

ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

VOL. XXVII

HELSINKI 1993 HELSINGFORS

INDEX

MAARIT KAIMIO	Henrik Zilliacus in memoriam	7
CHRISTER BRUUN	"Berichtigungsliste" to G. Forni's Posthumous New List of the Provenances of Roman Legionaries	11
MAARIT KAIMIO	The Protagonist in Greek Tragedy	19
IIRO KAJANTO	Analysis of a Verse <i>parentatio</i> : Johannes Ihre's Funeral Oration in Memory of Torsten Rudeen	35
WOLFGANG KUHOFF	Die Beziehungen des Römischen Reiches zum Volksstamm der Baquaten in Mauretanien	55
BENGT LÖFSTEDT	Weitere Notizen zu Justus Lipsius' Briefen	73
LEENA PIETILÄ-CASTRÉN	Incisioni e graffiti su ceramica a vernice nera di Ficana, settore 6b	79
OLLI SALOMIES	On the Interpretation of Epigraphical Filiations of the Type <i>L. f. f.</i>	95
JUHA SIHVOLA	Why Does Contemplation Not Fit Well into Aristotle's εὐδαιμονία?	103
HEIKKI SOLIN	Analecta epigraphica CL – CLIV	123
ASKO TIMONEN	Emperor's " <i>ars recusandi</i> " in Biographical Narrative	133
G. MICHAEL WOLOCH	Ammianus, Alpine Passes and Maps	149
	<i>De novis libris iudicia</i>	155
	<i>Index librorum in hoc volumine recensorum</i>	217
	<i>Libri nobis missi</i>	221

"BERICHTIGUNGSLISTE" TO G. FORNI'S POSTHUMOUS NEW LIST OF THE PROVENANCES OF ROMAN LEGIONARIES*

CHRISTER BRUUN

Several thousand Roman legionaries known through inscriptions have recorded their home town or region. The study of these mentions of the legionaries' *origo* over time provides valuable insights into imperial recruitment policy. The material can also be used for studies in social history including demographic aspects.

Giovanni Forni presented the first general geographical survey of Roman imperial legionaries in his *Il reclutamento delle legioni da Augusto a Diocleziano* (1953). Some twenty years later he updated his lists in the paper "Estrazione etnica e sociale delle legioni nei primi tre secoli dell'impero" (*Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II.1, 1974, 339-391). In Forni's posthumous *Esercito e marina di Roma antica* (1992) the update from 1974 is reprinted, followed by a second update called "Supplemento II".¹

Sadly enough, Forni apparently never had time to proofread the previously unpublished parts in his new book. While working on a review of that book, the present writer became aware of the fact that mistakes of various nature appear in the "Supplemento II". The number of errors is such that it seems best to register them and add corrections separately, apart from the actual review (elsewhere in this journal).

It is with the hope that users of Forni's important book, or the editor of a possible future edition of Forni's work, might make use of these notes, that the following corrections and additions are offered.² The paper naturally

* I am indebted to Dr. R. W. Daniel (Cologne) for correcting my English.

¹ G. Forni, *Esercito e marina di Roma antica*. Raccolta di contributi, *Mavors Roman Army Researches* V, ed. M. P. Speidel, Stuttgart 1992. The update from 1974 is reprinted on pp. 11-63, the "Supplemento II" follows on pp. 64-115.

² This paper does not intend to add anything to the material that Forni himself had collected. To be sure, there are Roman soldiers that are missing from Forni's work, see e.g. G. Alföldy, *Epigraphica Hispanica* XIV, ZPE 95, 1993, 229ff. for M. Cornelius M. f.

makes no claim to be an original scholarly contribution. Indeed, if the writer has mastered the "modest gifts of accuracy and orderly compilation",³ this publication has served its purpose, and the reader will be spared hours of tedious checking.

When registering the *origo* of Roman legionaries, Forni divided them into four chronological groups: I. Augustus to Gaius; II. Claudius and Nero; III. The Flavians to Trajan; IV. Hadrian onwards. This division of the material was maintained throughout the two updates.

