

Lukas LEMCKE*

Status identification on the road: requisitioning of travel resources
by senators, equestrians, and centurions without *diplomata*.
A note on the Sagalassus inscription (SEG XXVI 1392)

Abstract: This article seeks to answer the question posed in a study which I undertook with Altay Coşkun (forthcoming in *Latomus* 2013) how high-ranking users (senators, knights, and centurions) of the imperial information and transportation system (most commonly known by its late antique name, *cursus publicus*) would prove their social class, military rank, and official nature of their journey in order to qualify for requisitioning at stations (*mansiones*, *mutationes*) without permits (*diplomata*). Using the results of this study as basis, I offer a survey over the susceptibility of each of the classes of high-ranking users for status usurpation. This section is followed up by a discussion of the various ways in which identification was possible, including status symbols (*ornamenta*), travel permissions (*legatio libera*, *commeatus*) as well as other written documentation (*mandata*, *codicilli*, army records). It will thus be shown that there were acceptably reliable mechanisms in place to prove one's social status. This result will further corroborate the findings of our previous study that permits, in accordance with the edict of Sotidius Strabo (SEG XXVI, 1392 [20/37]), were not obligatory for certain status groups. Permits became a requirement for all users only in the reign of Claudius.

Keywords: status usurpation; senator; equestrian; centurion; *cursus publicus*; requisitioning; travel.

1. Background and Introduction

The inscription SEG XXVI, 1392 [20/37] from Sagalassus, Pisidia, first published by Stephen Mitchell in 1976,¹ is one of the most important pieces of evidence relating to the Imperial Information and Transportation System (IITS). The text represents an edict by Sextus Sotidius Strabo Libuscidianus, governor of Galatia, in both Latin and its Greek translation. This ruling tried to curb the misuse of the IITS at the expense of the provincials by defining precisely who was entitled to use that institution and under which conditions.

As such, this document has received a good deal of attention since its initial treatment, most notably by Anne Kolb.² But in a most recent study that I have undertaken together with Altay Coşkun, we have revisited the text in an attempt to specify more consistently the conditions under which the IITS worked in the 1st century CE with a particular interest in establishing who the official users of the institution were. We explain that the *militantes* mentioned in the inscription made up the largest part of the users of the IITS. This blanket term describes all «high- and low-ranking officials engaged in some function in the provincial or imperial administration as well as soldiers.»³ Based on this definition and a new analysis especially of the Latin text, we provide a fresh interpretation of the most controversial

* Lukas Lemcke, University of Waterloo, Department of Classical Studies, ML 209, Waterloo ON, N2L 3G1 (llemcke@uwaterloo.ca).

The present article is based on results from my Honours BA Thesis written during the Fall and Winter trimesters 2011/2012 under the supervision of Dr. Altay Coşkun.

¹ Mitchell 1976.

² Kolb, *Transport* 54–63 and 71–82.

³ Lemcke – Coşkun 2013, with a more complete bibliography on the Sagalassus inscription in fn. 15.

lines of the inscription, ll. 16–21,⁴ which detail those users who required permits (*diplomata*) to requisition *vehicula* and those who did not need such documents. We conclude that, for the purpose of requisitioning, the entire group of *militantes* was divided into three subgroups:

«a) *militantes ... ita ut ...*: high-ranking officials who are specified in the *ita ut*-clause, such as senators, knights, and centurions: as the *procurator* and his son, who had been singled out at the beginning, they did not require *diplomata* to requisition the allowance set out in this inscription;

b) *militantes ... ii, qui diplomum habebunt*: low-ranking state officials, including everyone not addressed under a), or high-ranking officials who were to exceed the regular maximum allowance, all of whom needed *diplomata*; slaves were not included in this category, and the same may be true for freedmen, at least if they acted not as state officials in their own right, but as clients for their patrons in a public position; but effectively the same rules applied to such slaves as to the lower-ranking *militantes*;

c) *militantes ... ii, qui ex alis provinciis militantes commeabunt*: all officials travelling through from other provinces, whose need of a *diploma* depended on whether they belonged to group a) or b).»⁵

According to this interpretation, a low-ranking official, i.e. any Roman official below the rank of centurion, had to provide written documentation in the form of a *diploma* to requisition *vehicula* at stations of the IITS. Therein, the maximum number of carts or draught animals would be specified. Since high-ranking officials did not require *diplomata* in order to requisition *vehicula*, their claim seems to have been based on their belonging to a social class, tenure of an official post, or holding of a certain military rank. However, the means by which these attributes contributed to establishing the traveller's legal right to requisition on the road has not yet received the attention it deserves. Finding an answer to this problem is all the more important as *usurpatio* – the appropriation of the status symbols of a higher class than one's own – was a well-known phenomenon in the Roman Empire. Indeed, examples for this kind of offence are attested as early as the 2nd century BCE⁶ and as late as the 3rd and 4th centuries CE.⁷

After an overview over the risk of status usurpation among the three groups of high-ranking officials identified in the Sagalassus inscription, the discussion will turn towards an investigation of the means of identification available to each of those groups.

2. Potential for *Usurpatio* among the Three User Groups defined by status

The *ordo senatorius* represents the most powerful and prestigious of the three groups singled out. It thus comes as no surprise that the number of its members was kept relatively low, being fixed at 600 according to the adjustments made by Augustus in 28 and 18 BCE. In addition to the numerical cap, all emperors tended to keep senators on a more or less tight leash and wanted to be informed about their whereabouts owing to their great influence and wealth.⁸ More crucially, the recruitment of senators – by adlection or through the grant of the *latus clavus* – was only possible at the hands of the emperors

⁴ *praeterea militantibus, et iis qui diplomum [sic] habebunt, et iis qui ex alis provinciis militantes commeabunt ita ut senatori populi Romani non plus quam decem carra [...]; equiti Romano cuius officio princeps optimus utitur ter carra [...]; centurioni carrum [...].*

⁵ Lemcke – Coşkun 2013, part 2.

⁶ See for example Liv. 34,42,5: *nouum ius eo anno a Ferentinatibus temptatum*, with Coşkun, Bürgerrecht 166–167 and fn. 514.

⁷ Cf. Paulus, Sent. 5,25,12: *Qui insignia altioris ordinis utuntur militiamque confingunt, quo quem terreant uel concutiant, humiliores capite puniuntur, honestiores deportantur*; Amm. Marc. 15,6,3: *praesumere fortunae superioris insignia*. On status usurpation in ancient Rome in general, see Reinhold 1969 and Reinhold 1971.

⁸ For the number of senators, see Eck, Augustus 70. Reinhold 1971, 280 out of hand considers abuse of the senatorial status unthinkable. This statement is incorrect. Though rare, there is evidence that usurpation of senatorial status did happen, see fn. 20 below. The monitoring of senators is discussed in Drogula 2011. See also Lemcke – Coşkun 2013, part 4.

themselves.⁹ Unfortunately, we do not know with certainty how such advancements of status were documented prior to the mid-4th century.¹⁰ Nevertheless, the restriction of this procedure suggests a close connection between the emperors and their senators as well as the formers' explicit interest in controlling matters surrounding the elite class of the empire. This interest must have arisen, at least to some degree, for reasons of self-preservation. Emperors were highly aware of the influence, wealth, and the resulting power of famous and «prestigeladen» ancient family names and their ability to incite rebellions or other forms of political opposition.¹¹ That being said, senators remained prevalent in most high offices of the imperial and provincial administration and throughout the high ranks of the military until the early 3rd century CE.¹²

