

THE TRIBE AFFILIATION OF THE ROMANS IN THE LOWER DANUBE

Ivo Topalilov

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0565-2054>

Institute of Balkan Studies and Centre of Thracology
“Prof. Alexander Fol” Bulgarian Academy of Sciences

Abstract

The article deals with the perception of the tribe *Papiria* in the nomenclature of the Roman civics in two Trajanic colonies in Moesia Superior and Moesia Inferior—*col(onia) Ulp(ia) Tra(iana) Rat(iariensium)* and *col(onia) Ulp(ia) Oescensium* respectively. Although located close geographically and with a few common traits of their historical development, some discrepancies appeared in the topic which are discussed. The inscriptions provide, although scanty, some information on the tribe affiliation of the civic and religious colonial elite, *augustales coloniae* as well as the tribe affiliation as a part of a certain *ornamenta*. All this allows to establish the Roman tribe as an important social marker and for prestige in the Roman civic community, and can therefore serve in the Roman provinces as a sign of the progress of urbanization and Romanization. Certainly, the observations made are preliminary due to the scanty evidence available so far for various reasons.

Keywords: Roman tribe, *Papiria*, colonial elite, Moesia, *augustales*, *ornamenta*, Roman provincial society, Romanization.

The tribe affiliation of the Romans on the lower Danube has not been the subject of special study until now. To the extent that they have been studied, it has been in the context of general study of the origin of the particular individual when it was possible as a part of his *origo*, or in some particular cases such as for example with the libertine and augustale of the Roman colony of Ratiaria M. Iulius Eutyches who had received *ornatus ornamentis decurionalibus* and was assigned to the tribe of *Papiria* instead of *Palatina* or *Collina* as it is mostly in this kind of case.¹ Unsurprisingly, Kalin Stoev believes that it is about the existence of a huge influence of individual wealthy libertines in the community, who has

¹ AE 2012.1251: *D(is) M(anibus) / M(arci) Iuli M(arci) l(iberti) / Pap(iria) Euty/chetis / o(rnato) o(rnamentis) dec(urionalibus) / et Aug(ustali) / col(oniae) Rat(iariae) / Iul(i) Sozon / et Epap<hr>o/ditus b(ene) m(erenti).*

released significant financial funds in the city as an expression of *evergetism* or due to other merits to the community. He assigns to this case also that of M. Antonius Ianuarius who was also granted *ornatus ornamentis decurionalibus*, possibly of neighboring Roman colony of Oescus.² We should add also the studies of A. Mócsy who in 1986 examines in general the Roman military nomenclature in the Danubian provinces but focused on formal features concerning the mention of the tribe (or pseudo-tribe),³ and these from 1970 and 1974 dealing with the provincial society in Upper Moesia.⁴ Such type of studies, however, are rare and as a whole the tribal affiliation still awaits its research. It is clear that the tribe was an essential part of the Roman civic nomenclature.⁵ Although its legal significance was gradually lost in the imperial era, it undoubtedly served as an important social marker and of prestige to the Roman civic community, and can therefore serve in the Roman provinces as a marker of the progress of urbanization and Romanization. As it is not possible in one article to explore all its aspects in the region which is characterized by the presence of a considerable number of tribes attested in Latin, but in Greek inscriptions as well, in this study we will focus only on these cases with Trajan's tribe of *Papiria* provided by the two neighboring Roman colonies—*col(onia) Ulp(ia) Tra(iana) Rat(iariensium)* and *col(onia) Ulp(ia) Oescensium*. Such a limitation of the study is justified by the synchronous development of the two colonies, although each of them bears its own specificities, but also the common practices that are attested in particular aspects, including in the sphere of our interest. The examples of M. Iulius Eutyches and M. Antonius Ianuarius described above is vivid evidence of this. Although the two colonies belonged to two Roman provinces, respectively Ratiaria in the province of Upper Moesia and Oescus in the province of Lower Moesia, considerably more similarities can be found between the two colonies than between them and the other Roman cities in their respective provinces. Where necessary, however, the latter will be used, and especially the other colony of the province Upper Moesia Stobis as well as the provincial capital Viminacium.

Given the fact that both colonies were organized in the time of Trajan which reflect on their official titles, nominally their citizens should be enrolled in the emperor's tribe of *Papiria*.⁶ The epigraphic monuments unsurprisingly provide a great deal of examples in both colonies, their administrative territories and provinces, and elsewhere, including Rome. A glance at the inscriptions allow to separate the civic and military cases, which is not surprisingly in this matter, so in this study the focus will be on the civic examples.

The inscriptions reveal that among the individuals that had been enrolled in *Papiria* one should note the members of the local *ordo decurionum*. A good example for this is the case of C. Valerius Firmus known from his funeral epitaph dated to the first half of 2nd century who might be in fact among the first decurions of the colony of Ratiaria.⁷ The case is of

² Stoev 2014, 260–261.

³ Mócsy 1986.

⁴ Mócsy 1970; Mócsy 2015.