Only the last section, the so-called Tabella IV presenting legionaries from Hadrian to the late third century, will concern us here. This is both the longest of Forni's sections and the one during which the largest numbers of soldiers are known.

The inaccuracies to be addressed here all have to do with Professor Yann Le Bohec's publication of several North African inscriptions registering several hundred previously unknown legionaries in *Antiquités Africaines* 25, 1989, 191-226. These new soldiers, all belonging to the period from Hadrian onwards, have to some extent been registered in Forni's "Suppl. II", Tabella IV. Forni had been able to see Le Bohec's paper while still in manuscript form, and gives as reference "Le Bohec, diss. ined.", followed by number of inscription and line. However, although Forni's book was printed in 1992 and Le Bohec's paper appeared in 1989, references to the paper as actually published were never incorporated in Forni's book. The reason for this is not important (it may have been due to the author's failing health, or to certain aspects relating to the production and printing of his book).

The somewhat unfortunate outcome, however, is of importance: Not only do Forni's references to "Le Bohec diss. ined." frequently not match the inscriptions as actually published (admittedly, sometimes only a matter of the wrong line-number), but sometimes Forni has gotten the hometown of the soldier wrong, and several soldiers presented by Le Bohec are altogether absent from Forni's "Supplemento II".

Ani(ensi tribu) Foro Iuli miles l(eg.) X G(eminae) known from a text that was first published in 1982. But it would serve little purpose to add single references occasionally, since it would confuse the issue here at stake.

³ R. Syme, *Gnomon* 29, 1957, 517 on the requirements for basic prosopographical work.

Two examples will give an idea of the problems that the user of Forni's table may face: Who is the soldier in "Le Bohec diss. ined." 16,17 who comes from Suf(es/etula)? Inscription 16 contains only 15 lines. Where lies the mistake? There are no indices in Forni's book to help the reader, and so the reader is left with the task of reading through some or even all of Le Bohec's text on his own.⁴ In this case the reader is fortunate, the correct location is LeB 16,7 and the soldier is L. Terentius Marce[llus?]. But the detection of an error is not always this easy. "Le Bohec diss. ined." 12,12 is said to register a soldier from Sabratha. But inscription no. 12 is an epitaph from Lambaesis for the military tribune Ulpius Longinus. Is he really from Sabratha? Certainly not, it is C. Aurelius Anio[l]us in LeB 22,12 who comes from that town.

It is in order to make further investigations of this sort unnecessary that the present paper is published.

Sometimes we are dealing with omissions, elsewhere apparently with careless proofreading. All sorts of misprints in fact marr the previously unpublished parts of Forni's book, both the "Suppl. II" and the "Origines dei legionari (ordinate per provincie)". Whether erroneous source references appear as regularly elsewhere in the work must be left for others to find out. To experts in the field, many errors are luckily enough of no consequence; for instance, everybody knows that there never was a *legio XL Claudia* (p. 87, *XI Claudia* must be intended), nor a *legio VI Flavia* (p. 100, should be *legio IV Flavia*). What the reader however must check most carefully is the existence or absence of square brackets [...]. In the introduction to his 1974 Supplement, Forni explained his use of them as follows: "Inoltre sono indicati fra parentesi quadre i dati già noti, editi o riediti posteriormente al 1951, e quelli da spostare o da correggere nelle tabelle apparse in precedenza" (p. 38 here). This means that, likewise, in the new "Suppl. II" square brackets should indicate either a publication that is not actually adding any new soldiers to the known body of legionaries, or the fact that Forni is now withdrawing an inscription that he had previously placed under a particular heading, on the grounds that new knowledge shows it to belong elsewhere.