The second-highest social class in the Roman Empire was the *ordo equester*. Contrary to senatorial status which could only be attained through the emperor personally, gaining equestrian status seems to have been much more closely linked to fulfilling the *census* requirement of HS 400,000.¹³ While it is true that the grant of the public horse (*equus publicus*) or direct adlection into the panel of jurors (*decuria iudicum*) could only be received from the emperor directly, obtaining one of these honors did not determine whether one belonged to the equestrian class or not.¹⁴ Moreover, members of this class could look forward to reaching the highest distinction in service to the empire. They were employed in all areas of the Roman military and civic administration with the possibility of attaining some of the most prestigious offices available at the time, e.g., that of the *praefectus Aegypti*.¹⁵ They could advance to senatorial rank by adlection at the hand of the emperor and in this way achieve the greatest *dignitas* attainable in Roman society, though at times equestrian rank was preferred notwithstanding.¹⁶ Reasons for this decision can be found in a compelling survey by Alföldy, which shows that equestrian and senatorial salaries rose relatively parallel as members advanced through the offices of their respective *cursus honorum*; and that, at least among the upper echelons of the *ordo equester*, the similarities to the *ordo senatorius* in terms of prestige and standing far outweighed the differences. In essence, these two *ordines* together formed the «politisch-militärische Führungsschicht» of the Roman Empire.¹⁷ The *ordo equester* thus offered its members a plethora of opportunities which could lead them to high office if desired while falling short of the *ordo senatorius* only in terms of *dignitas*.¹⁸ If the vast opportunities are contrasted with the relative ease with which one could enter the ranks of the knights, it will be no surprise

⁹ Millar, Emperor 290–291.

¹⁰ Cod. Theod. 12,1,42,1 [354]: *Si quis autem clarissimae meruerit infulus dignitatis nec indulti muneris gratiam codicillorum allegatione percepit, impetratae fructum dignitatis amittat.*

¹¹ Similarly, cf. Eich, Metamorphose 271–272, who makes a compelling argument against Brunt 1983, 63–66.

¹² Cf. Alföldy 1981, 174–177 for the financial administration; 177–178 for military commands; 178–179 for the administrative posts in Rome; 179 for the administration of Italy; 179–180 for the provincial administration; 180–182 for the circle of advisors to the emperor; for the limitation of the highest religious offices to senators, see 182.

¹³ Millar, Emperor 283–284.

¹⁴ See Millar, Emperor 280 with fn. 10, who states that Cass. Dio 59,9,5 and Suet. Vesp. 9,2 could be interpreted as the only known exceptions to this rule. For a number of examples illuminating the grant of the public horse to individuals and adlection into the *decuria iudicum*, see Millar, Emperor 280–284.

¹⁵ See Alföldy 1981, 173–182 and 206–217. Equestrians were most prevalent among the low-ranking officials in the military and the civic administration and only drew level with the senatorial order where the most prestigious offices were concerned in the 3rd century CE; similarly, see Nicolet, César 241–247.

¹⁶ For advancement by adlection, see Gagé, Classes Sociales 115–117 and Nicolet, César 247–250. For reasons against attaining senatorial status as well as examples, see Stein, Ritterstand 195–202 and 216–217, who nonetheless maintains that those who refused advancement to the senatorial class «stehen doch ziemlich vereinzelt dar.»

¹⁷ Alföldy 1981, p. 206–207 for literal quotation.

¹⁸ Suet. Vesp. 9: *Utrumque ordinem non tam libertate quam dignitate differe*; similarly, Cic. Dom. 74: *proximus est huic dignitati ordo equester.*

that the *ordo equester* was far more commonly the target of status usurpation than the *ordo senatorius*.¹⁹ In addition, the ambition to become a knight was nurtured by two mutually reinforcing factors during the 1st centuries BCE and CE: on the one hand, membership of the *ordo equester* was much more accessible thanks to a significantly lower census requirement than that for the *ordo senatorius*. Another reason was the simple fact that the number of knights in the empire was so great that it was essentially impossible to monitor every single member of the class;²⁰ on the other hand, there was a growing pool of freedmen who had accumulated sufficient wealth and the ambition to claim equestrian status for themselves. Tiberius attempted to counteract this trend with the *lex Visellia* in 23 CE. It barred freedmen from usurping any official positions or ranks reserved for freeborn men, with the exception of those who had received the *ius annuli aurei* from the emperor himself. Shortly afterwards, in 24 CE, the senate even went further by passing a *senatusconsultum*, restricting equestrian status to individuals whose fathers and grandfathers had been freeborn and who possessed a census rating of at least HS 400,000. Therefore, those freedmen mentioned above were now legally prohibited from attaining their desired social rank. It is thus not surprising that many self-made men were enticed to pass themselves off as knights and reap at least some of the benefits that came with this status. The extent of this problem is hinted at by Suetonius. He reports that when Claudius was censor in 48 CE, he had to make a number of arrests after a certain Flavius Proculus, himself an equestrian (*unus ex equitibus*), accused 400 freedmen (*libertos*) of having claimed equestrian status illegally.²¹

The third group of *militantes* singled out in the Sagalassus inscription consisted of centurions. With them, the focus shifts to the usurpation of military rank rather than social class, which the Romans appear to have taken even more seriously: while the penalties for the latter extended to loss of citizenship and exile, the usurpation of military status was frequently penalized with capital punishment.²² The severity of punishment correlates with the extremely small number of extant examples for this kind of offence related to the centurionate which suggests that it was very uncommon.²³

The frequency and prevalence of usurpation of status or rank thus clearly varied among the three groups discussed above. It was almost unheard of among the *ordo senatorius* on account of the close supervision and limited size of that social order and occurred only rarely among centurions, probably due to fear of rigorous punishment upon discovery. The equestrian order, on the other hand, seems to have been prone to attract status usurpers since it was relatively easy for an individual to blend into the masses of knights while gaining considerable immediate and future benefits.

¹⁹ Reinhold 1971, 280–282; for examples, see Cass. Dio 78,13,3–4; Juv. 5,3; Mart. 5,8; 5,23; 5,35. See Cass. Dio 73,6,2 for an example of usurpation of senatorial status (text in fn. 25).

²⁰ Reinhold 1971, 280. Vittinghoff 1980, 40 estimates that there were several tens of thousands of knights; also see Stein, Ritterstand 81–82; Eich, Metamorphose 260, with fn. 1.

²¹ Plin. nat. 33,8: *Adeoque id promiscuum esse coepit, ut apud Claudium Caesarem in censura eius unus ex equitibus Flavius Proculus cccc ex ea causa reos postularet*. Reinhold 1971, 287 most likely correctly associates these 400 individuals with the *libertinos* whose names Claudius published according to Suet. Claud. 25: *libertinos, qui se pro equitibus Romanis agerent, publicavit*; for specific cases of usurpation, see fn. 20 and fn. 24. According to Tac. Ann. 2,59, senators and the most prominent equestrians were prohibited from travelling to Egypt since Augustus.

²² The penalties for the usurpation of citizenship were initially limited to depriving the culprit of his illegally obtained qualification (cf. *lex Licinia Mucia* of 95 BCE). The *lex Papia* of 65 BCE increased the penalty by threatening exile from the city of Rome. See Coşkun, Archias 54–59 for penalties of usurping military status; further, cf. Paulus Sent. 5,25,12 (text see fn. 8 above); Dig. 49,16,11 prohibits slaves from enlisting for any military service at pain of capital punishment; also cf. Plin. Ep. 10,29–30; Dig. 49,16,4,1–9.

²³ For the only reference to an individual who had usurped centurion rank, cf. Cass. Dio 67,13,1, who recounts the case of Claudius Pacatus, an ex-centurion, who was identified as a slave and thus surrendered to his master for punishment.