⁵ *Q(uei) c(ives) R(omanej) erunt censum / ag[i]to eorumque nomina praenomina patres aut patronos tribus cognomina* (CIL XII 593).

⁶ Grotefend 1863, 133; Stoev 2017, 62.

⁷ AE 1938.95: *D(is) M(anibus) / C(aio) Valerio / C(ai) fil(io) Pap(iria) Firmo / vet(erano) leg(ionis) VII C(laudiae) P(iae) F(idelis) / conscripto / dec(urioni) Rat(iariae) vixit ann(os) / LXXV C(aius) Val(erius) Firmus / dec(urioni) col(oniae) eiusd(em) / patri pientissi(mo) / f(aciendum) c(uravit)*.

consequence as it reveals the entering of the ex-military into the *ordo decurionum* of the newly established colony which is rarely as although scanty in number, the names of the other known so far decurions from Ratiaria do not belong to the military ones and the link with the military which is usually underlined is missing. In fact, the case with C. Valerius Firmus is the only one attested for Ratiaria with tribal affiliation of a *decurio* as the rest of the *decuriones* known simply do not use it in their inscriptions whatever the type of it.

It seems that the same should be applied to neighboring Oescus. As in Ratiaria, the evidence is scanty in general and we are aware of at least two decurions of the early life of Oescus that had been enrolled in *Papiria*. The first one is M. Cacceius Victor⁸ and the second one—T. Flavius Rufinianus.⁹ The honorary inscription of M. Titius Maximus reveals that the other magistrates of the early colony, including sacerdotēs, were also enrolled in *Papiria*.¹⁰ Given the date of the inscriptions it is unlikely that they all originated from Oescus;¹¹ the tribal affiliation should be connected with the positions acquired in the colony. Moreover, the *nomina* of T. Flavius Rufinianus reveals the Flavian Romanization of the predecessor with military background who was most probably enrolled in *Quirina*.

There is another T. Flavius of *Papiria* who also was appointed at high colonial position in Oescus, whose case seems to be different. This is T. Flavius Valentinus known from an inscription dated to the time of Severans who had joined many *collegia* in the colony and elsewhere but also received the honorary position as patron of the colony.¹² What remains unclear is if he belongs to a certain T. Flavius family that originated from Oescus and was enrolled in *Papiria* in the early days of the colony, or was he enrolled in this tribe because of his position as patron of the colony. It may be the similar case with T. Aurelius Flavinus, known from an inscription of 20s–30s of 3rd century who belonged to *ordinis principes* of Oescus.¹³ His *nomina* clearly reveals the imperial Romanization of his ancestor dated to 138 AD.

The epigraphy reveals, however, that not all of the members of *ordo decurionum* were enrolled into the tribe of *Papiria* at least in Ratiaria. A good example for this is the case with T. Flavius Arruntius, who according to his funeral epitaph was a *decurio* of Ratiaria

⁸ ILBulg 70: [---] / M(arco) Cocceio / M(arci) f(ilio) Pap(iria) Victo/[r]i cui et Quir[itino] dec(urioni) O[esc(ensium)] / [e]x testament[o].

⁹ CIL III 6129 (= ILBulg 85): D(is) M(anibus) / T(ito) Flavio Pap(iria) / Ru[ffini]ano / d[ec(urioni)].

¹⁰ CIL III 14211.02 (= ILBulg 16; Kalinka 1906, 388): M(arco) Titio / M(arci) fil(io) Pap(iria) / Maximo / Ilviral(i) / iter(um) q(uin)q(uennali) / col(oniae) fla(mini) per(petuo) praef(ecto) / saltus / patr(ono) fabr(um) / Narcis(sus) actor.

¹¹ K. Stoev (2017, 178) believes that *Papiria* in T. Flavius Rufinianus' s nomenclature indicates Oescus as his *origo*.

¹² AE 2005.1325: T(ito) Flavio T(iti) f(ilio) Pap(iria) / Valentino eq(uiti) R(omano) / flam(ini) et Ilviral(i) / col(oniae) praef(ecto) salt(us) / patron(o) colleg(iorum) fabr(um) coloni(ar(um)) Oesc(ensium) et Apul(ensium) / patrono col(oniae) Ulp(iae) / Oescensium / bono civi et ama(tori) rei p(ublicae) ob meri(ta) eius in re publ(ica) / conlata spl(endidissimus) ordo // ex suo.