⁴ In some cases, a shortcut can be provided by the lists of the soldiers' provenance in Y. Le Bohec, *La troisième légion Auguste*, Paris 1989, 495-502. But Le Bohec divided the soldiers from the second and third centuries into four groups: "II siècle", "Hadrien-Antonin le Pieux", "Marc Aurèle-Commode", "Sévères-Maximin", which generally is a welcome aid for scholars, but in this case makes it somewhat more cumbersome to check Forni's references.

Clearly, if one wants to know how Forni thought about epigraphic evidence for Roman legionaries in the late 1980s, the square brackets are important. Unfortunately, very many of them seem to be missing, either at the beginning or after a clause, and this applies to all four "Tabelle" in "Suppl. II".⁵ In such cases the reader has to be very careful how he interprets the always rich evidence cited by Forni. In the following, square brackets have been used with the meaning assigned them by Forni.

When listing the origins of Roman legionaries, Forni adopted a straightforward geographical approach, starting with Italy and then proceeding clockwise around the Mediterranean, province after province. The same system will be followed here. The corrections or additions to Forni's "Supplemento II, Tabella IV" (*Esercito e marina di Roma antica*, pp. 97-107) are based on a comparison of Forni's paper with Y. Le Bohec, "Inscriptions inédites ou corrigées concernant l'armée romaine d'Afrique", *Antiquités Africaines* 25, 1989, 191-226. For inscriptions in that paper, the abbreviation **LeB**, followed by inscription **number** (there were 27 in all) and **line**, will be used (thus conforming as much as possible to Forni's citations).⁶

p. 97

ITALIA

Reg. I: Pometia: This is a questionable attribution. LeB 16,9 presents a very uncertain reading (POME)⁷

p. 98

HISPANIA BAETICA

Mun(da? - or -igua?⁸): not LeB 16,18 but 16,10

⁵ On this point, no claim to completeness is advanced. At least one square bracket seems to be missing on p. 86 (last line); p. 91 (l. 4); p. 92 (l. 3); p. 94 (l. 10); p. 95 (ll. 4 and 11); p. 100 (l. 19); p. 101 (l. 7); p. 102 (ll. 1, 3, 30, and 36); p. 103 (l. 4); p. 106 (l. 17 ?); p. 108 (ll. 15, 16 and 19).

⁶ Also so as to conform to Forni's practice, references to the lines in Le Bohec's inscription no. 26 column 1 will be given according to Forni's numbering (1 to 8), not according to the numbering which is implied in the publication (4 to 11). In this case Forni's differing way of counting will not cause the reader any discomfort.

⁷ See Y. Le Bohec, *Inscriptions inédites ou corrigées concernant l'armée romaine d'Afrique*, *Antiquités Africaines* 25, 1989, 210; cf. Le Bohec, *III légion Auguste*, 307 and 497 (without reservations).

⁸ Le Bohec, *Inscriptions*, 210 also considers Mun(ione) = Min(ione) in Etruria a

HISPANIA LUSITANIA

Aeminium: not LeB 16,13 but 16,11

p. 99

PANNONIA SUPERIOR

Car(nuntum): correctly LeB 16,8, but not Carnuntum at all; the entry reads *C. Cap.* According to Le Bohec (p. 210) we are dealing with a *c(olonia)* that might be Cappa (in Baetica), Capena (in Etruria), Capitulum⁹ or Capua (in Campania).

p. 100

MOESIA SUPERIOR

Mar[cianopolis?]: add LeB 16,13 (Nowhere registered by Forni. As Le Bohec comments ad loc. (p. 211), there are many cities beginning with MAR.)

p. 105

SYRIA

Antiochia: not LeB 15,26 but 15,27

[Dan]ab(a?): not LeB 15,22 but 15,18

Dolic[he]: add LeB 15,32

Epiphania: add perhaps LeB 15,3: E[piphania?]