3. Methods of Status Identification

In any event, once a traveller reached a changing station, he would have to provide proof of either his social class, his official function, or his military mission and rank, in order to requisition means of transportation without holding a *diploma*. The methods of identification can conveniently be split into two categories. First, the outward appearance of the traveller, ranging from the simple *dignitas*, *gravitas*, and *professio* – the «déclaration orale»²⁴ when communicating with the station personnel – to the *ornamenta*²⁵ and *insignia* he carried as status symbols: all of these would partially contribute to his credibility when identifying himself; secondly, written documentation stating his official reason for travelling and – therewith – also his social class, his military rank, or his mission would provide another means of identification.

3.1. *Ornamenta* – External Status Symbols

Both Roman society and government were underpinned by a highly complex hierarchical structure. Adhering to a certain social class was not only a gateway to the highest offices and honours, but also conditioned an individual's legal rights and privileges. Belonging to one of the upper social classes was thus crucial for one's career prospects, and it paid to be recognized as an important persona from afar. Thus, certain *ornamenta*, external status symbols, came to be associated with each social class for exactly that purpose.

As a Roman citizen, a senator was permitted to wear the *toga*, though the extent to which this rather cumbersome piece of clothing, whose only function was to qualify the wearer as a Roman citizen, was used on the road is questionable. Of much greater importance were the belted tunic with the broad purple stripe (*latus clavus*) and the characteristic, possibly black, senatorial shoes (*calcei*).²⁶ Especially the first was widely recognized as the prerogative of the senatorial class and must have been a particularly important *ornamentum* to display. The *calcei* were most likely of somewhat lesser importance for identification on the road. They were meant to be worn in combination with the *toga* and may at times have been substituted in favour of more comfortable sandals which were worn together with the tunic, particularly when travelling. Nevertheless, in his complaints about the dress code of young senators who showed themselves in Rome wearing tunics, Greek cloaks, and sandals, the second-century CE writer Gellius is most insistent about the inappropriateness of this attire when he turns his attention towards the sandals. His account may indicate the importance of proper shoes (i.e., *calcei*) as part of the senatorial wardrobe on the one hand, contrasted by their limited use in reality for reasons that remain unspecified on the other.²⁷

An equestrian was permitted to wear the *trabeate* or the normal *toga* over a belted tunic with a narrow purple stripe (*angustus clavus*) underneath, equestrian *calcei*, as well as the golden ring (*anulus aureus*). When travelling, any version of the *toga* – *trabeate* or plain – would certainly have been just as inappropriate for equestrians as it was for senators. Rather, in analogy to senatorial dress, it was again the

²⁴ Moatti 2000, 928. Indeed, the *habitus* of a person when interacting with others seems to have held at least as much significance as *ornamenta* with respect to being identified as an aristocrat. Cass. Dio 73,6,2 reports that Pertinax exposed the imposter of Sextus Condianus on account of the latter's lack of learnedness (οὕτω που τὸ μὲν εἶδος ἐκ φύσεως καὶ τὰλλα ἐξ ἐπιτηδεύσεως αὐτῷ ἔψκει, τῆς δὲ δὴ παιδείας αὐτοῦ οὐ μετεσχίκει); further, Josephus attests that Augustus exposed an individual who pretended to be Alexander, son of Herod, king of Judea, due to his rough body – Josephus likens it to that of a slave – which was contrary to the softness of body that should be his as a result of years of generous learning (Jos. BI 2, 101–10; Ant. Iud. 17, 324–37).

²⁵ Moatti 2000, 928. For *ornamenta* in general, see Mommsen, Staatsrecht¹ 439–450.

²⁶ Regarding senatorial *calcei*, see Goldman 1994, 116–122; for the clothing of senators, see Croom, Roman Clothing 31–41, particularly 33 for tunics during the 1st and 2nd centuries CE; 61–62 for footwear; on senatorial dress in general, cf. Cleland et al., Dress «*Senatorial Dress*.»

²⁷ Gell. NA 13,22.

tunic with the *angustus clavus* that constituted one of the most characteristic and important items in a knight's wardrobe. There are no sources that attest the importance of equestrian *calcei*. We know, however, that they were of similar make as those of senators and only differed in that they were made of inferior materials.²⁸ Due to this general resemblance, it seems reasonable to assume that they, again similarly to their senatorial counterpart, may have been generally recognized as belonging to the equestrian class. However that may be, at least as important as the *angustus clavus* was the golden ring (*anulus aureus*), a symbol inextricably linked to the equestrian order in the 1st century CE. The sheer number of cases in which the two are directly associated in the sources may serve as testimony to its importance as a status symbol until the reign of Hadrian, when the *ius aureorum anulorum* began to stand merely as a proof of *ingenuitas*.²⁹ It is all the more surprising then that throughout the 1st centuries BCE and CE there are reports of freedmen being elevated to equestrian status «at the whim of Roman officials»³⁰ through the grant of the golden ring. The proliferation of the *anulus aureus* might well have had a detrimental effect on its exclusivity and prestige.³¹ Thus, Pliny the Elder dramatically comments on the state of the equestrian order in the 1st century CE: *ita dum separatur ordo ab ingenuis, communicatus est cum seruitiis*.³²

The use of *ornamenta* to identify centurions on the road is problematic at best. Ancient sources provide very little information on the differences in dress in the army. It is known that officers from the rank of centurion upwards wore the *paludamentum*, a military cloak of better quality than that of normal soldiers. It was fastened around the neck or on the right shoulder with a *fibula* and was coloured in dyed scarlet or purple, or bleached white. Its lower edge could be curved and was sometimes decorated with tassels or fringes.³³ Moreover, a soldier on official business had to wear his uniform, including *tunica* (tunic), *sagum* (thick cloak), *congulum* (sword belt), *gladius* (sword), and *pugio* (dagger), which would at least further facilitate the identification of a traveller as a military man. However, an inscription showing a Roman soldier most likely travelling on official business may suggest that this dress code was at times handled somewhat loosely.³⁴

Finally, the ease with which counterfeits of all the *ornamenta* described above could be obtained must be considered. Neither the tunic with the *latus clavus* or the *angustus clavus*, nor the *calcei* of either the senatorial or the equestrian class were impossible to forge: purple dye was available to individuals from almost any social layer in the Roman Empire at varying qualities, and a fake, if not checked too closely, could probably pass inspection at the hands of station personnel.³⁵ Moreover, senatorial or equestrian

²⁸ For equestrian status symbols in general, see Stein, Ritterstand 31–47; Alföldi, Reiteradel 26–72; and Reinhold 1971, 285. For the dress of equestrians, cf. Cleland et al., Dress «*Equites (Dress of)*»

²⁹ Dig. 2,4,10,3: [...] *quamuis omnia ingenuitatis munia habet*; Dig. 40,10,5: *Is, qui ius anulorum impetrauit, ut ingenuus habetur* [...]; cf. Dig. 40,10,6 for the rescript of Hadrian to the same law, allowing the elevation to free status through the grant of the *ius aureorum anulorum*; see Stein, Ritterstand 41–47, and Alföldi, Reiteradel 26–35 about the significance of the *anulus aureus* for equestrians during the empire.

³⁰ Reinhold 1970, 279.

³¹ Reinhold 1970, 279 accepts the granting of golden rings by Roman magistrates as «common practice.» This seems somewhat problematic as we only have a handful of examples from the first century BCE indicating this sort of procedure. Cicero even denounces one such case – Verres granting a golden ring to his clerk Maevius (Cic. Verr. 2,3,185; 187) – as done with *singulari impudentia noua*, indicating at the very least that the grant of golden rings to mere clerks was heard of but that it was certainly not well received or commonplace in his times.

³² Plin. nat. 33,8.