¹³ CIL III 14416 (= ILBulg 18): T(ito) Aurelio T(iti) fil(io) Pap(iria) / Flavino primipilari / et principi ordinis col(oniae) / Oesc(ensium) et buleutae civitatu[m] / Tyrannorum Dionysiopol(itanorum) / Marcianopol(itanorum) Tungroru[m] / et Aquincensium patron[o] / collegi(i) fabr(um) honorat(o) / a divo Magno Antonino / Aug(usto) HS L milia n(ummum) et XXV / gradum promotionis / [ob] alacritatem virtu[tis] / [adv]ersus hostes Ge[nt]is / [e]t res prospere Ty[beris] Cl(audius) Nicom[edes] / buleuta civitatis [Tyra]norum amico dign[issimo] / l(ocus) d(atu)s d(ecreto) d(ecurionum).

in the second quarter—middle of 2nd century.¹⁴ In it, he is mentioned with the *Quirina* affiliation which raises the question of the reasons why he was not enrolled in *Papiria*: either he was not allowed given the fact that he had already been enrolled into a Roman tribe, or he had the choice to decide to join the new tribe or kept the original instead. We may assume that T. Flavius Arruntius was not a random person as he contributed greatly to the religious topography of the colony by constructing a *templum* or *aedes* in the colony given the iconographic specifics of his funeral stela.¹⁵

This very example reveals that not all of the members of *ordo decurionum*, at least in Ratiaria, had been enrolled in *Papiria*, and some of them kept their own original tribe while in service in the new colony and state it in their official nomenclature. It is without any doubt that his contemporaries would notice this and it seems that his status in the society did not suffer. So, the question is whether the members of *ordo decurionum* were able to choose or they followed a strict rule which regulated under what circumstances they may be enrolled in colony's tribe?

I believe that the answers of these questions which are crucial for understanding of the importance of tribal affiliation in the provincial society may be provided by the epigraphy of a colony that is well attested with the tribal affiliation of its citizens and especially elite and that is located geographically close to Ratiaria. Such a colony may be *colonia Flavia Felicis Dardanorum* or *colonia Flavia Scupinorum* in province of Moesia superior whose members of *ordo decurionum* have been attested epigraphically in the colony itself and its administrative territory.

Although not numerous as a whole, in compare for instance with the ex-militaries, the epigraphy provides some key information on this topic. Given the Flavian origin of the colony one would expect that its decurions would be enrolled in the tribe of *Quirina* which, indeed, appeared in their nomenclature from the very beginning of the colonial life till the second half of 2nd century.¹⁶ It seems, however, that this is not the entire case. According to the inscriptions quite a few local decurions and other high administrative magistrates and religious authorities of the colony had kept their original tribe and were not enrolled into *Quirina*. These are for example Sex(tus) Caelidius Secundus who originated from *Aemil(ia) Stob<i>s* and who was 'cui ordo col(oniae) Scup(inorum) (h)onores aedil(itatis) et decu/rionatus con/tulit',¹⁷ *Q(uintus) Axenna Q(uinti) f(ilius) Fab(ia) Rufus* who was *decurio* and *aedilis*,¹⁸ and M. Octavius Valens with *origo* of *Aemil(ia) Stobis*, who was decurion and pontifex of the colony.¹⁹ Some others such as for example *L(uci) f(ilius)*

¹⁴ Velkov 1940/1942, 273: *T(ito) Fl(avio) T(iti) f(ilio) Pap(iria) / Arruntio / dec(urio) col(oniae) Rat(iariae)*.

¹⁵ Topalilov (forthcoming).

¹⁶ See for example *IMS* VI 65 (= *AE* 1984.749); 66 (= *AE* 1971.411) and possibly *IMS* VI 63 (= *AE* 1977.724).

¹⁷ *CIL* III 8203 (= *IMS* VI 62): *D(is) M(anibus) / Sex(tus) Caelidi/us Secundus / S(exti) C(aelidi) Lupi et Mat/aurae Comi/niae fili<us> Aemil(ia) Stob<i>s / cui ordo col(oniae) / Scup(inorum) (h)onores / aedil(itatis) et decu/rionatus con/tulit vix(it) an(nos) / XVIII dies XXXX / h(ic) s(itus) e(st)*.

¹⁸ *AE* 2012.1255: *Aug(usto) sacr(um) / Q(uintus) Axenna / Q(uinti) f(ilius) Fab(ia) Rufus / dec(urio) col(oniae) / ob honor(em) / aedilitatis / l(ocus) d(atus) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum)*.

¹⁹ *IMS* VI 42 (= *AE* 1910.173): *M(arcus) Octavius / M(arci) f(ilius) Aemil(ia) Valens / Stobis mil(es) leg(ionis) V / Macedo(nicae) decu(rio) / pontif(ex) col(oniae) F(laviae) F(elicis) D(ardanorum) / viv<u>s fecit sibi / Octaviae Marcellinae / filiae suae defunctae / vixit annis XXVI et Catiae / Secundae coniugi suae / hic se vivo / f(aciendum) c(uravit)*.

Pub(lilia) RE / [---] Verona who was *decurio*, *questor* and *Ilvir* of the colony,²⁰ and T. Turrano Proculus, who was appointed as *Ilvir q. q. col. Fl. Scupinor(um)*²¹ only kept its original tribe, but also the *origo*. This practice is well attested with the military, and not surprisingly T. Turrano Proculus was such. If so, we may speculate that *L(uci) f(ilius) Pub(lilia) RE / [---] Verona* was also a military or ex-military preserving his tribe and home *origo*.

