

*Militärdiplome. Die Forschungsbeiträge der Berner Gespräche von 2004.* Herausgegeben von MICHAEL ALEXANDER SPEIDEL – HANS LIEB unter Mitarbeit von ALFRED MICHAEL HIRT. *Mavors Roman Army Researches* 15. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 2007. ISBN 978-3-515-09144-2. IX, 414 S. EUR 88.

The fifteenth volume of the *Mavors* series consists of fifteen papers, written by the leading scholars of their specific fields, related to the study of Roman discharge diplomas presented in a colloquium held in Bern in October 2004. This conference was a continuation of a previous colloquium held in Passau in 1984 and the papers presented in Bern are in many ways related to the research questions raised during the previous conference. The number of known diplomas had nearly doubled during the time that elapsed between the colloquia and many issues could now be re-examined in a different light.

The first paper, written by Franziska Beutler (pp. 1–14), discusses the origin of the military diplomas and the development of discharge preconditions and benefits in the Julio-Claudian era. The observations she brings forth show that the development of a regular system was relatively slow; the early emperors only granted extended civic rights with *conubium* (which included the offspring and possible other family members) sparingly, and seemingly such grants were originally provided only individually through extraordinary merit. Although the development of official documents and legal formulas of discharge grants were finally formalized by Claudius, it remains uncertain whether the grants already concerned all veterans at that time or whether veterans still required additional merits to obtain grants.

The next paper by Regula Frei-Stolba (pp. 15–53) covers the problems related to the witnesses in the early *diplomata* and provides a full prosopographic study of them. The study covers such issues as the legal status of the witnesses, their relationship to the recipient, problems related to the early manufacture of the diplomas and irregularities in their witness lists. In another paper concerning early *diplomata*, Slobodan Dušanić (pp. 55–85) examines the religious and propaganda significance of the location (*loci*) and dates (*dies*) of the bronze discharge tablets on the Capitol and provides further insight into the challenges related to some witness lists of the early *diplomata*. Dušanić's attempt to argue that the diploma *CIL XVI 28* is related to the possible Dacian incursion of 81/82 CE on the other hand would seem to be based on too narrow an interpretation of this singular piece of evidence. The suggestion that the find spot of the diploma and its *dies* and *loci* could mean that every auxiliary unit of Germania Superior provided vexillations for the war and that all of these were seconded under the general command of *legio I Italica* seems overly simplified and stretches the evidence. Especially given that the precise meaning of the *dies* and *loci* given are uncertain, and the simplest explanation that the recipient of the diploma died while travelling from his parent unit in Germania back to his native country in Galatia is not taken into consideration.

The legal standpoint of the formulas used in diplomas are examined by Werner Eck (pp. 87–104), who concentrates on the changes that occur during the reign of Antoninus Pius (138–161 CE). The interpretation of these changes to privileges, which mainly concerned the spouses and the offspring of the auxiliary soldiers born during the time in service, shows that Antoninus Pius had a deeply conscientious mind for legal issues and strict attitude toward military discipline. The next two papers are written by Paul Holder. The first one (pp. 105–63) is a statistical study continuing the research of the late Margaret Roxan with several tables (pp. 120–42) concerning diploma distribution, the status and origin of their recipients, and the

possible reasons for them obtaining a diploma in the first place. The paper also includes a full list (pp. 144–63) of diplomas from Flavian to the Antonine Era (71–192 CE) as it stood at the time of the colloquium. The second paper (pp. 165–86) examines the dissimilarities between multiple copies of the same constitutions, and shows on the basis of variations in abbreviations and spelling mistakes that there was no uniform method of production.

The issue of authorship of the diplomas is further pursued by Peter Weiss, whose paper (pp. 187–207) deals with multiple authors and later additions to the text of the diplomas. The examination shows that the production of diplomas evolved into mass production, where basic formulas were inserted in advance and details only added later, while mistakes of the first engraver or changed details on the formulas could be corrected to the text by various means. Barnabás Lőrincz on the other hand provides a continuation (pp. 209–20) of his paper from the 1984 colloquium and examines the forms of provincial governors' names and the function they performed in the discharge process.

The paper by Barbara Pferdehirt (pp. 221–45) examines the use of auxiliary vexillations and their manifestation in the diplomas. This interesting study concentrates on diplomas that mention the discharge of men while temporarily located in another province and the question of whether these units had been sent as complete units or if only vexillations had been used. The issue of vexillations occasionally remaining in a new province and evolving slowly into a unit in their own right is also reviewed. The use of topographical sequences in the order of units listed in the diplomas is examined by Zsolt Visy (pp. 247–65). The known diplomas for Pannonia are used as a case study and the author determines that either straight topographical listings or mixed topographical listings (where *milliaria* units were given precedence) were generally in use until the Marcomannic wars.

Auxiliary recruitment patterns are surveyed by Sébastien Gallet and Yann Le Bohec (pp. 267–92). Their study raises the question of continued recruitment (especially of specialists) from each unit's province of origin against the evidence of local recruitment. Michael A. Speidel (pp. 293–325) examines the process of honourable discharge and what this meant for the veterans in practice. This very interesting survey also explores the cases where men seem to have chosen to remain in service even after the fulfilment of required service time and their actual discharge.

