

Konrad STAUNER\*

## The funerary inscription of Gaius Tarquitiu

*Abstract:* This article presents a fragmentary inscription of a Roman soldier named Gaius Tarquitiu who served probably as an ordinary soldier or as a middle-ranking officer at best in what presumably was an auxiliary cohort. Perhaps of Bithynian extraction, Gaius Tarquitiu or one of his forebears may have received Roman citizenship through the patronage of Marcus Tarquitiu Priscus, proconsul of *Bithynia et Pontus* in the reign of Nero.

*Keywords:* Roman army; auxiliary cohort; virgane grant of Roman citizenship; governor; Bithynia; Nikomedeia.

Slab of light-coloured marble, broken into several joining pieces; it perhaps originally formed one of the two longitudinal faces of a sarcophagus (πύελος) and was apparently sawn off on the left-hand side for some secondary use, a practice frequently encountered in Nikomedeia; most of the top as well as the right-hand and bottom sides are missing. The rear side of the slab is worked rough. As can be learned from the text (l. 4), the burial site comprised said sarcophagus and at least one other item.

The fine and very carefully carved lettering is typical of the High Empire, with fine apices, spacers and one extant ligature (line 7). Carved probably towards the end of the 1<sup>st</sup> or in the early 2<sup>nd</sup> century CE (roughly between 75 and 125 CE), the inscription was recorded in the Archaeological Museum of İzmit (Kocaeli) in 2003 and revised in 2007; its place of discovery is not known, but it is most probably İzmit/Nikomedeia.<sup>1</sup> Dimensions: H.: 0.97 m; W.: 1.50 m; D.: 0.16 m; H. of letters: 0.065–0.07 m.

The inscription is in a rather fragmentary state, which hampers its reconstruction. However, as far as the left-hand edge is preserved, the text seems to be intact. Making sense of what is left is compounded by the uncertainty as to the length of the missing portion of the inscription. The name Tarquitiu is mentioned in the fragments three times (lines 1, 4 and 5), but unfortunately the name's ending is missing in each case, making it impossible to reconstruct with certainty the case in which the name stood in each instance. Interestingly, only the Tarquitiu in line 1 bears a *praenomen*, while the Tarquiti in the lines 4 and 5 do not. They seem to have been related to Gaius Tarquitiu.

---

\* Dr. Konrad Stauner, lecturer at FernUniversität in Hagen, Germany (gephyra@arcor.de).

<sup>1</sup> I extend my thanks to my very dear friend and colleague Mustafa Adak for ceding to me the right to publish this inscription. I am also indebted to Christian Marek and Eckhard Meyer-Zwiffelhofer for discussing with me the inscription and giving me valuable suggestions. I also thank Anthony Birley for his comments! Any errors are, of course, my own.



- Γ. Ταρκύτι[ος + cognomen? + military title? + στρατευσάμενος? ]  
 2 ἐν σπείρη [+ number + name of unit? + years of service? + ζήσας? ]  
 ἀμέμπτως ἔτη[ + number of years + verb + τὸν βωμόν? ]  
 4 καὶ τὴν πύελον Ταρκυτίου[ υ? + cognomen? + καὶ Ταρκυτίου? ]  
 Κρατέρου καὶ Ταρκυτίου[ υ? + cognomen? + sons/brothers? + ?αὐ- ]  
 6 τοῦ καὶ κληρονόμου[ ων? + ἕτερος δὲ ἐν τῇ πυέλῳ? ]  
 μὴ βληθήσεται ἐ[άν δέ τις τολμήσῃ + verb? ]  
 8 [ἢ? κακο]υργήσαι τ[ι? ]
- 

#### Line-to-line commentary

Lines 1–2: The words ἐν σπείρη at the beginning of line 2 strongly suggest that line 1 ended with the participle στρατευσάμενος indicating that the deceased served *in a cohort*. This may have been followed by his number of years of service.<sup>2</sup> Whether or not a military title, perhaps in abbreviated fashion<sup>3</sup>, stood behind Tarquitiuus’ name cannot be said.<sup>4</sup> Since we have no further information about the military service of Gaius Tarquitiuus, all we can say is that he served in an auxiliary cohort.

<sup>2</sup> *Studia Pontica* III: 34, 70; *IKlaudiupolis* 162. The «στρατευσάμενος ἐν + name of unit» construction was used by both ordinary soldiers and officers (*INikaia* II.2, 1250; *TAM* IV.1, 285).