Whether we should add the case with T. Statilius Faustianus to those of the members of *ordo decurionum* is not clear, but very likely as he had received *ornamenta* of *ordo splendidissimo Scupinorum*.²²

To sum up. The inscriptions from Scupi and its territory undoubtedly reveal that it was not only the members of *ordo decurionum* who were not enrolled into the colony's tribe, but also the holders of the whole range of the colonial high offices, including the religious and temporary ones as these cases as a whole cover the time span from the very beginning of the Flavian colony till the second half of 2nd century. What is also clear is that all of the military or ex-military kept its original or family's tribe and *origo*, although some of them joined *ordo decurionum* or other high colonial offices. Following this logic, we may speculate on the military background of *L(uci) f(ilius) Pub(lilia) RE / [---] Verona* and alike, including T. Flavius Arruntius, the decurion of Ratiaria.

It seems that in general the picture in Ratiaria and Oescus is pretty much the same like that in Scupi. There is, however, a nuance of difference between Ratiaria from one side, and Oescus from the other side. According to the scanty epigraphic evidence that covers the period from the foundation of the colony till second quarter of 3rd century, all of the attested and identified with certainty members of *ordo decurionum* of colonia Ulpia Oescus were enrolled in the *Papiria* tribe. If so, I hardly believe that this is by chance and at first glance it would mean that the Oescan society was more homogenous with tribal affiliation focused exclusively, if not entirely on *Papiria*. Unlike Oescus is Ratiaria whose society is more heterogeneous, and the use of *Papiria* seems not to be so strict. The fact that not even all of the decurions in Ratiaria were enrolled in *Papiria* to the contrary to these in Oescus raises the question of the discrepancy in this practice between both colonies as well as the perception of *Papiria* itself in Ratiaria and Oescus. Should it be linked with *Papiria* as a colony's tribe or as the colony's founder's tribe? Whether the omission or addition of 'Trajana' to the city name is connected with this is speculative, but should not be excluded as both places have their own specifics in their historical development in the pre-colonial period. It is worth mentioning that the evidence reveals that at that time Ratiaria enjoyed a substantial civic development and even assuming that the settlement become the main center of province with all that it requires including numerous migrants,²³ while Oescus was less developed and possibly based more on the military factor.

²⁰ IMS VI 15 (= AE 1984.747): [---] *L(uci) f(ilius) Pub(lilia) RE / [---] Verona CON / [de]c(urio) quaestor Ilv(i)r / [col(oniae) Fl(aviae?)] Fel(ici)s Dar(danorum) hoc t(emplum) / [impe]nsa sua fac(iendum) c(uravit) / [d]eae Syriae.*

²¹ IMS VI 31 (= AE 1973.477): *T(ito) Turrano / L(uci) f(ilio) Sergia / Proculo / Flan(ona) prim(o) p(ilo) / praef(ecto) castror(um) / leg(ionis) XIII Gem(inae) / Ilvir(o) q(uin)q(uennali) col(oniae) / Fl(aviae) Scupinor(um) / L(ucius) Valerius Ius/tus amico l(ocus) / d(atus) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum).*

²² IMS VI 63 (= AE 1977.724): *T(ito) Statilio T(iti) f(ilio) / Tauro Quir(ina) / Faustiano / ornat(o) a splen(didissimo) ordin(e) / Scup(ensium) ornam(entis).*

²³ Gerov 1949, 30, 55.

By the enrolment in *Papiria*, Ratiaria is closer to the other colony in the province – that of Scupi, rather than of Oescus. It is in Ratiaria, however, where the inscriptions show that some of the military or ex-military when entering *ordo decurionum* might have changed their original tribe by being enrolled into the colony's tribe or that of its founder. The aforementioned C(aius) Valerius Firmus may be one of these cases.

In Ratiaria individuals who were granted with *ornatus ornamentis decurionalibus* were enrolled in *Papiria*.²⁴ In fact, the inscriptions reveal cases with enrollment of individuals in *Papiria* who were entitled to the honours/distinctions of the dignity of decurion (*ornamenta decurionalia*) without actually holding the office of *decurio*.²⁵ The funeral stela of Lucius Flaminus Crispus, who was awarded the *ornamenta decurionalia* of the *ordo splendidissimo Ratiariens(ium)* provides an example of this.²⁶ The case has been studied and the fact that Lucius Flaminus Crispus was awarded the *ornatus ornamentis decurionalis* before his 15th year, when he died, allows the assumption that he was the heir of a prominent and influential urban family, and as such was allowed to use the *insignia* of the *decuriate*²⁷ and possibly of certain privileges, without, however, making him an actual member of *ordo decurionum*.²⁸

Unlike Ratiaria and Scupi, just few examples attested so far with individuals that were granted with *ornatus ornamentis decurionalibus* may be linked with Oescus. They do not give any clue that all of the bearers were enrolled in *Papiria*, even in the early days of colony. One example is C(aius) Iul(ius) Maximus who set a funeral stela of a friend of his between middle of 1st—middle of 2nd century in Almus.²⁹ In this case we have to admit that as the epitaph is dedicated to someone else and the spelling of his full nomenclature should not be necessarily fulfilled. Another example concerns the aforementioned M. Antonius Ianuarius, a citizen of Oescus which is proudly stated in his funeral epitaph, who was also granted with *o(rnamentis) d(ecurionalibus)*. The probable date of the stela is the middle – second half of 2nd century.³⁰

Unlike Oescus, in Ratiaria is attested the enrollment in *Papiria* of *augustales coloniae*.³¹ An example for this is the aforementioned M. Iulius Eutyches.³² The case is curious as it deals with the enrollment of a *libertinus* and Augustale in the emperor's tribe,

²⁴ CIL III 12650; 14501,1; IMS III.2, 25; Kalinka 1906, 378; Gerov 1952/1953, nos. 212, 237; Velkov – Atanasova 1967, 150, no. 5. For the *ornati*, see Eck – Ivanov 2010, 203.