Laud(icea?)¹⁰: not LeB 15,23 but 15,7

Tyrus: add perhaps LeB 15,2: T[yrus?]

p. 106

AFRICA

Ammaedara: not LeB 19,20 but 19,10 (attribution questionable, as Forni remarks); not LeB 24,9 but 24,8 [CIL VIII 18068 a 44]

Capsa: not Capsa at all but Carthago/Karthago in LeB 22,5; LeB 22,16; LeB 22,17; LeB 26, II 5

Carthago: LeB 20,4 is better given as 20, I 4; not LeB 227, II 1-2 but 27, II 1-2. Add LeB 22, 5; add LeB 22,16-17; add LeB 26, II 5 (= BCTH 1905, 239 no. 21, I 7 without *origo*); add LeB 26, II 9

possibility.

⁹ Capitulum is hardly an alternative; nothing suggests that it ever was a *colonia* (as prof. H. Solin kindly informs me).

¹⁰ Le Bohec, *Inscriptions*, 207 also considers Laud(ia) a possible reading.

Hippo: not LeB 23,8 but 23, II 2 [CIL VIII 18068 b 13]

Sabratha: not LeB 12,12 but 22,12

p. 107

Suf(es? - etula?); not LeB 16,17 but 16,7

Thagora: add LeB 27, I 3 [CIL VIII 2554 d 14]

Thamugadi: correctly LeB 22,8 although interpretation questionable;¹¹ not LeB 23,13 but 23, II 7 [CIL VIII 18068 b 18]

Theveste: LeB 20,7 better 20, I 7; LeB 21,4 better 21, I 4. Not LeB 23,11 but 23, II 5 [CIL VIII 18068 b 16]. The references to LeB inscription no. 26 should read LeB 26, II 3 (= BCTH 1905, 239 no. 21, I 5 without *origo*) and LeB 26, II 7 [BCTH 1905, 239 no. 21, I 9].¹² Not LeB 26, II 9, which is Ka[rthago]

Thibica: delete reference to LeB 26, II 12, since the soldier is in all likelihood identical with the homonymous man in BCTH 1905, 239 no. 21, I 13 from Tipasa (as Forni seems to have suspected)¹³

T(h)imida Re(gia): LeB 22,11 is questionable¹⁴

Thurburbo: the inscription "BCTH 1905, p. 238,21 I 11" is better given as LeB 25 a 11 [BCTH 1905, 239 no. 21, I 11] = LeB 26, II 10. Whether it belongs here is uncertain; Forni records it also under Thubursicum Num.

Thubursicum Num.: this entry is somewhat garbled; delete the first clause "[BCTH 1905, p. 238,21 I 11 (*III Aug.*) dele!]". The references to Le Bohec's paper should read LeB 25 a 11 [BCTH 1905, 239 no. 21, I 11] = LeB 26, II 10¹⁵

Tipasa: better LeB 26, II 12 [BCTH 1905, 239 no. 21, I 13 – which actually presents the soldier's *origo* in full]¹⁶

Tubur(-): add LeB 20, I 2

Utica: add LeB 8,8; add LeB 22,29

Ut(h)ina: not LeB 8,8, which is Utica; add LeB 22,20

Vaga: LeB 21,3 better 21, I 3

¹¹ Forni 106 n. 52 argues that ILIAM be read as "THAM".

¹² Forni 107 pointed out that since for these two soldiers only THE[-] is known as *origo*, Thelepte might be another possibility.

¹³ See the argument in n. 18 below.

¹⁴ Le Bohec, *Inscriptions*, 218 presents the text as "Ael(ia) TFIM." and suggests "T[h]im(ida Regia?)".

¹⁵ Le Bohec, *Inscriptions*, 224 presents the *origo* as TVBVR[-], adding one letter to what was formerly known.

¹⁶ See also n. 18 below.

NUMIDIA

Calceus Herculis: not LeB 15,23 but 15,13

Cirta: LeB 20,3. 5-6. 10 better 20, I 3. 5-6. 10; LeB 21,5 better 21, I 5.