<sup>3</sup> Marek, *EA* 28, 1997, 81: στρατευσάμενον PX (= ἑκατόνταρχον); *Studia Pontica* III 49; *AE* 1915, 49.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *IGR* III 1396 = *IPrusa ad Olympum* 145; *TAM* IV.1.203.

As far as I can see, «ἐν σπείρη» has hitherto been unattested.

Lines 2–3: The words ἀμέπτως ἔτη at the beginning of line 3 suggest that line 2 ended with a word like ζήσας.<sup>5</sup> The inscription proclaims Gaius Tarquitius to have led an irreproachable life for so and so many years. This is a fairly sure indication that the inscription is funerary and that our Tarquitius is in all likelihood the deceased person. It is unclear, though, whether he died while an active soldier or after retirement. Apart from a 2–digit figure indicating the number of years Tarquitius had lived, line 3 must also have accommodated a word for an object set up together with the sarcophagus, as is shown by the continuation of the wording in line 4 (καὶ τὴν πύελον). Comparison with other funerary inscriptions from Nikomedeia suggests that this object may have been an «altar-shaped platform»<sup>6</sup> or βωμός<sup>7</sup> on which stood the πύελος, a word characteristic of Bithynia in general and of Nikomedeia and its environs in particular (Fig. 1).<sup>8</sup> Line 3 may also have provided room for a verb like κατασκευάζειν, ποιεῖν or τίθημι<sup>9</sup> indicating that C. Tarquitius and/or his relatives and heirs had set up the funerary monument with the concomitant inscription.



Fig. 1: a πύελος on top of a βωμός<sup>10</sup>

Lines 4–6: Interestingly, unlike the Tarquitius in line 1 the two Tarquiti in lines 4 and 5 do not bear a *praenomen*. This may be an indication that the Tarquiti in hand are not genuine Romans but Greeks with Roman citizenship, since, as Box remarks, the «omission of the *praenomen* from the style of Greeks possessing the citizenship of Rome is very common. [...] When Greeks acquired Roman citizenship they tended to treat their *praenomina* as though they were hereditary, like their gentile names, and not to use *cognomina* at all. Two results followed. First, the *praenomen* remained identical from generation to generation. Secondly, the Greek name, appearing in the third place after the nomen, bears a superficial resemblance to a *cognomen*, but is really the personal name of the man mentioned. To this last the father's Greek name is added in the genitive case in a complete formula. The *praenomen*, therefore, did not serve among the Greeks to distinguish different members of the same family. Its function was performed by the third, or Greek, name, with or without patronymic. It is not surprising, then, that the *praenomen*, being invariable in the family pedigree,

<sup>5</sup> TAM IV.1: 121, 263.

<sup>6</sup> Coulton 2005, 140. Dörner 1941, 23: «Die Sarkophage in Bithynien haben die Eigentümlichkeit der Aufstellung auf einem Unterbau ...».

<sup>7</sup> For the use of βωμοί as platforms see Kubinska 1968, 73–9.

<sup>8</sup> TAM IV.1: 231, 293; IScM II 204; cf. Kubinska 1968, 48–9; Marek 2003, 134; idem 2010, 564–8.

<sup>9</sup> TAM IV.1: 171, 236–8.

<sup>10</sup> Dörner 1941, Table 4.3.

and affording no means of identification, was frequently omitted in the styles of Greek bearers of Roman citizenship.»<sup>11</sup>