²⁵ On *ornatus ornamentis decurionalibus*, see Gerov 1952/1953, no. 191; Stoev 2014, 258; Stoev 2015, 104.

²⁶ Stoev 2015 (= AE 2015.1198): *D(is) M(anibus) / L(ucio) Flaminio L(uci) f(ilio) / Pap(iria) Crispo or/nato / ornamen/tis decurional(ib)us / ab ordine splen/didissimo / Ratia/riens(ium) vixit an(nis) XV / h(ic) s(itus) e(st) / L(ucius) Flaminus Mar/tialis pater infe/licissimus / f(aciendum) c(uravit)*.

²⁷ According to B. Gerov (1952/1953, 374, no. 309) *ornamenta* means: “external marks, distinctions and privileges”.

²⁸ See for this Stoev 2015, 103–106.

²⁹ CIL III 7422 (= Kalinka 1906, no. 378): *D(is) M(anibus) / L(ucio) Domit(io) / Narcis/so q(ue) vixit a(nnos) LXX / h(ic) s(itus) e(st) C(aius) Iul(ius) / Maximus / o(rnatus) o(rnamentis) decurionalib(us) / amico / merit(o)*.

³⁰ Conrad 2004, 491 (= AE 2004.1238): *D(is) M(anibus) / M(arco) Antonio / M(arci) f(ilio) Pap(iria) Ian/uario do/[m]o Oesci o(rnato) / [o(rnamentis) d(ecurionalibus) vi]xit an/[nos]*.

³¹ On the *augustales coloniae* that were granted *ornati ornamentis decurionalibus*: Gerov 1952/1953, no. 191; Karadimitrova 2005, 215–216 (= AE 2005.1311); Karadimitrova 2013, 266–272.

³² AE 2012.1251: *D(is) M(anibus) // M(arci) Iuli M(arci) l(iberti) / Pap(iria) Euty/chetis / o(rnato) o(rnamentis) dec(urionalibus) / et Aug(ustali) / col(oniae) Rat(iariae) / Iul(i) Sozon / et Epap<hr>o/ditus b(ene) m(erenti)*.

instead of in the usual *Palatina* or *Collina*. The case has been commented in the literature, and may reveal the existence of strong influence of individual wealthy libertines in the community, who also spent considerable financial resources as an expression of *euergetism* in the cities or due to other merits to the community.³³ I would add to this another possibility related to the right of the buried to enjoy in life the honours/marks of the dignity of decurion (*ornamenta decurionalia*). It is very tempting to suggest the automatic enrollment of M. Iulius Eutyches and alike in *Papiria*, probably as part of the *ornamenta*.

Indeed, the freedman, though honored with the *insignia* of *ordo decurionum* of the city, did not actually hold the office of decurion himself, yet through *ornatus ornamentis decurionalibus* he received that prestige which was to bind him to the rank of decurion. But, belonging to the higher nobility also required the receipt of the full Roman *nomina*. I am therefore inclined to assume that the receipt of the *ornatus ornamentis decurionalibus* enabled the individual to be enrolled into the Roman tribe, and in the case of Marcus Iulius Eutyches this was *Papiria* because of the close relationship between *augustales coloniae* and *ordo decurionum* in Ratiaria.³⁴ Whether, however, the receipt of the *ornatus ornamentis decurionalibus* should also be accepted as an explicit argument for freedman background of the awardee, who could not be admitted to the office itself,³⁵ is unclear. What is clear is that there are a few examples of *augustales coloniae* who were awarded the *ornatus ornamentis decurionalibus*, but their nomenclature lacks any indication of tribal affiliation and therefore more arguments are needed on the automatic enrollment in *Papiria* as part of the *ornamenta*. It should be underlined that most of the cases of *augustales coloniae* with *ornatus ornamentis decurionalibus* known so far from Ratiaria belong to the time when the tribe system itself seems to have lost its original purpose, and therefore importance as a whole in the society. One should note that already in the reign of Antoninus Pius (137–161) the enrollment of new Roman citizens into the original Roman tribe was generally abandoned. Yet since, according to *lex Iulia*, which was not repealed, the tribal affiliation of each Roman citizen was obligatory, the practice reverted once again to the creation of tribes bearing the name of the imperial *gentilicum*, as had been the case with the earlier *Iulia* and *Claudia*. Called “pseudo-tribes” in modern literature,³⁶ they filled the inscriptions around the middle of the 2nd century and onward and one can find a significant number of Roman citizens who bore the tribal affiliation *Ulpia* (after Marcus Ulpius Traianus), *Aelia* (after the emperor Publius Aelius Hadrianus), *Aurelia* (after Marcus Aurelius and later Caracalla) (M. Aurelius Antoninus), *Septimia* (after Publius Septimius Severus), etc. The problem of the occurrence of the pseudo-tribe *Flavia* still remains insufficiently well understood, but the absence of inscriptions from the time of the Flavian dynasty referring to this tribe points to a later time.

