists in the main of two chapters. The first of them (I, p. 23–85) could be described as introductory, for it includes e.g. observations on the sources and the army units based in Rome in general. The second chapter (II, p. 89–244) consists of an analysis of the material. This is followed by a short chapter (III, p. 245–252) with the author’s conclusions, this chapter being in turn followed by a substantial epigraphic catalogue, where the relevant texts are cited in full (IV, p. 253–370). The catalogue contains 438 texts, numbered “C1” (“C” apparently standing for “Catalogo”) etc., and 33 uncertain or excluded items, numbered “Incl” etc. I shall return to the catalogue below. Finally, there are appendices (V, p. 371–410) listing material aspects and the findspots of the inscriptions (1), the inscriptions that are addressed to various deities (2) and the inscriptions that include biometric details (age at death, length of military service) (3). At the end of the book there is, as one would expect, a bibliography and an index.

The attribution of a Danubian-Balkan origin to a soldier is based not only on mentions of *patriae* (e.g. *Dober(o)* in C1) but also on the soldiers’ names (e.g. *Mucianus* and *Diza* in C2). There is no section devoted to a discussion of how to define a particular name as Danubian or Balkanic, but there is some relevant material on this aspect in sub-section 1.11. of Ch. II on soldiers for whom an *origo* is not attested (see below).

The contents of the book are set out in some detail in the “Indice”, p. 7–9. But within the chapters and sub-chapters registered there are many sections, some of them of great interest, which the reader can only find by browsing through the book. For instance, in Ch. I, the sub-chapter on the history of the army based in Rome (3.1., p. 43ff.) contains sections on the praetorian and the urban cohorts, the *vigiles*, the marines, the *frumentarii* and the *speculatores*, etc. The sub-chapter on Danubian soldiers (3.3., p. 60ff.; “Danubian” is here and elsewhere used as a general term for soldiers from all of the regions mentioned above) is divided into sections on *evocati* and *veterani Augusti*, on the status of the praetorians and on that of the *equites singulares* before the *constitutio Antoniniana*, on tribes and “pseudo-tribes”, on the legal status of the *classarii*, on the careers of praetorians and *equites singulares*, and, finally, on Danubian soldiers among the *vigiles*.

Chapter II begins with section 1 on the recruitment of the soldiers, both from a geographical point of view (starting with sub-section 1.1. on Raetia, p. 89ff.) and from that of the various modalities of the recruitment process. An interesting sub-section is 1.11. (p. 129ff.) on soldiers for whom a *patria* is not attested, for this sub-section deals essentially with the soldiers’ names. As Thracian names are normally easy to identify, soldiers of Thracian origin dominate here; but a few names can be identified as Norican or Illyrican or (perhaps) Raetian (nn. 343, 344, 353; *Petiganus* in *CIL VI* 31182, cited on p. 132, is, however, surely an erroneous reading of **Peticanus* and an Italic nomen comparable to *Rasticanus Ruficanus* etc.). Section 2 of this chapter deals with cults attested for the soldiers, taking into account also the topography of the cultic monuments (2.1., p. 154ff.). At the end, there a few pages on Christianity (2.10., p. 196ff.).

Section 3 is on “social relations and processes of intergration”. Here we find sub-sections on the locations of the funerary inscriptions of the soldiers, on their social networks and on their families, etc. There is also, for instance, a short sub-section (3.3.) on the age and length of service of soldiers as defined in their (funerary) inscriptions, and another (3.8.) on veterans returning to their home provinces. This is obviously a section in which inscriptions from Rome are of no use, and it is here (and only here) that many provincial inscriptions, and of course also military diplomas, are referred to.

A chapter (Ch. III, p. 245ff.) containing general conclusions is followed by the epigraphic catalogue (Ch. IV, p. 255ff.), consisting, as mentioned above, of about 450 items (for some corrections note the author’s papers in *Epigraphica* 84 (2022) 563ff., and *ZPE* 226 (2023) 207ff.). The catalogue is divided into four sections: honorific inscriptions (1, p. 256ff.), votive inscriptions (2, p. 263ff.), fragments of uncertain nature (3, p. 307f.) and funerary inscriptions (4, p. 308ff.). Long lists of soldiers’ names appear in sections 1 and 2. It might have been a good idea to assemble all name lists, whether honorific or votive (and there is in fact not a great difference between the two), in one section, and the inscriptions set up by just one or two soldiers in others. In any case, in sections 1 and

2 at least the name lists seem to have been arranged chronologically. In section 4 the arrangement is by province, beginning with Raetia. All inscriptions except *CIL* VI 1058, even long lists of names, are cited in full. In order to save space, the author could have considered quoting only those passages which mention Danubian soldiers, but I must admit that there is a point in citing the complete texts, for especially in the case of name lists this gives the reader a picture of the frequency of “Danubian” soldiers, as either their *patriae* or the “Danubian” items within their names are printed in bold. One could argue about a name or two which the author has classified as “Danubian”, for instance about the cognomen *Macedo* in C31. And could the cognomen *Caristianus* in C22 not have been simply derived from *Caristius*, a nomen attested in Sutrium, *CIL* XI 3254? However, there does not seem to be a point in entering into details that are after all minor. Instead, let me observe that the author should perhaps have considered adding a specification of the unit in question – praetorians, *vigiles*, etc. – in the headings of at least the name lists, as the area of recruitment may have been influenced by the nature of the unit in question. The years of the consular dates could also have been explained. In any case, it is important to note that the catalogue includes many inscriptions that do not appear in the standard collections – *CIL*, *AE*, etc. – and which may thus be less familiar to interested scholars (note e.g. C71, quoted from an archaeological publication that has not necessarily been consulted by historians).

I observed some small errors, but let me note only the following. In C38, some of the references (*AE* 1935, 156, etc.) are wrong and seem to have been taken over from C36. In C79 (*CIL* VI 32638), fragment c–d, line 6 a man is said to have had the tribe “*Cal(udia)*” and this is explained on p. 293 as being a mistake for *Cla(udia)*; but the man is from Compsa, the inhabitants of which were in the tribe *Galeria*, and surely *Cal.* is thus an erroneous reading for *Gal(eria)*. In the same text, l. 67, the *patria* of C. Valerius C. f. Cla. Masculinus *Cael.* is probably *Caelia* in the Italian region II rather than *Celeia* in Noricum, as suggested by Cenati. The inhabitants of both cities were in any case in the *Claudia* tribe.

But these are matters of minor interest, and I can thus conclude by observing that this is a useful contribution to the study of “Danubian” soldiers based in Rome in the military garrison of the capital, but more generally also to the study of the recruitment of soldiers from the northeastern provinces of Rome.

Olli Salomies
University of Helsinki