The fact that, first, at least one of the persons (Krateros) in lines 4–5 is given in the genitive and, second, «κληρονόμ.» in line 6 is not preceded by an article – which suggests a paratactic construction<sup>12</sup>, probably with a previously mentioned relationship indicator like ..., *his sons / brothers and heirs* (τῶν υἱῶν or ἀδελφῶν ἀνδρῶν)/τοῦ καὶ κληρονόμ[ων], of which τοῦ at the beginning of line 6 is still extant – makes it probable that all persons in these lines stood in the genitive. Perhaps the lines 3–6 contained a genitive absolute phrase saying that the men mentioned in these lines built the funerary monument.<sup>13</sup> Owing to the uncertainty as to the overall width of the slab, it is impossible to say without further information how many men we are dealing with, whether it is two or three; if two, then the Tarquiti in line 4 likely bore two (Greek) cognomina since it can be ruled out that this line ended right after the Latin nomen gentilicium, and so a further name must have stood between «Tarquiti» and the Greek cognomen Krateros in line 5. On the assumption of a parallel construction in the indication of names<sup>14</sup>, the Tarquiti in line 5 would then also have had to bear two (Greek) cognomina.<sup>15</sup> If it was three men, then each one of them could have been mentioned with his Latin name Tarquiti plus a (Greek) cognomen, whereby in line 4 the cognomen of the first Tarquiti and the Latin name of the second Tarquiti would be missing; only the latter's Greek cognomen would be preserved (Krateros). Conversely, in line 5 the Latin name of the third Tarquiti would be preserved, but not his (Greek) cognomen. If this is correct, a reading with three sons or brothers is preferable to one with only two, as the latter solution means that two cognomina plus a relationship indicator would have to be accommodated in line 5, which would probably render it (much) longer than line 4. The whole phrase in lines 3–6 may have read as follows: ... κατασκευασάντων τὸν βωμὸν / καὶ τὴν πύελον Ταρκυτίου + (Greek) cognomen καὶ Ταρκυτίου / Κρατέρου καὶ Ταρκυτίου + (Greek) cognomen, τῶν υἱῶν or ἀδελφῶν ἀνδρῶν/τοῦ καὶ κληρονόμ[ων]...<sup>16</sup>

Line 7: The fact that μὴ is written in ligature and the relatively narrow spacing between the next few letters may indicate that this line contained much text. I have not encountered another funerary inscription with identical wording, though some phrases come pretty close.<sup>17</sup> Yet, the message is quite clear: The words μὴ βληθήσεται (...will or shall not be buried [in the sarcophagus]) suggest a provision to the effect that nobody else shall be entombed in the sarcophagus – whether to the exception

<sup>11</sup> Box 1932, 180; cf. Fernoux 2004, 214–8.

<sup>12</sup> I am grateful to Professor Marek for drawing my attention to this possibility.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. *IPrusa ad Olympum* 83; *AE* 2006, 1420.

<sup>14</sup> Parallel indications of names, either with a Greek cognomen alone (e.g. *AE* 2004, 1455) or with the Latin nomen and a Greek cognomen (e.g. *AE* 2004, 1456), are not unusual.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. *IKlaudiupolis* 53. The chances that «Κρατέρου» is a patronymic are, in my opinion, rather slim, as the abovementioned paratactic construction would call for a relationship indicator applicable to all men in lines 4–5 in the same way (*his ... and heirs*). Different degrees of relationship would make a parallel construction difficult, if not impossible. Although it is theoretically possible that the Tarquiti in lines 4–5 are the sons or brothers not of Gaius Tarquiti, but of different fathers, it is not very likely. I have not found an inscription that would support such a reconstruction.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. *TAM* V.1.604; *AE* 1930, 107; *SEG* 41, 1364. Numerous inscriptions, also from *Bithynia et Pontus*, show similar father–son–brother burial constellations, e.g. *Studia Pontica* III 49: Antonius Crispus and Antonius Calvinus erected a tomb for their father L. Antonius Valens, a *centurio legionis*, and their brother M. Antonius Aelianus.

<sup>17</sup> *TAM* IV.1: 185; 231.

or inclusion of certain persons cannot be said.<sup>18</sup> The word following βληθήσεται begins with an E which is unlikely to have belonged to the preposition εις (in a phrase like εις ταύτην τήν πύελον or εις ἡν<sup>19</sup>) since in this case one would expect to see the top of the iota (I) (unless there was an inordinately wide gap between the E and the I, which is unlikely<sup>20</sup>). What could have followed is an A; in this case the distance between the E and the apex of the A is wide enough for the apex not to be visible because it lay just beyond the fracture line.<sup>21</sup> E and A could be expanded into ἔαν as part of the phrase ἔαν δέ τις τολμήσῃ (if someone dares to...).<sup>22</sup> Comparison with other such provisions suggests that the one in hand also contained a stipulation warning against infringement and threatening pecuniary punishment for trespassers.<sup>23</sup>