That the changes also affected the nomenclature of the Roman citizens of Ratiaria can be clearly traced in the *laterculus* placed at Viminacium in 195 on the occasion of the honorary dismissal of the veterans of the VII Claudian Legion. In it they are represented solely by the *tria nomina*, supplemented by the *origo*, a significant number of them originating

³³ Stoev 2014, 260–261.

³⁴ On this close connection, cf. Stoev 2014, 258; Stoev – Hristov 2014, 68.

³⁵ Stoev 2015, 104.

³⁶ Forni 1985.

from Ratiaria.³⁷ This list, one of the most significant sources to date on the onomastics of the colony and the extent of the participation of its inhabitants in the provincial garrison, differs radically from those placed in Rome by the praetorians in their *laterculi*, and raises the question of what extent the use of the tribe in the nomenclature of veterans in the provinces was still an integral part of it. The *laterculus* in question, and other similar inscriptions, suggest rather an abandonment of tribal affiliation in the provinces by the end of the 2nd—beginning of 3rd century, even if this practice still continued to exist in Rome.

By the beginning of the 3rd century, however, there had also been some changes in Rome itself. Thus, as B. Gerov has correctly noted, in the honorary inscription for Caracalla, placed by *coh. V. vig.* in 210, in contrast to the other veterans, the centurion of the cohort M(arcus) Antonius Valens is presented by his tribal affiliation.³⁸ In fact, we might add that all the centurions in this inscription are transmitted with their tribal affiliation.³⁹ Thus, in my opinion, the impression is given of the use of the tribal affiliation as a distinguishing mark in society, associated with higher status or stronger Romanization in the capital, and why not in the provinces themselves.

Despite these trends, in Rome the tribal affiliation retains its importance in the following decades. Thus, the tribe *Papiria* is used to refer to the veterans and soldiers of Ratiaria and Oescus in Rome, either in official military diplomas or in *laterculi*.⁴⁰

In *Papiria* were also enrolled other inhabitants of both colonies for whom we have no data on their social status in the society. For Ratiaria one such example is L(ucius) Aebutius Gratus, known from his tombstone, placed by his wife.⁴¹ Given the specific gentilium, we can assume his Italian origin or naming according to the family name of the military commander or provincial governor, if he was a provincial at all. This is not the only example known,⁴² and it is very likely that some of the bearers of *Papiria* held magistracies in the colony.

The inscriptions, which have been found outside Ratiaria and its administrative territory, also add to our knowledge of the tribal affiliation of the colony's citizens. Thus, from Viminacium we are aware of an inscription, dated generally to the 2nd century, which identifies Lucius Valerius Cretus of Ratiaria,⁴³ whose tribal affiliation is indicated. For the moment, this is the only inscription known to me with the provenance of the province of Upper Moesia, which mentions this tribe in the nomenclature of a citizen of the colony.

Similar examples can be attracted for citizens from Oescus that also have been enrolled in *Papiria*, but remain unclear their social status in the colonial society. One such

³⁷ CIL III 14507: *M(arcus) Cass(ius) Sulpician(us) Rat(iaria), M(arcus) Curt(ius) Stambon b(ene)f(iciarius) s(emestris) Rat(iaria), T(itus) Aur(elius) Drigissa Rat(iaria), M(arcus) Aur(elius) Thamarcus Rat(iaria), T(itus) Aur(elius) Thithi() Rat(iaria), Q(uintus) Val(erius) Quintianus b(ene)f(iciarius) Rat(iaria), M(arcus) Ulp(ius) Ianuarius b(ene)f(iciarius) c(onsularis) Rat(iaria), C(aius) Iul(ius) Sabinus Rat(iaria), P(ublius) A[e]l(ius) Maximus Rat(iaria), C(aius) Val(erius) Rufus Rat(iaria) etc.*

³⁸ Gerov 1952/1953, 365, no. 141: *M(arcus) Antonius M(arci) f(ilius) Papir(ia) Valens Ratiar(ia).*

³⁹ CIL VI 31234.

⁴⁰ They are beyond the scope of this study which deals with the civilians only and will be discussed elsewhere.