³³ For the dress of Roman centurions and soldiers while on official missions, see Sander 1963, 149; Croom, Roman Clothing 52; and Cleland et al., Dress «*Centurion*» and «*Military Dress*» For the *paludamentum*, see *ibid.*, «*paludamentum*»; Croom, Roman Clothing 52; and Sander 1963, 153.

³⁴ Sander 1963, 149, fn. 33.

³⁵ For the availability of purple dye in the Roman Empire, see Reinhold, Purple 48–61. That purple on clothing in general was common even though attempts were made by emperors since Augustus to restrict its use to the upper clas-

shoes, if they were worn while travelling, could most likely be obtained by anybody with the money for the product and possibly a little extra to persuade a somewhat more ‘conscientious’ vendor through bribes. Even the golden rings that were such an important *ornamentum* for equestrians were prone to forgery. Literary evidence, reinforced by physical remains, attests that freedmen used gold plated rings to appear as members of the equestrian order.³⁶ These cases notwithstanding, the *anulus aureus* continued to be identified with the equestrian order until the early 2nd century CE and as such must have been an essential status symbol for equestrians to put on display. The same is true for the *latus clavus* and *angustus clavus* for their respective classes. Only for centurions, the effectiveness of *ornamenta* is impossible to judge due to the lack of sources, though the severe punishments for usurping military status as outlined above may have been enough of a deterrent.

3.2. Written Documentation

The use of written documentation for status identification always requires that the controllers were at least semi-literate.³⁷ But while there is, as far as I know, no evidence directly indicating the qualification of station workers *per se*, the existence of some level of literacy must have been expected as is implied by the official use of *diplomata*. Maintaining this minimum level of reading comprehension should not have presented much of a problem to the *municipia*, whose responsibility it was to maintain the stations during the 1st century CE.³⁸ This becomes particularly clear if we consider the case of Sagalassus as an example: the city had to service stations of the IITS along the *viae militares* in its territory, in this specific case approximately 42 km of the *Via Sebaste*.³⁹ Along this stretch of road, there may have been about three stations that fell within the sphere of responsibility of the city.⁴⁰ Accordingly, a city of 2500–3750 inhabitants⁴¹ would have had to provide at least three semi-literate individuals to guarantee the minimum level of literacy at the stations in its territory.

There is ample evidence that the emperors starting from the beginning of the Principate attempted to control the movement of senators and high-ranking equestrians to check their influence and power.⁴² Thus, Augustus prohibited both groups from entering Egypt and leaving Italy without his explicit

ses is shown in Reinhold 1971, 282–285.

³⁶ Plin. nat. 33,6,23; for examples see Marshall, Finger Rings nos. 20 and 32.

³⁷ According to Harris, Literacy 5, a semi-literate is a «person who can write slowly or not at all, and who can read without being able to read complex or very lengthy texts.» This degree of literacy is adequate for the purposes of the IITS, as the travel documents only had to be read and understood at the changing stations.

³⁸ Plut. Galba 8.4 for the responsibility of the *municipia* to maintain the IITS.

³⁹ See Mitchell 1976, 117–120 for a discussion of the extent of the territory of Sagalassus; for details about the course of the *Via Sebaste*, cf. Waelkens 2002, 322–323, French, Roads A.9; G.4; H; I.1–2; J.1.

⁴⁰ Holmberg, *Cursus Publicus 71–77* and Kornemann 1953, 1003–1004 both note an average distance between *mutationes* (changing stations) of 8–10 *mp*. Ausbüttel, *Verwaltung 108* notes a slightly higher average of 11,8 *mp* specifically in Asia Minor; Kolb, *Transport 212–213*, fn. 10, following Holmberg, *loc. cit.*, notes the average distance between *mansiones* (resting stations) as 25 *mp*. However, a closer review of the *Itineraria Burdigalense (ItBurd)* and *Antonini (ItAnt)* indicates a slightly different pattern. Following the common route of both itineraries from Constantinople via Nicaea to Ancyra, the average distance between stations, including both *mutationes* and *mansiones*, in the *ItAnt* is 21,5 *mp*, while it is 9,5 *mp* for the *ItBurd*. Turning south from Ancyra towards Tarsus, these distances on average remain the same in the *ItAnt* but increase to 13,3 *mp* in the *ItBurd*. For the latter, the distances increase just as the road from Ancyra enters the mountainous regions of Central Anatolia, which have a topographical similarity to the area around Sagalassus. For the purpose of this example, I will thus be using a distance of 13 *mp* (ca. 19,5 km) between stations. Of course, the applicability of these figures based on distances attested from the 3rd and 4th centuries CE to conditions the 1st century is most likely optimistic.

⁴¹ Waelkens 2006, 210.

⁴² Most recently, Drogula 2011 has argued for a deliberate policy of the Roman emperors to restrict the movement of the empire’s aristocracy.

permission.⁴³ That these regulations were commonly known at least among Roman officers and probably civic functionaries is implied when Tacitus reports that the senator Rubrius Fabatus was discovered near the straights of Sicily by a centurion, who immediately returned him to Rome. There, Rubrius was punished, having been unable to provide a feasible explanation for his journey.⁴⁴ Reports that emperors intentionally promoted certain individuals to senatorial rank in order to restrain them to Rome, in other words to «bind them with golden fetters,»⁴⁵ again emphasize the conscious restriction of senatorial travel at the hands of the emperors.⁴⁶ Since senators as well as equestrians had to travel from time to time for official or private reasons, it stands to believe that there existed documented, official procedures to accommodate these cases.

A first insight into travel documentation might be gained from a closer look at the *legatio libera*, which senators had to obtain since Republican times if they wished to absent themselves from Rome. Surviving information about details surrounding the *legatio libera* in the sources is very scarce.⁴⁷ Nonetheless, it is possible to say a few things about its nature. In Cicero's days, it could only be obtained through a direct application to the senate.⁴⁸ Suetonius reports that during the reign of Tiberius, the senate, contrary to the directive of the emperor, furnished a *praetor* with a *legatio libera*.⁴⁹ The Republican system of granting the leaves of absence thus probably still remained in place to some degree until Claudius reserved the right to grant such permissions to himself. At the same time, he allowed senators who owned property in Sicily or Narbonese Gaul to visit these provinces without receiving a leave of absence.⁵⁰

Those who had obtained a *legatio libera* are defined as follows in the *Digesta* of Justinian: «*qui libera legatione abest, non videtur rei publicae causa abesse: hic enim non publici commodi causa, sed sui abest.*»⁵¹ The latter thus confirms what seems clear from Cicero's comments, namely that the *legatio libera* merely allowed a senator (and perhaps a knight, see below) to absent himself from Rome for a certain time

⁴³ See Cass. Dio 52,42,6–7 regarding the prohibition for senators to leave Italy without permission in 29 CE; Cass. Dio 51,17,1–2 indicates that Augustus prohibited senators from entering Egypt; Tac. Ann. 2,59 and Hist. 1,11,1 includes prominent equestrians (*equites inlustres*) alongside senators: *nam Augustus inter alia dominationis arcana, vetitis nisi permissu ingredi senatoribus aut equitibus Romanis inlustribus, seposuit Aegyptum*. On the latter, see especially Geraci, *Genesis* 137–146 (non vidi) and Brunt 1983, 61–63.

⁴⁴ Tac. Ann. 6,14,2. Similarly, Drogula 2011, 245, who goes a step further when he states that «the restriction on senatorial travel was common knowledge.»

⁴⁵ Cass. Dio 60,29.