Line 8: The tops of seven letters are clearly visible: Y P Γ (or E?) Η Σ Α (or Λ?) Ι. If these letters formed part of one and not of different words, the sequence ΥΡΓΗΣΛΙ or ΥΡΕΗΣΛΙ cannot be expanded into any meaningful (part of a) word, while ΥΡΓΗΣΑΙ looks much more promising. Its last three letters may be an aorist infinitive ending (-σαι). The Η immediately preceding the possible infinitive ending suggests that the verb in question is a contract verb that changes its ε to η in the aorist (ποιεῖν > ποιῆσαι). The Υ is not unlikely to have been preceded by an Ο, so that we may have to look for a verb ending in -ουργεῖν in the present tense infinitive. As said above, lines 6 and 7 probably contained a provision about who was allowed to be interred in the sarcophagus and about how to deal with trespassers or vandalisers of the burial site. Potential malefactors may therefore have been addressed in line 8. A suitable verb for acts of vandalism or malice would be κακουργεῖν, which means «do evil, work wickedness»<sup>24</sup>. As in line 7, the narrow spacing between the letters suggests that this line contained much text, too.



Line 3: T in ΑΜΕΜΠΙΤΩΣ



Fig. 2: Left half of transverse hasta of a T is visible after top of iota; cf. T in l. 3.

On close inspection, even what looks like the left half of a transverse hasta of a T is visible after the top of the iota (I) mentioned above, so that, if I surmise correctly, we have the discernible remains of a total of eight letters ΥΡΓΗΣΑΙΤ in line 8. If the first seven of them belong together and have perhaps formed part of the verb κακουργῆσαι, the T perhaps belonged to a word like τι.<sup>25</sup> The line may have contained (part of) a sentence along the lines of *if somebody dares to (... or) inflict damage to any part of the burial site he shall pay ... to...* – and may in Greek perhaps have read ἔαν

<sup>18</sup> Exclusion of others: *ISmyrna* 211.11–3; partial exclusion: *IEphesos* 2424.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. *TAM* IV.1: 243, 293.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. the distance between E and I in σπεῖρη, line 2. For the same reason, «εἰ» as in the phrase «εἰ δέ τις τολμήσῃ» seems improbable.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. the distance between the E and Λ in πύελον in line 4.

<sup>22</sup> *TAM* IV.1: 215; cf. 236, 237, 238.

<sup>23</sup> Torchia 1970, 288; Cormack 1997, 149–50; Marek 2003, 132–3; idem 2010, 567–8.

<sup>24</sup> *LSJ*, p. 864 s. v. κακουργέω.

<sup>25</sup> *IEphesos* 2211; cf. *TAM* IV.1.220; Cass. Dio 40.45.2. However, a restoration like τ[ὴν σορόν] is equally possible (cf. *TAM* IV.1: 263, 267, 334).

δέ τις τολμήσῃ (... ἦ) κακουργήσαί τι, δώσει ... ✕ ...<sup>26</sup> The four letters KAKO could easily be accommodated at the beginning of this line.

### Gaius Tarquitiu s and his Roman citizenship

The above elaborations have shown that it is not unlikely that Gaius Tarquitiu s had a Greek background and perhaps hailed from Nikomedeia. Yet, he appears to have been a bearer of the Roman citizenship. If this appearance is not deceptive, how did he come by it? Perhaps through military service in the Roman army, as so many others of his fellow countrymen did. However, one should also consider another possibility for him or one of his forebears to have acquired the citizenship of Rome. Under Nero there was a proconsul of *Bithynia et Pontus*, Marcus Tarquitiu s Priscus, whose full name is known from provincial coins.<sup>27</sup> If this identity in name is not a mere coincidence, the name in our inscription may attest to a viritane grant of Roman citizenship by the homonymous governor.