⁴¹ CIL III 14497 (= Kalinka 1906, no. 377): *D(is) M(anibus) / L(ucio) Aebutio / L(uci) f(ilio) Pap(iria) Gra/to v(ixit) a(nnos) LVI / h(ic) s(itus) e(st) / Aebutia / Mar[cia(?)] / con[ugi].*

⁴² CIL III 14502: *Iulius Valer(ius) / Iul(i) f(ilius) Vale(n)s / qui et Iul(ius) / Fanius Papiria / [...].*

⁴³ CIL III 14599, 2: *Lucius Valerius / Cretus Papiria / [l]at(eres?) cusit(!) e Ratiaria.*

is that of *Aul(us) Antonius / Auli fil(ius) Papiria / Valens Oesci* of second half of 2nd century from Troesmis.⁴⁴

These inscriptions are not numerous for both colonies; in fact, they are quite few and undoubtedly do not reveal different picture of already presented.

After this brief review of the data known, we can observe that the material on the topic studied is generally not vast. Compared to the epigraphic monuments from Ratiaria and Oescus discovered, which are also not significant in number, the available material appears to be of a small percentage. And this makes the observations proposed preliminary, and incomplete. Nevertheless, I believe that several points can be highlighted.

When examining the inscriptions from Ratiaria and Oescus, whether public or private, we cannot help but find that, on the whole, the tribal affiliation is relatively rarely mentioned, and examples are exception rather than rule. In this, the society in both colonies is similar to other municipal societies in the province of Upper Moesia, including Viminacium and Scupi, where the immediate presence of Roman authority should have been a catalyst for the full representation of the Roman nomenclature. It is noteworthy that the inscriptions with the indicated tribal affiliation are predominantly dated till the mid-second century, i.e. to the end of the practical use of the old tribal system in nomenclature.⁴⁵ Even in the inscriptions of this time, however, we cannot ascertain a dense coverage, as the omission of the tribal affiliation is found in inscriptions of different type belonging to different strata of society in Ratiaria and Oescus. Very revealing, in my opinion, is the example of *L(ucius) Tettius Fonteianus*, who on a monumental and exceptionally elaborate dedicatory marble ara, dated to the first half of the second century, is referred to only with a *tria nomina*, along with his membership in the *ordo decurionum* and as *pontifex*.⁴⁶ *L(ucius) Tettius Fonteianus* is not the only decurion with an omitted tribal affiliation of this time.⁴⁷

The reasons for the absence of the tribal affiliation in the individual name nomenclature can be sought in the decline of the tribe system, which no longer had the meaning for the new Roman citizens that it had in the previous years. They could also be sought in the degree of Romanization of the local society and/or of the individual concerned, and it is striking that even provincial governors do not present themselves with their tribal affiliation.⁴⁸ However, the arbitrary spelling out of the tribal affiliation, not only before the mid-second century, but also afterwards, when it is clear that its bearer cannot be listed in the Roman tribe lists, as well as the emergence of the pseudo-tribe system, shows that one cannot accept the end of the tribal system, at least as a tradition.

In the 2nd century the provincial societies were filled with many *Ulp(i)i*, *Ael(i)i*, *Flav(i)i* and *Aurel(i)i*, who were the new citizens (*cives novi*). They bore the name of the emperor and

⁴⁴ *CIL* III 6201 (= *IScM* II,5, 177): *Aul(us) Antonius / Auli fil(ius) Papiria / Valens Oesci vi/xit annis XXXX / Antonia Tyran/nis liberta et h[e]/res patrono / b(ene) m(erenti) p(osuit)*.

⁴⁵ For the absence of the tribe affiliation in the *decurio*'s nomenclature in Ratiaria after the middle of 2nd century, see for example *CIL* III 8088, 8090; *AE* 1938.101; 1966.344; 2010.1391.

⁴⁶ Karadimitrova 2005, 207–211, 221, 1 (= *AE* 2005.1310): *L(ucius) Tettius Fonteia/nus dec(urio) / pontifex / ex voto*.

⁴⁷ See *AE* 1913.186: *Pali Sanc(to) / Pastoral(i) C(aius) Iul(ius) Valen[s] / dec(urio) col(oniae) [Rat(iariae)]*.

⁴⁸ See for example Topalilov 2017 (= *AE* 2019.1297): *Dianae / sacr(um) / T(itus) Minic(ius) / Opimianus / [U]lleg(atus) Aug(usti) pr(o) pr(aetore) / [p]rov(inciae) Moes/[ia]e super(ioris)*. See also *CIL* III 14499 (= *AE* 1902. 128): *L(ucio) Vitr[asio] / Flamin[i]no / leg(ato) Aug(usti) [pr(o) pr(aetore)] / Moesia[e supe]rioris [col(onia)] / Ulp(ia) Tra(iana) [Rat(iaria)] / d(ecreto) [d(ecurionum)]*.

were the social base of imperial power. The persistence, albeit partial, of references to the Roman tribes at a time when the system no longer existed indicates the existence of a resistance of a group of Roman society to the new order which is filled with former peregrines. I would not be surprised if, in some cases, the main purpose in using the Roman tribe was to emphasize belonging to traditional Roman society, and therefore it was a mark of the greater prestige in provincial society. K. Stoev even assumed that it was used to emphasize an old Roman status, also connected with the use of land under *ius Italicum*.⁴⁹

The use of *Papiria* in name nomenclature after the mid-second century in documents issued in Rome is probably an indication that the tribal affiliation of its bearers was most likely secondary, i.e. through their ancestors who were recorded in the tribal lists. If so, it may be due to the understated control in this aspect, or rather it may be related to administrative attempts to differentiate between different groups in society; for the variation can largely be thought of as left to personal choice—as signifying old lineage or other reasons.