⁴⁶ Tiberius honoured two senators, Aelius Lamia (21/2 CE) and L. Arruntius (22/3 CE), with the governorships of Syria and Spain, respectively, but did not permit them to leave for their posts (Tac. Ann. 6,27 = Hist. 2,65). A similar event is reported under Nero in Tac. Ann. 13,22,1: *Syria P. Anteio destinata, set variis mox artibus elusus ad postremum in urbe retentus est*.

⁴⁷ On the *legatio libera*, see Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*^{II.1} 671–672. He classifies it as «einer der schädlichsten und schreiendsten Missbräuche der das Gemeinwesen als Privatdomäne ausbeutenden Oligarchie» while pointing out that the name in itself was contradictory to its purpose by implying an official mission from the senate when none was in reality assigned. Similarly, Suolahti 1969, 115: «The *legatio libera* meant, as is obvious from the title, the status of a *legatus* without any fixed official duty.» Talbert, *Senate* 139 characterizes *legationes liberae* as «travel warrants entitling the bearer to treatment reserved for government officials;» see similarly Bonnefond-Coudry, *Sénat* 370–371. Cf. further Moatti 2000, 935–937.

⁴⁸ Cf. Cic. Fam. 12,21.

⁴⁹ Suet. Tib. 31.

⁵⁰ Suet. Claud. 16; Cass. Dio 100,60,25,6–7, which finds confirmation in Plin. Ep. 10,8,6 and the response from Trajan in Ep. 10,9. For the permission to visit Sicily and Narbonese Gaul, see Tac. Ann. 12,23: *Galliae Narbonensi ob egregiam in patres reuerentiam datum ut senatoribus eius prouinciae non exquisite principis sententia, iure quo Sicilia habetur, res suas inuisere liceret*.

⁵¹ Dig. 50,7,15.

period on private rather than official business.⁵² On the latter point, Cicero is very clear when he provides the following reasons for which the submission of an application was proper: in order to fulfill oaths (*voti causa*⁵³), for exacting payment of debts (*exigendi causa*⁵⁴), and for one's private business (*negotiorum suorum causa*⁵⁵). This interpretation finds further support in an alternative term for a leave of absence that came to be used in place of *legatio libera*, namely *commeatus*. In the context of leave of absence, this term appears for the first time in Cicero who condemns Verres for offering to send sailors on a leave for the entire summer against payment of 600 sesterces.⁵⁶ It appears again in Livy⁵⁷ and thereafter in Quintilian,⁵⁸ Tacitus,⁵⁹ several places in Suetonius,⁶⁰ and Pliny.⁶¹ The apparent significant difference in the frequency of use of *commeatus* and *legatio libera* in the authors of the 1st and early 2nd centuries CE may indicate the increased popularity of the former.⁶² Lawyers of the 3rd and 4th centuries CE were still familiar with it, indicating its continued use at least until that time.⁶³ Known to us mainly from military records as an official leave of absence,⁶⁴ the *commeatus* appears to have had largely the same purpose as a *legatio libera*, although the specific meaning of the term may have varied depending on the recipient of the document. If, however, the *commeatus* had a very similar format regardless of whether it was applied in a military or civil context, the recipient of a *legatio libera* was only allowed to absent himself for a specific time period determined upon grant of the leave of absence.⁶⁵ Evidence suggests as much for *legationes liberae* at least during the Republic: In 44 BCE, Cicero wrote to Atticus that they were valid only within a certain time limit set down in a Julian law (*lege Iulia*⁶⁶). He provides no further detail on this regulation that possibly reaffirmed the *lex Tullia de liberis legationibus* which he himself had introduced during his consulship in 63 BCE.⁶⁷ Overall then, *legationes liberae* and *commeatus* provided recipients with the right to absent themselves from their post for non-official reasons.

⁵² Cic. Leg. agr. 2,45,3–4: *legatos nostros, homines auctoritate tenui, qui rerum privatarum causa legationes libera obeunt [...]*.

⁵³ Cic. Att. 2,18.

⁵⁴ Cic. Flac. 86,7.

⁵⁵ Cic. Fam. 12,21.

⁵⁶ Cic. Verr. 2,5,61

⁵⁷ Liv. 3,46,9–10: [9] *Appius [...] collegisque in castra scribit, ne Verginio commeatum dent atque etiam in custodia habeant. [10] improbum consilium serum, ut debuit, fuit, et iam commeatu sumpto profectus Verginius prima vigilia erat, [...]*.

⁵⁸ Quint. Inst. 7,4,14.

⁵⁹ Tac. Hist. 1,46.

⁶⁰ For example, cf. Suet. Tib. 10; Claud. 23; Nero 35; Galba 6.

⁶¹ Plin. Ep. 3,4,2.

⁶² Since the only mention of *legatio libera* other than that in the *Digesta* is, like most of the occurrences of *commeatus*, from Suetonius, it is impossible to say with any certainty when exactly one term overtook the other in popularity during the 1st century. On the other hand, our perspective might simply be skewed on account of the kinds of extant written sources. Nevertheless, the *commeatus* seems to have been considered as equivalent of the *legatio libera* eventually, cf. Schol. Bob. Cic. Flac. 86: *An legationes liberae? Eas nunc commeatus appellamus.*

⁶³ For later examples, see Cod. Theod. 7,12: De Commeatu and Dig. 50,1,22,6; 50,7,15.

⁶⁴ The excavations at Vindolanda have brought to light a number of such documents, cf. TVII 168; 174; 175; 176; 177. According to Dig. 49,16,1, soldiers holding a *commeatus* were not considered to be in the service of the state, reinforcing its similarity to the *legatio libera* as defined in fn. 52. Veg. mil. 2,19 indicates that the army kept records of *commeatus*, called *breves*. That the *commeatus* was used by officials in the civic administration is indicated in Plin. Ep. 10,8,5–6.

⁶⁵ Dig. 49,16,14.

⁶⁶ Cic. Att. 15,11.

⁶⁷ Rotondi, *Leges* 379–380: Cicero attempted to abolish the *legatio libera* altogether but was prevented from doing so by the veto of a tribune. In the end, he appears to have been able to limit its valid duration to one year.

They indicated that senators – and possibly even equestrians in high positions⁶⁸ – were legally allowed to travel and, combined with the appropriate *ornamenta*, these documents would go a long way in proving the status of their holders. From the extant records of applications for *commeatus* as well as due to the fact that decisions of the senate were always recorded, we know with certainty that written proof of these leaves of absence existed. However, none of the sources explicitly indicate whether a traveller would retain a copy of this document for his own records. But since senators needed to be able to prove that their leave of absence was sanctioned upon request,⁶⁹ Talbert's definition of a *legatio libera* as a «travel warrant,»⁷⁰ i.e. a written document in the possession of the traveller, seems to be the only possible solution.

Next, it is clear that, with few exceptions,⁷¹ the emperor personally awarded the higher offices to individuals of the equestrian and senatorial classes. For equestrians, this practice applied particularly to military capacities, such as tribuneships or various prefectural positions within the military hierarchy, as well as a great number of other positions at all levels, while senatorial positions depended on personal conferment at all times. All grants of office were accompanied by *codicilli* from the emperor confirming the respective individuals as office holders.⁷² A rather curious example is that of Gaius, who rewarded a senator for eating with great relish at his table with the praetorship by bestowing *codicilli* upon him.⁷³ Moreover, Suetonius recounts an episode during the reign of Vespasian, in which the emperor rescinded the letter of appointment of a young man who was expressing his gratitude for having been granted a military position on account of the smell of his overpowering perfume.⁷⁴ But there are other more conventional examples, such as that of Julius Severus, who was sent into Asia as legate with a letter and *codicilli* of the divine Hadrian.⁷⁵ Others, attesting the conferment of consular governorships⁷⁶ by means of *codicilli*, indicate that this practice was certainly not uncommon and applied to most of the official

⁶⁸ This is indicated by a reprimand that Claudius gave certain knights when they had absented themselves from Rome without seeking his approval. Cf. Suet. Claud. 16,2: *notavitque multos, et quosdam inopinantis et ex causa novi generis, quod se inscio ac sine commeatu Italia excessissent.*

⁶⁹ See fn. 44.