Without further information it is impossible to say whether Gaius Tarquitiu s (perhaps together with one or all of the other men mentioned<sup>28</sup>) or a common forebear received Roman citizenship through the patronage of the governor M. Tarquitiu s Priscus and handed it down to his children. Be that as it may. If the grant was indeed viritane, what does this tell us about the social standing of Gaius Tarquitiu s (or his forebear)? A viritane grant connotes connections to (a) high-ranking person(s) close to the emperor, in our case to the provincial governor. Gaius Tarquitiu s (or his forebear) must have somehow won the governor's attention, which would have been easiest if he was a provincial notable, i.e. a member of the local elite, perhaps in Nikomedeia, the seat of the Bithynian *koinon* and of a temple for the imperial cult. These institutions could have provided occasions for a notable to meet, socialise with and become a friend of the governor. A man like M. Tarquitiu s Priscus was certainly accessible and amenable to a notable with the necessary wherewithal and a desire to become a Roman.<sup>29</sup> As a member of a local elite family endowed with the Roman citizenship, Gaius Tarquitiu s could have embarked on a career as an officer (*centurio*) in an auxiliary unit.<sup>30</sup> However, Gaius Tarquitiu s (or his forebear) was in all likelihood not a member of the *equester ordo*, because one would then expect him to have entered on a career in the *equestris militia*, which he did not (see below).<sup>31</sup> It is equally possible that Gaius Tarquitiu s was just an auxiliary soldier who

<sup>26</sup> TAM IV.1: 256, 265, 267.

<sup>27</sup> PIR<sup>2</sup> T 25. M. Tarquitiu s Priscus was charged by the Bithynians with extortion (*repetunda*) and convicted (Tac. *Ann.* 14.46; cf. *Ann.* 12.59). For an overview of governors of this province prosecuted for *repetunda*, see Brunt 1961, 224–7; see also Rémy 1988, 47.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Plin. *Ep.* 10.106–7: The *centurio* P. Accius Aquila of the *cohors VI equestris* in Bithynia «petitioned Pliny to request citizenship for his daughter from Trajan» (Saddington 2000, 174). According to Torchia (1970, 73), Aquila appears to have «received Roman citizenship under conditions which left his daughter a peregrina (x, 106). This was not an ordinary grant; normally, he and his family would receive citizenship at his discharge. But this letter further illustrates the native, non-Roman composition of the army in Bithynia.»

<sup>29</sup> Jacques/Scheid (1998, 236) assume that acquiring the citizenship was a time-consuming process involving official fees and bribes. Cf. Acts 22.28; Cass. Dio 60.17.6–8; Sherwin-White <sup>2</sup>1973, 246.

<sup>30</sup> Alföldy 2000, 39. For Roman army officers with Greek names, see Devijver 1986. The earliest and only officer from Bithynia attested with certainty for the early first century (cf. Table on p. 200) is ...tilius Longus from Apamea (Neronian; CIL III 335 = *I Apameia und Pylai* 2; Fernoux 2004, 416 no. 1).

<sup>31</sup> Alföldy 2000, 39. Devijver (1986, 145) believes that the «new citizens of an emperor did not always enter the *ordo equester* right away. I have the impression that only a small group was made citizens and *eques* simultaneously; most had to wait 1 to 3 generations to attain equestrian status.»



somehow won the governor's support for a viritane grant. Strictly speaking, it cannot even be ruled out that Gaius Tarquitiu was the son of a former slave who was manumitted by M. Tarquitiu Priscus and adopted his former master's *nomen*.<sup>32</sup> Be that as it may, all we can say with relative confidence is that if the excellent workmanship of the slab fragments and the impeccable execution of the extant inscription are indicative of the financial resources of Gaius Tarquitiu, he must have been a man of means, able to have a nice burial site set up for himself and his relatives.

### The soldier Gaius Tarquitiu

The name Tarquitiu is a rarity at best amongst Roman soldiers under the Empire. Spaul does not list a single soldier with this *nomen*; consultation of *CIL* III furnishes the meagre result of a single Tarquitiu<sup>33</sup>, who, however, does not seem to have been a soldier, and even the compendious *CIL* VIII volumes include but a single man of this name.<sup>34</sup> Devijver lists only one officer of Italian origin by this name.<sup>35</sup> In addition, a legionary centurion named (Quintus) Tarquitiu Restitutus and a *legatus Augusti* Q(uintus) Tarquitiu Catulus are known from Cologne.<sup>36</sup> No Tarquitiu has hitherto been known from Bithynia.