ABBREVIATIONS

ILBulg – B. Gerov, *Inscriptiones Latinae in Bulgaria repertae*, Sofia 1989.

IMS III.2 – P. Petrović, *Inscriptions de la Mésie Supérieure*, vol. 3,2: *Timacum Minus et la vallée du Timok*, Belgrade 1995.

IMS VI – B. Dragojević-Josifovska, *Inscriptions de la Mésie Supérieure*, vol. 6: *Scupi et la région de Kumanovo*, Belgrade 1982.

IScM II,5 – E. Doruțiu-Boila, *Inscriptiones Daciae et Scythiae Minoris antiquae. Series altera: Inscriptiones Scythiae Minoris graecae et latinae*, vol. 5: *Capidava, Troesmis, Noviodunum*, Bucharest 1980.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Conrad, S. (2004), *Die Grabstelen aus Moesia inferior. Untersuchungen zu Chronologie, Typologie und Ikonographie*, Leipzig.

Eck, W., Ivanov, R. (2010), Zwei Votivinschriften aus Ratiaria in der Provinz Moesia Superior, *ZPE* 173: 201–205.

Forni, G. (1985), *Le tribù romane. III, 1. Le pseudo-tribù*, Roma.

Gerov, B. (1949), Romanizmat mezhdu Dunava i Balkana. Ch. 1: Ot Avgust do Hardian, *Godishnik na Sofiiskiya universitet, Istoriko-Filologicheski fakultet* 45/4, 3–91.

Gerov, B. (1952/1953), Romanizmat mezhdu Dunava i Balkana. Ch. 2: Ot Hadrian do Konstantin Veliki, *Godishnik na Sofiiskiya universitet, Filologicheski fakultet* 48: 307–411.

Grotefend, C. L. (1863), *Imperium romanum tributim descriptum die geographische Vertheilung der römischen Tribus im Ganzen romischen Reiche*, Hannover.

Kalinka, E. (1906), *Antike Denkmäler in Bulgarien*, Wien.

Karadimitrova, K. (2005), Novi posvetitelni nadpisi ot Ratsiariya, *Numizmatika, sfragistika i epigrafiika* 2: 205–222.

⁴⁹ Stoev 2017, 62.

- Karadimitrova, K. (2013), Latinitas v Ratsiariya i teritoriyata, in: M. Manov (ed.), *Vasilka Gerasimova – Tomova. In Memoriam*, Sofia: 266–272.
- Mócsy, A. (1970), *Gesellschaft und Romanisation in der Römischen Provinz Moesia Superior*, Budapest.
- Mócsy, A. (1986), Die Namen der Diplomempfänger, in: W. Eck, H. Wolff (eds.), *Heer und Integrationspolitik. Die römischen Militärdiplome als historische Quelle*, Köln–Wien: 437–466.
- Mócsy, A. (2015), *Pannonia and Upper Moesia: A History of the Middle Danube Provinces of the Roman Empire*, Abingdon, Oxon–New York.
- Stoev, K. (2014), Novi epigrafski pametnitsi ot Ratiaria i neinata teritoriya, in: R. Ivanov (ed.), *Ratiaria semper floreat*, t. 1: *Ratsiariya i neinata teritoriya. Izsledvaniya*, Sofia: 230–283.
- Stoev, K. (2015), K. L. Flaminus Crispus, ornatus ornamentis decurionalibus (v nadgroben nadpis ot Ratsiariya), *Izvestiya na Natsionalniya istoricheski muzei* 27: 103–112.
- Stoev, K. (2017), *Da badesh rimlyanin v Miziya. Antroponomiya i prosopografiya na romaniziranoto naselenie v Gorna i Dolna Miziya (I–III vek)*, Sofia.
- Stoev, K., Hristov, Iv. (2014), Epigrafski pametnitsi ot Ratsiariya, *Izvestiya na Natsionalniya istoricheski muzei* 26: 65–88.
- Topalilov, I. (2017), A New Governor of Moesia Superior, *ZPE* 201: 292–296.
- Topalilov, I. (forthcoming), Sanctuaries in Ratiaria and its Surroundings. In: Cs. Szabó, Ch. Gugl (eds.), *Sanctuaries in the Danubian Provinces Interdisciplinary Studies in the Archaeology of Religion*, Brill, Leiden.
- Velkov, I. (1940/1942), Nahodki i vesti ot razni mesta, *Izvestiya na balgarskiya arheologicheski institut* 14: 265–281.
- Velkov, V., Atanasova, Y. (1967), Latinski nadpisi ot Ratsiariya, *Izvestiya na arheologicheskiya institut* 30: 143–156.