Questions related to discharge are also considered by Miroslava Mirković (pp. 327–43), who examines the reasons why veterans would return to their native lands after twenty-five years of service. One of the more interesting questions examined is whether certain rights such as land ownership and tax exemptions bequeathed to a specific tribe followed veterans to the provinces where they served or whether they were required to return to their native land to take full advantage of their individual rights. Hartmut Wolff (pp. 345–72) provides a study of the policy of granting civil rights to the veterans during the Principate as well as its late republican precedents and relation to larger imperial ideologies. The series of papers is concluded by Hans Lieb (pp. 373–88), who examines the length of service among the different branches of the Roman army.

It is not unfair to say that, in recent years, discharge diplomas have provided an unforeseen surge in our knowledge of Roman administration, military history and in the complicated legal issues related to the status of veterans and their families. Since the colloquium in Bern, several hundred new complete or fragmentary diplomas have come to light which keep providing new information about the Roman world. It is against the backdrop of this new information

that the importance of these fifteen papers should be seen. In the end, one can only state that this collection of papers is not merely valuable to those who seek deeper understanding of the actual diplomas themselves, but also to those who are interested in larger issues of Roman society.

*Kai Juntunen*

*Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum. Consilio et auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Berolinensis et Brandenburgensis editum. Vol. II<sup>2</sup>: Inscriptiones Hispaniae Latinae. Pars XIV: Conventus Tarraconensis. Fasc. 2: Colonia Iulia Urbs Triumphalis Tarraco.* Edidit GÉZA ALFÖLDY. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin – New York 2010. ISBN 978-3-11-026403-6. CXXVII, 304 (pp. 169–472) pp. EUR 199.95, USD 300.

Hic corporis vol. II partis XIV (dedicatae titulis conventus Tarraconensis) fasciculus secundus continet titulos Tarraconenses (fasciculus primus, editus a. 1995, titulos eiusdem conventus partis meridionalis continet), sed non omnes, ut quidam sine dubio existimabunt propterea, quod in frontispicio legimus "Fasciculus secundus. Colonia Iulia Urbis Triumphalis Tarraco", cum tituli sepulcrales praeter eos, qui pertinent ad homines ordinum paulo superiorum, et indices in hoc fasciculo non reperiantur et hic fasciculus solum titulos nn. 815-1199 contineat. Tituli tamen fasciculi eius, qui hunc sequetur, et qui mox ut spero edetur, quamquam editorem titulorum Tarraconensium G. Alföldy Athenis nuper mortuum esse valde dolemus (sub <http://cil.bbaw.de/> legimus enim "Zur Zeit bereitet das CIL zwei weitere Bände Géza Alföldys zum Druck vor, die seine Neuedition der Inschriften Tarracos abschließen werden — postum"), hic et illic in hoc fasciculo laudantur (e.g. n. 2341 p. CI).

Idem Alföldy iam a. 1975 ediderat titulos Tarraconenses in libro qui inscribitur *Die römischen Inschriften von Tarraco (RIT)*. At post a. 1975 reperti sunt tituli novi multi, et tituli quidam Tarraconenses melius explicati sunt, saepissime ab ipso Alföldy; ita facile intellegitur, cur Alföldy titulos Tarraconenses denuo edendos esse sibi persuaserit. Titulos, qui in *RIT* non inveniuntur sed qui in ephemeridibus vel in libris quibusdam post a. 1975 editi sunt, observavi praeter fragmenta quaedam hos, nn. 828a, 836, 838a, 841, 860, 893, 944a (titulus imp. Constantis), 982, 1017, 1023, 1065 (fragmentum a), 1068, 1075, 1078a, 1152; notandum est titulos quosdam non esse receptos in *Année épigraphique* (e.g. nn. 860, 893, 1017 editus a. 1995, qui est titulus M. Fulvi Grati honoribus Tarracone functi et tribuni militum legionis XI Claudiae, 1152). Titulos omnino novos observavi nn. 946, 992a (titulus L. Rutili Pudentis Crispini hominis ordinis senatorii, cuius praenomen adhuc ignorabatur; in v. 2 legendum est *pr[ae]f(ecto)*, non *pr[ae]f(ectus)*, cum et nomina et honores alii enuntiantur casu dativo, non nominativo), 1000, 1001, 1025. Tituli melius lecti vel intellecti sunt n. 974 (titulus Caninae Gallae), 977 (*RIT* 362, quem titulum iam apparet esse positum in honorem Cn. Domiti Calvini), 989 (*RIT* 143, in quo titulo posito sub imp. Pertinace iam legitur *cos. II post patre patriae*). Etiam hoc notandum est, Alföldy se ipsum saepius corrigere (e.g. nn. 837 – "aliter ALFÖLDY 1978a ... minus recte" –, 908, 910, 929, 966, 1019, 1070, 1077, 1110, 1120, 1163, in adnotationibus).

Fasciculus hic praeter Praefationem continet Conspectum auctorum operumque laudatorum (ubi non inveni "FRANCE 2001", quod opus laudatur ad n. 1108) et capita haec: De in-