⁷⁰ See fn. 47.

⁷¹ Millar, Emperor 284–285, following Mommsen, Staatsrecht^{II} 266, indicates the possibility that imperial *legati* could fill a certain number of the equestrian positions in their staffs with individuals of their own choosing. In Ep. 4,4, Pliny asks Sosius Senecio to grant a six month tribunate to Gaius Calvisius; in Ep. 7,22, he asks his friend Falco, who was governor-designate of Judaea at the time, to make his friend Cornelius Mucianus a military tribune; however, the only other piece of evidence for this practice is CIL XIII, 3162 [early 3rd century] from Vieux, so the generalization of this right is problematic. For the latter, also see Pflaum, Carrières 771 no. 297, 1.

⁷² Suet. Aug. 46: *equestrem militiam petentis etiam ex commendatione publica cuiusque oppidi ordinabat*; also cf. Artem. 4,28: ἰππικός ἀνὴρ στρατείας αἰτῶν παρὰ τοῦ βασιλέως. For the personal conferment of office and status, see Millar, Emperor 279–290 (equestrian offices); 290–313 (senatorial offices) with further examples. Also see Dig. 27,1,41 (ed. Krueger): *administratos rem principum ex indulgentia eorum, licet citra codicillos, a tutela itemque cura tempore administrationis delata excusantur. Idemque custoditur in his, qui praefecturam annonae vel uigilum gerunt.* Millar, Emperor 288, reading «*licet citra codicillis*» [sic], misleadingly translates «even without *codicilli*.» Rather, following the translation of Watson, Digest («although this is not expressed in writing»), these officials still required *codicilli*. Thus, the exemptions from tutelage and curatorships applied even if they were not mentioned explicitly within the *codicilli* of the respective official.

⁷³ Suet. Calig. 18,2: *Sparsit et missilia variarum rerum et panaria cum obsonio viritim divisit; qua epulatione equiti R. contra se hilarius avidiusque vescenti partes suas misit, sed et senatori ob eandem causam codicillos, quibus praetorem eum extra ordinem designabat.*

⁷⁴ Suet. Vesp. 8,3.

⁷⁵ IGR III, 174 = OGIS 543, ll. 9–11: πρεσβεύσα[ν] τα ἐν Ἀσίᾳ ἐξ ἐπιστολῆς [καί] κωδικίλων Θεοῦ Ἀδριανοῦ. For another example for the award of a legateship by *codicilli*, see Suet. Tib. 42,1.

⁷⁶ Tac. Agr. 40,2.

senatorial and equestrian positions that would require the office holder to travel and leave Italy.⁷⁷

Along with *codicilli*, emperors also provided their senatorial and equestrian *candidati* with sets of orders – *mandata* – before sending them across the empire to take up their posts. This practice is well-known for governors and *legati Augusti*, and according to Dio, it also applied to propraetors, proconsuls, and procurators since the inception of the Principate.⁷⁸ These might have served to further buttress a traveler's claim to be on an official mission.

The wide range of backgrounds from which centurions could rise to their position makes the determination of the required documentation much more difficult for this category. It is clear that their ranks were most often filled with career-soldiers recruited from the lower ranks of the army, but that the remainder consisted of soldiers who had served in the Praetorian Guard for 16 years, sons of *evocati*, and – though rarely – members of the equestrian class by direct appointment.⁷⁹ Thus, if a member of the latter two groups gained the position through a direct petition, he might hold *codicilli* proving his new rank.⁸⁰ If, on the other hand, a soldier had moved up through the ranks, he might hold a document issued by the military commander responsible for promoting him. Similarly, records documenting the transfer of a soldier from the Praetorian Guard to the regular army and a commission to the rank of centurion may have been awarded to an ex-Praetorian.⁸¹ However that may be, it is probably safe to assume that centurions on official duty would be carrying orders issued by their commander with an official seal affixed indicating the nature of their mission. This document would amply suffice to prove their rank and allow them to requisition *vehicula* in the context of the IITS.⁸²

⁷⁷ See Millar, Emperor 313–328 for the issue of imperial *mandata* to magistrates upon taking up their office. See AE 1962, 183 for a surviving *codicilli*.

⁷⁸ Cf. Cass. Dio 53,15,4. Notwithstanding the reference to ἐντολαί (= *mandata*) that were received by a proconsul under Claudius in (IGR IV, 1044) which Millar, Emperor 316 mentions in passing, he cautions that the scarcity of reports of *mandata* prevents us from postulating the general issue of such documents to proconsuls in the early Principate. He continues by identifying a «fundamental change in the hitherto essentially independent position of proconsuls» in the 2nd century CE as their receipt of *mandata* seems to be taken for granted at this point by Q. Fabius Postuminus, proconsul of Asia in 111/12 (IGR IV, 572). Similarly, cf. Sherwin-White, Letters 589–591 who does, however, not specify an alternative date for this change. Nevertheless, Burton 1976 was able to show convincingly that proconsuls in fact received *mandata* from the emperor before departing to the province assigned to them. He does so first by discussing an inscription from Cos mentioned above (IGR IV, 1044 with the reading from Segre – Herzog 1975 (non vidi) as printed in Burton 1976, 65); and secondly, by pointing out the deficiency of the pertinent surviving literary sources for imperial correspondence, namely that they deal exclusively with matters in imperial, not senatorial, provinces. This explains their silence where proconsuls are concerned. Against Millar, see also Jördens, Statthalter 56–57.

⁷⁹ Stein, Ritterstand 135–141, whose argument that knights who intended to serve as centurions in the legions without having held a *militia equestris* before as part of their *cursus honorum* had to surrender their equestrian rank is unconvincing (see 136 with fn. 3); Gillam 1957, 164–168, who concludes that even though the majority of centurions in the auxiliaries were men promoted from the ranks, the direct appointment was certainly not unknown for local aristocrats, though very rare for members of the equestrian class and unheard of among senators; similarly Birley, Roman Army 189–205 and Holder, Auxilia 86–88; see Birley 1989 for further examples of legionary centurions, none of whom held equestrian rank.

⁸⁰ For examples, see Millar, Emperor 284, fn. 35.

⁸¹ Stauner, Schriftwesen 62–63 shows that the army at least kept detailed records of every promotion to the rank of decurion or centurion. These records included the name, old rank, new rank, date of promotion, etc. of the soldier in question, as well as the names of his old and new army unit. It is not clear whether soldiers could obtain a copy of this document for their own records.

⁸² Mitchell 1976, 126. Surviving instructions regarding, for instance, the assignment of horses to individual soldiers (PDur. 56 = Fink n. 99 or PDur. 58 = Fink n. 100 [ca. 240–250 CE]) or *frumentationes* (PDur. 61 = Fink n. 101 [ca. 216 CE]) make the commonplace issue of written orders to officers very likely. The fragmentary nature of these papyri, however, complicates the precise interpretation of these documents. In any case, Stauner, Schriftwesen 60–61 convincingly shows that records of all external missions of individual soldiers were maintained by the army. These would include the name of the soldier as well as his orders, the date on which he was dispatched, and the date of his return.

