

D. B. SADDINGTON

Problems in the Development
of the Auxiliary System in the
Roman Army

OF THE LATE REPUBLICAN AND EARLY
IMPERIAL PERIOD

THESIS SUBMITTED FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN THE
UNIVERSITY OF THE WEST-INDIES.

PROBLEMS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE
AUXILIARY SYSTEM IN THE
ROMAN ARMY
OF THE LATE REPUBLICAN AND EARLY IMPERIAL PERIOD.

BY DENIS BAIN LADDINGTON

FIRST TERM.

1970

INDEX

	Page
I INTRODUCTION.	2
II THE "AUXILIA" OF THE PERIOD OF THE CIVIL WARS AT THE END OF THE REPUBLIC.	11
III THE "AUXILIA" OF THE LATE REPUBLICAN PERIOD : B. THE SECOND TRIUMVIRATE.	34
IV AUGUSTUS.	49
V TIBERIUS.	63
VI FROM GAIUS TO NERO.	85
VII FROM GALBA TO VESPASIAN.	129
VIII THE "AUXILIA" IN THE LITERARY RECORD.	207
IX THE EPIGRAPHICAL EVIDENCE.	243
X THE ORIGINS OF THE IMPERIAL AUXILIARY REGIMENTS.	289
XI REGIMENTAL TITLES.	361
XII THE PLACE OF THE "AUXILIA" IN THE ROMAN ARMY.	382
XIII ROMANIZATION.	402
XIV CONCLUSION.	417
XV BIBLIOGRAPHY -	428
A. Abbreviated Titles	428
B. Books	429
C. Articles in Periodicals	433

1. INTRODUCTION.

The common presentation in standard histories of the auxiliary forces of the early imperial Roman army is of a number of light-armed infantry regiments called cohorts and cavalry regiments called "alae"¹ assigned to the legions to assist them in their task of defending the imperial frontiers. Augustus is usually stated to have been the founder of the auxiliary system as we know it, whereby young men from the provinces were drafted into cohorts or alae for a period of at least twenty five years service before discharge, when they received Roman citizenship as a reward.

A cursory reading of the ancient authorities for the early imperial period certainly shows that considerable attention was paid to the role of the "auxilia" in military contexts. Their importance became increasingly apparent².

The standard work on the subject dates from 1914 - Cheesman's "The Auxilia of the Roman Imperial Army"³. It is of the greatest value as the only comprehensive general account. The main emphasis falls upon constructing the organizational framework into which the "auxilia" were fitted. In 1938 Wagner produced a book entitled "Die Dislokation der römischen Auxiliarformationen in den Provinzen Noricum, Pannonien, Moesien und Dakien von Augustus bis Gallienus"⁴. Its scope and limitations are sufficiently defined by the title : in essence it is a list of the regiments stationed along the Danube with a consideration of the evidence

/relating

relating to their garrisons and movements. Kraft's "Zur Rekrutierung der Alen und Kohorten an Rhein und Donau"⁵ was published in 1951. It is also regional in scope but ranges beyond questions concerning the original composition of, and later recruitment for the regiments concerned to include useful discussions on the extension of citizenship to auxiliaries. It concludes with useful lists containing summarized information on individual auxiliaries as recorded on their epitaphs. Besides these three books it is necessary to consult the very detailed articles by Cichorius entitled "ala" and "cohorta" in Pauly-Wissowa's "Realencyclopädie"⁶. They go back to 1893 and 1900 respectively but retain their value as the only complete lists of all the auxiliary regiments in the Roman world that were known at the end of the last century. However, due to the nature of the evidence, which will be discussed below, all these studies have concentrated on the last quarter of the first century and on the second century A.D. The situation before then remains most obscure. As Collingwood has remarked: "eine eingehendere Untersuchung über das Wesen der regulären Auxilien der frühen Kaiserzeit fehlt"⁷. Burn has even gone so far as to say of Cheesman's book that it is a "fine work clamouring to be redone"⁸. The position for the end of the republican period is not much better⁹.

In other words, the development from the auxiliaries of the republic, which were essentially allied contingents supplied for a particular campaign, to the permanent regiments of the imperial period has not been systematically studied. This will form the main subject of this thesis.

/however

However such a study is fraught with problems and difficulties caused by the lack of evidence. It will be the aim of the thesis first to investigate these problems, then to attempt to trace the emergence of the professional auxiliary army and finally to consider its subsequent consolidation and extension.