Add LeB 26, I 6

Cuicul: not LeB 22,27 but 8,25

p. 108

Lambaesis: not LeB 23,1 but 23, II 4 [CIL VIII 18068 b 15]; not "ined. diss. Le Bohec" but LeB 13

Lambaesis (castra): LeB 20,8-9 better 20, I 8-9; LeB 21,2 better 21, I 2; not LeB 22,18 and LeB 22,31, which are not from the *castra* but from the "cas(tra) Ves(pasiani?)"¹⁷ not LeB 23,6-7. 9. 12 but 23, II 1. 3. 6. 8 [CIL VIII 18068 b 12. 14. 17. 19]; not LeB 24, 7-8. 10 but 24, 6-7. 9 [CIL VIII 18068 a 42. 43. 45]. Add square brackets in LeB 25, c 2 [BCTH 1905, 241 no. 21, III 2]; LeB 26, II 8 [BCTH 1905, 239 no. 21, I 10]; and presumably also in LeB 26, II 11 [BCTH 1905, 239 no. 21, I 12].¹⁸ Add LeB 23, col. I [CIL VIII 18068 a 7]

Cas(tra) Ves(pasiani?): add LeB 22,18 and LeB 22,31. (Location and toponym are unknown, suggestion by Le Bohec p. 219.)

Milev: add LeB 26, I 7; add LeB 26, I 8 (according to Forni's counting of the lines)

MAURETANIA TINGITANA

Volubilis: not LeB 15,24 but 15,22. Add perhaps LeB 15,34 V[olub(ili)?]

¹⁷ Thus Le Bohec, *Inscriptions*, 219; cf. Le Bohec, *III légion Auguste*, 499.

¹⁸ In the cases of LeB 26, II 11 and 12 it would seem that Le Bohec has made a mistake in counting the soldiers Q. Antonius Secundus from the *cas(tra)* and C. Caecilius R[-] from "THIb" as different from two already known soldiers [T]annonius Secundus from the *cast(ra)* and [C]aecilius Romanus from "Tipasa" appearing in BCTH 1905, 239 no. 21 col. I on lines 12-13 (see Le Bohec, *III légion Auguste*, 315. 316. 324 where these names can be found). In contrast, Forni 108 l. 16 seems to imply that we are dealing with the same soldiers in the two inscriptions (although the square brackets are missing), surely correctly. The list of soldiers in LeB 26 col. II is an almost exact copy of the beginning of BCTH 1905, 239 no. 21 col. I. In our two cases, the differences boil down to easily explained errors of reading or writing. Firstly, there is no reason at all why we should read "[T]annonius" and not "[Q.] Annonius" (which should be a stonecutter's error for Antonius) in BCTH 1905. Secondly, the *origo* for C. Caecilius R[-] in LeB 26 is clearly incomplete and damaged. If the reading "TIPASA" in BCTH is correct (LeBohec has in fact seen the text and under his no. 25 gives some brief comments on new readings, but nothing on the cases here under discussion), we can easily assume that the stonecutter is responsible for the unclear *origo* "THIb" in LeB 26.

VARIA

From North Africa because of the cognomen Baricio: not LeB 8,17
but 22,23

p. 109

origin "CVLC": not "8;17" but LeB 8,17, where the text is read as
Culci

origin "Liec[-]": not "Liec" in LeB 19,12 but tentatively read by Le
Bohec p. 214 as IEC, which may stand for [Sul]lec(thum)

origin TPPQ: better LeB 26, II 6 (= BCTH 1905, 239 no. 21, I 8
without *origo*).

All the soldiers registered here belonged to the *legio III Augusta*. The natural next step would be to incorporate the above corrections in Forni's "Origines del legionari (ordinate per legioni)" on p. 123 of his *Esercito e marina*. This task has in fact already been accomplished by Le Bohec in his *La légion III Auguste*. Naturally, being in possession of reliable information from his own research on the then unpublished North African inscriptions, Le Bohec was able to present an up-to-date list, town by town, of the origins of all the legionaries from the *III Augusta* on pp. 496-502. These pages should now be consulted instead of Forni's corresponding sections.

Universität Köln