These proposed solutions notwithstanding, one problem remains that cannot be resolved with certainty due to the scarcity of the evidence currently available: the Sagalassus inscription leaves it open if equestrian centurions could requisition according to their military rank or to their social class; for while they were on an official mission due to their service in the military, they were, for the same reason, also effectively an equestrian in the service of the emperor. As such, they would fall under both the category of *equ(es) Roman(us) cuius officio princeps optimus utatur* and that of *centur(io)*, allowing them to requisition three carts or one cart, respectively. However that may be, those cases were exceptional, so that the administrative and social provisions and mechanisms outlined in the paragraphs above certainly sufficed to keep abuse of the system at a minimum by providing travellers with the documentation that made reasonably accurate identification of their social status or military rank possible.

Of course, even written documentation was prone to abuse. Letters and certificates could be and were forged or obtained illegally as has been discussed above. The same problem is well-known for the *diplomata* of low-ranking officials which the Codex Theodosianus deals with at length.⁸³ These cases notwithstanding, the threat of being demoted to plebeian status for illegally obtaining official documents or even incurring capital punishment for falsifying them would most likely have discouraged the creation and use of forged paperwork to a large degree.⁸⁴ This applies particularly to scenarios in which these documents pertain to requisitioning *vehicula* from the IITS since forging papers to that end would only confer very limited advantages to equestrians and centurions, i.e. three or one cart, respectively,⁸⁵ at the risk of incurring disproportionately high penalties.

4. Conclusion

The above survey has shown that there were a number of possibilities in which Roman officials could identify themselves, not only with respect to their position and mission, but also to their social class. As a result, it is possible to draw the following conclusions:

According to the Sagalassus inscription, a travelling senator did not have to be on official duty but was allowed to requisition simply because he was a member of the *ordo senatorius*. He thus would only have to provide evidence for the fact that he had been granted a *legatio libera* or a *commeatus* to indicate that his absence from Rome was approved and permitted; if he had been appointed to an official position in a province and was travelling there, he would hold *codicilli* and possibly even *mandata* from the emperor that could be used to bolster his claim. His dress, in particular the *latus clavus*, as well as the way in which he carried himself when interacting with the station personnel would – ideally – complement and reinforce his claim.

Equestrians, on the contrary, only had the right to requisition without *diplomata* if they were employed in the service of the emperor. Thus, they had to prove the official reason behind their trip in addition to their membership in the *ordo equester*. Similarly to senators, a high-ranking equestrian might well carry documentation for a *legatio libera* or a *commeatus* permitting his absence from Italy. But since these documents of course implied that his business was of private nature, he had to provide the *codicilli* which he had received from the emperor upon being endowed with an official position as well as the imperial *mandata* that he was furnished with upon setting out to take up that posting. Again, the *ornamenta* associated with the *ordo equester*, i.e. the *angustus clavus*, the *anulus aureus*, and possibly even

Again, it is unclear if soldiers carried copies of their orders on the road in a similar format, though it seems likely.

⁸³ See Cod. Theod. 8,5,4 [326]; 8,5,22 [365] etc.

⁸⁴ Both measures are attested in the Cod. Theod. 9,19,1 [316] indicates that decurions who falsified documents would retain their duty to fulfill all «compulsory municipal services» (transl. by Pharr, CTh), but lose their decurion rank; also see Cod. Theod. 6,20,1 [321/4]. Cod. Theod. 9,19,2 [320/26] shows that both deportation and even capital punishment could be the result of being convicted of falsifying documents, at least in civil courts.

⁸⁵ SEG XXVI, 1392, ll. 19–21.

the *calcei*, would add credibility to the traveller's claim.

The case for centurions seems to be the most clear-cut with respect to the kind of documentation that was needed and could be provided as the Roman army most likely issued orders to the officers detailing specific missions. In addition, a centurion might hold a document indicating his promotion to his current position. Combined with items of clothing, such as the *paludamentum*, permitted only to Roman officers, these official documents would amply suffice to prove his legal right to his allowance at a changing station. At the same time, it remains unclear whether equestrian centurions could requisition according to their military rank or to their social class.

However that may be, it is clear that there were means available to senators, equestrians, and centurions to provide sufficient documentation to make a legally valid claim to the allowances set forth in the Sagalassus inscription. This should give further credence to the view expressed by Altay Coşkun and myself that the use of a *diploma* had not yet been a necessary requirement under Augustus and his successors. Moreover, the restriction of the right to grant leaves of absence to the emperor by Claudius parallels a similar reform for the issuing of *diplomata* that appears to have been promulgated under the same emperor. This corroborates the view that the three excepted groups that are singled out in the Sagalassus inscription only lost their privilege under Claudius or Vespasian.⁸⁶

Abbreviated Literature

- | | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Alföldi, Reiteradel | A. Alföldi, <i>Der frühromische Reiteradel und seine Ehrenabzeichen</i> , Baden-Baden 1952. |
| Alföldy 1981 | G. Alföldy, <i>Die Stellung der Ritter in der Führungsschicht des Imperium Romanum</i> , <i>Chiron</i> 11, 1981, 169–215. |
| Ausbüttel, Verwaltung | F. M. Ausbüttel, <i>Die Verwaltung des römischen Kaiserreichs: von der Herrschaft des Augustus bis zum Niedergang des Weströmischen Reiches</i> , Darmstadt 1998. |
| Birley, Roman Army | E. Birley, <i>The Roman Army</i> , Amsterdam 1988. |
| Birley 1989 | E. Birley, <i>Some Legionary Centurions</i> , <i>ZPE</i> 79, 1989, 114–128. |
| Bonnefond-Coudry, Sénat | M. Bonnefond-Coudry, <i>Le sénat de la République romaine de la Guerre d'Hannibal à Auguste</i> , Rome 1989. |
| Brunt 1983 | P. A. Brunt, <i>Princes and Equites</i> , <i>JRS</i> 73, 1983, 42–75. |
| Burton 1976 | G. P. Burton, <i>The Issuing of Mandata to Proconsuls and a New Inscription from Cos</i> , <i>ZPE</i> 21, 1976, 63–68. |
| Cleland et al., Dress | L. Cleland – G. Davies – L. Llewellyn-Jones, <i>Greek and Roman Dress from A to Z</i> , New York 2007. |
| Coşkun, Archias | A. Coşkun, <i>Cicero und das römische Bürgerrecht: die Verteidigung des Dichters Archias</i> . Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung und historisch-philologische Kommentierungen, Göttingen 2010. |
| Coşkun, Bürgerrecht | A. Coşkun, <i>Bürgerrechtsentzug oder Fremdenausweisung? Studien zu den Rechten von Latinern und weiteren Fremden sowie zum Bürgerrechtswechsel in der Römischen Republik (5. bis frühes 1. Jh. v.Chr.)</i> , Stuttgart 2009. |
| Croom, Roman Clothing | A. T. Croom, <i>Roman Clothing and Fashion</i> , Stroud 2002. |
| Drogula 2011 | F. K. Drogula, <i>Controlling Travel: Deportation, Islands and the Regulation of Senatorial Mobility in the Augustan Principate</i> , <i>CQ</i> 61.1, 2011, 230–266. |
| Eck, Augustus | W. Eck, <i>The Age of Augustus</i> , 2nd ed., Malden 2007. |
| Eich, Metamorphose | P. Eich, <i>Zur Metamorphose des politischen Systems in der römischen Kai-</i> |

⁸⁶ Lemcke – Coşkun 2013.