If Gaius Tarquitiu was a Roman citizen prior to his military service, one would normally expect him as a soldier to have served in the legions. However, he could also have served in a *cohors civium Romanorum*.<sup>37</sup> Even service in a peregrine cohort is possible. Epigraphic evidence suggests that Roman citizens served in auxiliary units right from the time of Augustus.<sup>38</sup> Though initially low, their numbers seem to have strongly increased around the middle of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century CE. Holder adduces several reasons why Roman citizens served in auxiliary units: Citizen-soldiers may have been transferred from a legion to an auxiliary unit.<sup>39</sup> Another reason could be non-compliance with the physical requirements for service in the legions.<sup>40</sup> A third possibility is that an auxiliary soldier received a viritane grant of citizenship: «This would have happened through the recommendation of a person

---

<sup>32</sup> For example, on L. Calpurnius L. f. Ser(gia) Frugi of *Antiochia Pisidiae* (*CIL* III 6831; *PME* C 54) who served, amongst other things, as *praefectus alae Augustae Germanicianae* Devijver (1986, 175) remarks that he «may be a new citizen of L. Calpurnius Piso, leg. Aug. pro praetore (ca. a. 14–13 BC; Sherk 1980 [*ANRW* II.7.2]: 964b), or a descendant of a freedman of this governor?» On *liberti* in this context, see also Dessau 1910, 25; Devijver 1986, 146–7. Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 13.27.

<sup>33</sup> *CIL* III, p. 2371 s. v. Tarquitiu.

<sup>34</sup> *CIL* VIII 2569.6. The *AE* indices for 1931–40, 1941–50 and 1961–80 do not contain an entry for a Tarquitiu, either.

<sup>35</sup> *CIL* XI 3801. *PME* T 3; cf. Holder 1980, 247 E 55.

<sup>36</sup> Q.T.R.: *CIL* XIII 12048 = *ILS* 9241 = *AE* 1910, 61; cf. *CIL* XIII 12041. Q.T.C.: *CIL* XIII 8170. See also *OPEL* IV p. 108 s.v. Tarquitiu.

<sup>37</sup> For a list of *cohortes civium Romanorum*, see Spaul 2000, 19–20.

<sup>38</sup> *CIL* IX 733 (Augustan); cf. Speidel 1980. *CIL* III 12347 (Tiberian); cf. Holder 1980, 49 with fn. 4. *AE* 1969/70, 583 (Domitian); cf. Saddington 2000, 169–71.

<sup>39</sup> The *pridianum cohortis I Augustae praetoriae Lusitanorum equitatae* (*RMR* 64, col. II.13–21; 31<sup>st</sup> Aug. 156 CE) lists two soldiers as having been transferred from the *legio II Traiana* to this cohort. The entry does not suggest that this was an act of demotion. Holder (1980, 49) assumes that it was a «simple transfer», but also says that there is «no definite evidence of such transfers earlier than this».

<sup>40</sup> Vegetius (*mil.* 1.5) writes that a height of six feet or at least five feet ten inches was required for service in the cavalry or in the first cohort of a legion. According to Holder (1980, 50), such «standards were probably less severe for service in auxiliary cohorts. Thus, if a citizen recruit was physically fit although not tall enough for the legions, it is conceivable he would have been drafted into an auxiliary cohort rather than have been rejected.»

of influence, as for example the provincial governor. In such cases the man would not assume an imperial gentilicium, making him difficult to recognise.»<sup>41</sup> It could also be that a man was drafted into an auxiliary unit to meet an emergency.<sup>42</sup>

The extant fragments tell us nothing directly about Gaius Tarquitiu's rank. If he made a career for himself in the army, he presumably did not mention the various rungs he had climbed but indicated only the last post he held. And he probably served only in the auxiliary cohort mentioned in line 2, since there was probably not enough room left in this line to accommodate yet another unit with its (full) name. If he was an officer, he cannot have been more than a middle-ranking one, perhaps a *centurio*. As such he may have indicated himself as having served *in a cohort*. As the unit's commanding officer he would most certainly have used a genitive construction to identify himself as commander *of the cohort* (ἑπαρχος σπειρης/*praefectus cohortis*).<sup>43</sup> This also tells us that our Tarquitiu was not a member of the *equester ordo* because as such he would have served as the commander of the cohort.

A comparison of the length of information about Tarquitiu's military service, which took up a line or two at most, and that of what follows (indication of elements of the burial site, naming of relatives and heirs plus a more or less elaborate provision about the future use of the grave) shows that the emphasis was obviously not on Tarquitiu's military service or career.<sup>44</sup> This is quite telling, as inscriptions provided an excellent opportunity to make one's achievements or social advancement known to a wider public and therefore constituted a social asset that also enhanced the prestige of the deceased's relatives. Perhaps there was not much to advertise. At all events, the extant wording does not suggest that Tarquitiu was a man with an awesome career in the army.