- serzeit. Die Entstehung einer «personalen Bürokratie» im langen dritten Jahrhundert, Berlin 2005.
- Fink R. O. Fink, *Roman Military Records on Papyrus*, Cleveland 1971.
- French, Roads D. H. French, *Roman Roads and Milestones*, fasc. 3.2: Galatia, Ankara 2012 URL: <http://www.biaa.ac.uk/home/images/stories/3.2%20gal%20final%20optimised.pdf>.
- Gagé, Classes Sociales J. Gagé, *Les Classes sociales dans l'Empire Romain*, Paris 1964.
- Geraci, Genesi G. Geraci, *Genesi delta Provincia Romana d'Egitto*, Bologna 1983 (non vidi).
- Gillam 1957 J. F. Gillam, *The Appointment of Auxiliary Centurions* (PMich. 164), *APA* 88, 1957, 155–168.
- Goldman 1994 N. Goldman, *Roman Footwear*, in: J.L. Sebesta – L. Bonafante (eds.), *The World of Roman Costume*, Madison 1994, 101–29.
- Harris, Literacy W. V. Harris, *Ancient Literacy*, Cambridge 1989.
- Holder, Auxilia P. A. Holder, *Studies in the Auxilia of the Roman Army from Augustus to Trajan*, Oxford 1980.
- Holmberg, Cursus Publicus E. J. Holmberg, *Zur Geschichte des Cursus Publicus*, Uppsala 1933.
- Jones, Suetonius B. W. Jones, *Suetonius: Vespasian*, London 2000.
- Jördens, Statthalter A. Jördens, *Statthalterliche Verwaltung in der römischen Kaiserzeit. Studien zum praefectus Aegypti*, Stuttgart 2009.
- Kolb, Transport A. Kolb, *Transport und Nachrichtentransfer im römischen Reich*, Berlin 2000.
- Kornemann 1953 E. Kornemann, *Postwesen*, *RE* XXII, 995–1014, 1953.
- Lemcke – Coşkun L. Lemcke – A. Coşkun, *Users and Issuers of Permits of the Imperial Information and Transportation System in the 1st Century CE*, forthcoming in *Latomus* 2013.
- Marshall, Finger Rings F. H. Marshall, *Catalogue of the Finger Rings, Greek, Etruscan, and Roman*, in the *Departments of Antiquities*, British Museum, London 1907.
- Millar, Emperor F. Millar, *The Emperor in the Roman World*, London 1977.
- Mitchell 1976 St. Mitchell, *Requisitioned Transport in the Roman Empire: A New Inscription from Pisidia*, *JRS* 66, 1976, 106–131.
- Moatti 2000 C. Moatti, *Le contrôle de la mobilité des personnes dans l'empire romain*, *Mélanges de l'Ecole Française de Rome, Antiquité* 112, 2000: 925–958.
- Mommsen, Staatsrecht Th. Mommsen, *Römisches Staatsrecht*. Leipzig 1876–7.
- Nicolet, César C. Nicolet, *Rendre à César*, Paris 1988.
- Pflaum, Carrières H.-G. Pflaum, *Les carrières procuratoriennes équestres sous le Haut-Empire Romain*, Paris 1960.
- Pharr, CTh C. Pharr, *The Theodosian Code and Novels and the Sirmondian Constitutions. A Translation with Commentary, Glossary, and Bibliography*, New York 1952.
- Reinhold 1969 M. Reinhold, *Status Symbols in the Ancient World*, *CJ* 64, 1969, 300–304.
- Reinhold, Purple M. Reinhold, *History of Purple as a Status Symbol in Antiquity*, Brussels 1970.
- Reinhold 1971 M. Reinhold, *Usurpation of Status and Status Symbols*, *Historia* 20, 1971, 275–302.
- Rotondi, Leges G. Rotondi, *Leges Publicae Populi Romani*, Milan, 1912.
- Sander 1963 E. Sander, *Die Kleidung des römischen Soldaten*, *Historia* 12, 1963, 144–166.
- Serge – Herzog 1975 M. Serge – R. Herzog, *Una lettera di Corbulone ai Coi*, *PP* 30, 1975, 102–

- 104 (non vidi).
- Sherwin-White, Letters A. N. Sherwin-White, The Letters of Pliny. A Historical and Social Commentary, Oxford 1966.
- Stauner, Schriftwesen K. Stauner, Das offizielle Schriftwesen des römischen Heeres von Augustus bis Gallienus (27 v.Chr. – 268 n.Chr.). Eine Untersuchung zu Struktur, Funktion und Bedeutung der offiziellen militärischen Verwaltungsdokumentation und zu deren Schreibern, Bonn 2004.
- Stein, Ritterstand A. Stein, Der Römische Ritterstand: Ein Beitrag zur Sozial- und Personengeschichte des römischen Reiches, München 1927.
- Suolahti 1969 J. Suolahti, Legatio libera, Arctos 6, 1969, 113–119.
- Talbert, Senate R. J. A. Talbert, The Senate of Imperial Rome, Princeton 1984.
- Vittinghoff 1980 F. Vittinghoff, Soziale Struktur und politisches System der hohen römischen Kaiserzeit, HZ 230, 1980, 31–55.
- Waelkens 2002 M. Waelkens, Romanization in the East. A Case Study: Sagalassos in Pisidia (SW Turkey), MDAI 52, 2002, 311–368.
- Waelkens 2006 M. Waelkens et al., The Late Antique to Early Byzantine City in Southwest Anatolia. Sagalassos and its Territory: A Case Study, in: J.-U. Krause – C. Witschel (eds.), Die Stadt in der Spätantike - Niedergang oder Wandel? Akten des internationalen Kolloquiums in Munich am 30. und 31. Mai 2003, Stuttgart 2006, 199–255 (Historia. Einzelschriften; Heft 190).
- Watson, Digest A. Watson, The Digest of Justinian, Philadelphia 1998.

Özet

Yolda kimlik tespiti: senatörler, *equester*'ler ve *centurio*'ların resmi ulaşım vasıtalarını *diplomata* olmaksızın talep etmeleri üzerine bir not

Yazar, bu makalede Altay Coşkun ile birlikte çalıştıkları ve yakında yayımlanacak olan (Latomus 2013) bir çalışmada ortaya çıkan, Roma İmparatorluk Dönemi resmi haberleşme ve ulaşım sisteminin (geç dönemde genel olarak bilinen adıyla *cursus publicus*) senatörler, *equestres* ve *centuriones* gibi üst düzey kullanıcılarının, izin belgeleri (*diplomata*) olmaksızın araç değiştirme istasyonlarında (*mansiones*, *mutationes*) vasıta talebi yapabilmeleri için sosyal sınıflarını, askeri rütbelerini veya yolculuklarının vesilesini nasıl kanıtlayabildikleri sorusuna cevap aramaktadır. Bu çalışmanın sonuçlarını temel alarak yazar üst düzey kullanıcıların her bir sınıfının statü gaspı için gösterdikleri hassasiyetleri üzerine bir araştırma sunmaktadır. Bu bölümden sonra ise, statü göstergelerini (*ornamenta*), yolculuk izinlerini (*legatio libera*, *commeatus*) ve diğer yazılı belgeleri (*mandata*, *codicilli*, askeri kayıtlar gibi) de içermek üzere kimliklendirmenin mümkün olduğu değişik yöntemlerin tartışması yer almaktadır. Böylece yazar, bir kimsenin sosyal statüsünü gösteren güvenilir bazı mekanizmaların olduğunu göstermektedir. Dahası bu sonuç daha önceki yapmış oldukları çalışmalarının sonucunda elde ettikleri, Sotidius Strabon *edictum*'u (SEG XXVI, 1392 [20/37]) uyarınca, belirli statü sahibi gruplar için izinlerin zorunlu olmadığı bulgusunu desteklemektedir. İzinler yalnızca Claudius Dönemi'nde bütün kullanıcılar için zorunlu hale gelmiştir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: statü gaspı; senatör; *equester*; *centurio*; *cursus publicus*; vasıta talebi; seyahat.