I am therefore inclined to see in Gaius Tarquitiu a first- or second-generation bearer of Roman citizenship who perhaps hailed from Nikomedeia and served in an auxiliary cohort as an ordinary soldier, a non-commissioned officer or, at best, a middle-ranking officer.

### Abbreviated Literature

The abbreviations used in this article are generally those listed in *Brill's Encyclopaedia of the Ancient World New Pauly*, Vol. I (Leiden/ Boston, 2006). All other abbreviations are indicated below.

Alföldy 2000	G. Alföldy, Das Heer in der Sozialstruktur des Römischen Kaiserreiches, in: G. Alföldy / B. Dobson / W. Eck (eds.), <i>Kaiser, Heer und Gesellschaft in der Römischen Kaiserzeit. Gedenkschrift für Eric Birley</i> (Stuttgart 2000) 33–57.
Box 1932	H. Box, Roman Citizenship in Laconia, Part II, <i>JRS</i> 22.2, 1932, 165–83.
Brunt 1961	P. A. Brunt, Charges of Provincial Maladministration under the Early Principate, <i>Historia</i> 10, 1961, 189–227.
Cormack 1997	S. Cormack, Funerary Monuments and Mortuary Practice in Roman Asia Minor, in: S. E. Alcock, <i>The Early Roman Empire in the East</i> (Oxford 1997) 137–56.
Coulton 2005	J. J. Coulton, Pedestals as 'altars' in Roman Asia Minor, <i>AS</i> 55, 2005,

<sup>41</sup> Holder 1980, 50; cf. Saddington 2000, 173–4.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. Mann (1983, 52–3) for emergency recruitment into legions; by analogy, the same system may have applied to auxiliary units.

<sup>43</sup> E.g. *IEphesos* 680.

<sup>44</sup> In numerous inscriptions in this province, protective provisions concerning the use of the burial site and warning against infringement take up more than half of the text; cf. Marek (s. fn. 23).



- 127–57.
- Dessau 1910 H. Dessau, Die Herkunft der Offiziere und Beamten des römischen Kaiserreiches während der ersten zwei Jahrhunderte seines Bestehens, *Hermes* 45, 1910, 1–26.
- Devijver 1986 H. Devijver, Equestrian Officers from the East, in: Ph. Freeman / D. Kennedy (eds.), *The Defence of the Roman and Byzantine East. Proceedings of a colloquium held at the University of Sheffield in April 1986* (Oxford 1986) 109–225 = H. Devijver, *The Equestrian Officers of the Roman Imperial Army*, Vol. I (Mavors Vol. VI) (Amsterdam 1989) 273–389.
- Dörner 1941 F. K. Dörner, *Inschriften und Denkmäler aus Bithynien* (Berlin 1941).
- Fernoux 2004 H.-L. Fernoux, *Notables et élites des cités de Bithynie aux époques hellénistique et romaine (IIIe siècle av. J.-C. – IIIe siècle ap. J.-C.). Essai d'histoire social* (Lyon 2004).
- Holder 1980 P. A. Holder, *Studies in the Auxilia of the Roman Army from Augustus to Trajan* (BAR Intern. Ser. 70) (Oxford 1980).
- IApameia und Pylai* *Die Inschriften von Apameia (Bithynien) und Pylai (IK 32)*, ed. by Th. Corsten (Bonn 1987).
- IEphesos* *Die Inschriften von Ephesos*  
– nos. 600–1000 (IK 13), ed. by H. Engelmann / D. Knibbe / R. Merkelbach (Bonn 1980).  
– nos. 2001–2958 (IK 16), ed. by R. Merkelbach / J. Nollé (Bonn 1980).
- IKlaudiupolis* *Die Inschriften von Klaudiupolis (IK 31)*, ed. by F. Becker-Bertau (Bonn 1986).
- INikaia* *Katalog der antiken Inschriften des Museums von Iznik (Nikaia)*, Part II.2 (nos. 1230–1597): *Entfernte Umgebung der Stadt (IK 10.2)*, ed. by S. Şahin (Bonn 1982).
- IPrusa ad Olympum* *Die Inschriften von Prusa ad Olympum*, Vol. I (IK 39), ed. by Th. Corsten (Bonn 1991).
- IScM* *Inscriptiones Scythiae Minoris Graeciae et Latinae* (Bucharest 1980–).
- Jacques/Scheid 1998 F. Jacques / J. Scheid, *Rom und das Reich in der Hohen Kaiserzeit: 44. v. Chr.–260 n. Chr.* Vol. 1: *Die Struktur des Reiches* (Stuttgart/Leipzig 1998).
- Kubinska 1968 J. Kubinska, *Les Monuments funéraires dans les inscriptions grecques de l'Asie mineure* (Warsaw 1968).
- Mann 1983 J. C. Mann, *Legionary Recruitment and Veteran Settlement during the Principate* (Edited for publication by M. M. Roxan) (London 1983).
- Marek 2003 Chr. Marek, *Pontus et Bithynia. Die römischen Provinzen im Norden Kleinasien* (Mainz 2003).
- Marek 2010 Chr. Marek, *Geschichte Kleinasien in der Antike* (München 2010).
- OPEL IV* *Onomasticon Provinciarum Europae Latinarum*, Vol. IV: *Quadrata – Zures*, by B. Lőrincz (Vienna 2002).
- PME* H. Devijver, *Prosopographia Militarium Equestrium Quae Fuerunt Ab Augusto Ad Gallienum*, Vols. I–V (Leuven 1976–1993).
- Rémy 1988 B. Rémy, *Les fastes sénatoriaux des provinces romaines d'Anatolie au Haut-Empire (31 av. J.-C. – 284 ap. J.-C.) (Pont-Bithynie, Galatie, Cappadoce, Lycie–Pamphylie et Cilicie)* (Paris 1988).
- RMR* R. O. Fink, *Roman Military Records on Papyrus* (Philological Monographs of the American Philological Association, no. 26) (Ann Arbor / Michigan 1971).

- Saddington 2000 D. B. Saddington, The sorts of names used by auxiliaries in the Early Principate, in: G. Alföldy / B. Dobson / W. Eck (eds.), *Kaiser, Heer und Gesellschaft in der Römischen Kaiserzeit. Gedenkschrift für Eric Birley* (Stuttgart 2000) 163–78.
- Sherwin-White <sup>2</sup>1973 A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Roman Citizenship* (Oxford <sup>2</sup>1973, reprint ed. 2001).
- Spaul 2000 J. Spaul, *Cohors<sup>2</sup>. The evidence for and a short history of the auxiliary infantry units of the Imperial Roman Army* (BAR Intern. Ser. 841) (Oxford 2000).
- Speidel 1980 M. Speidel, A Spanish Cavalry Decurion in the Time of Caesar and Augustus, *AEA* 53, 1980, 211–3 = M. Speidel, *Roman Army Studies*, Vol. I (Amsterdam 1984) 111–3.
- Studia Pontica* III J. G. C. Anderson / F. Cumont / H. Grégoire (eds.), *Studia Pontica*, Vol. III: *Recueil des inscriptions grecques et latines du Pont et de l'Arménie* (Brussels 1910).
- Torchia 1970 M. K. Torchia, *Trajan and Civic Autonomy in Bithynia. A Study of the Governments of Nicaea, Nicomedia, and Prusa* (Yale 1970).

## Özet

### Gaius Tarquitiu'sun Mezar Yazıtı

Makalede Nikomedeia kentinde ele geçen ve Kocaeli Müzesi'nde korunan kırık bir lahit parçasının üzerindeki yazıt yorumlanmaktadır. Lahit; Roma ordusunda orta derece bir subay ya da sıradan bir asker olarak hizmet vermiş olan Gaius Tarquitiu (Krateros)'a aittir. Mezar sahibinin Bithynia kökenli olduğu düşünülmektedir. Kendisi veya atalarından birisi Roma vatandaşlığı hakkını almayı başarmıştır. Vatandaşlık büyük ihtimalle Nero Dönemi'nde *Bithynia et Pontus* valisi olan Marcus Tarquitiu Priscus vesilesiyle verilmiştir. Gaius Tarquitiu muhtemelen Bithynia'da konuşlanmış olan bir yardımcı birlikte görev yapmış olabilir.

*Anahtar Sözcükler:* Roma ordusu; yardımcı birlikler; Roma vatandaşlığı; vali; Bitinya; Nikomedeia.