The first problem is to assess the character of the historical record concerning the "auxilia" of the late republic and early empire. The Civil war between the Pompeians and the Caesarians that began in 49 B.C. will be taken as the starting point. From this date onwards professional generals were regularly applying lessons which they had learnt in long term provincial commands to lengthy civil wars between armies that were virtually identical in composition and had to range from one end of the empire to the other. It will be convenient to end with the principate of Vespasian (69 - 79 A.D.). The military diplomas, which will be discussed below, and the epitaphs of deceased auxiliaries of that period make it plain that the classic imperial auxiliary system was almost completely operational at that date. In analysing the historical record, an attempt will be made to isolate the regular or professional regiments in the "auxilia". As a starting point, a professional regiment¹⁰ will be regarded as one that shares the characteristics of those known from the diplomas. In most cases these had a number, and a distinctive name added to the generic title "ala" or "cohorta" (usually the name of a people in the genitive case, as in "ala I Hispanorum"). Normally such regiments were stationed in provinces other than those where they were first raised. The soldiers serving in them were

/receiving

receiving pay and were apparently required to complete at least twenty five years of service before being entitled to discharge. Their commanders were Roman citizens, usually at the commencement of their military careers. It should be noted, however, that this was the fully developed form of the end of the period set, and that earlier regular regiments are not well documented. Accordingly it will be necessary to reconsider the definition of "professional" in the light of different contexts and to pay particular attention to regimental titulatures.

Another major question is to consider the origins of such permanent regiments. At what point can any one regiment be said to have been formally created? A wider question is whether the professional auxiliary system as a whole (as distinct from particular regiments) can be assigned to a specific date or to a particular enactment by a particular emperor.

Arales are part of society, and the Roman army played a key role in the development of the provinces, especially those of Europe¹¹. Within the Roman army the system was an important factor in the assimilation of the provincials and in the spread of certain Roman values. The extent to which this occurred in this period will be considered.

Success in finding satisfactory answers to these problems and questions depends to a large extent upon the nature of the evidence that is available. It must be acknowledged at the outset that there is little

/evidence, ...

evidence, and what little there is is unevenly distributed over the period chosen for study. It is difficult enough to trace the development of the legions at this time : how much more so that of the auxiliaries. For the late republic, for Augustus, and even for Tiberius there is hardly any epigraphical material. It will be necessary, therefore, to use the literary sources. However these present difficulties of their own. It was traditional in Roman historiography to concentrate on things Roman. Hence the "auxilia" were often ignored or mentioned only in the most general terms. The surviving authors rarely discussed matters of military organization or policy. Detail was lavished only on the set piece battle. Accordingly even in Caesar and Appian, but especially in Tacitus, references to auxiliaries are often by the way. This applies with even greater force to other writers who will be quoted. Either their compass is much briefer or their main concern is not military or even political history. However the literary evidence has one great advantage : most of it can be dated with considerable precision.

The most useful epigraphical evidence¹² is found on the military diplomas¹³. These were bronze documents issued to auxiliaries recording grants of citizenship and other privileges after at least twenty five years of active service. The diploma normally contained, besides the name of the recipient, the regiment in which he served, its commander, and a list of the regiments in the same provincial command containing soldiers receiving the same privileges. The exact date is always stated. Unfortunately, although the first known example can be dated to the last year of the principate of

/Claudius, ...

Claudius, the diplomas do not become common until the later Flavian period. The second major type of inscriptional evidence is numerically more numerous, the epitaphs of deceased auxiliaries. These tend to conform to fixed sets of formulae, but are usually very brief. The custom of erecting tombstones inscribed in Latin was not common before the middle of the first century A.D. Thirdly, the commanders of auxiliary regiments often had their auxiliary commands mentioned on their tombstones or on other monuments erected in their honour. These, and other less frequent types of auxiliary inscription, all suffer from the disadvantage that it is usually almost impossible to date them except in the broadest of terms.

Given this sort of evidence, an attempt will be made to investigate the questions raised earlier in this introduction. The general conclusions found in earlier treatments of the "auxilia" will not be reconsidered except in so far as they throw light upon the problems raised in this inquiry or to the extent that they need modification in the light of what emerges. What follows then may be regarded as "prolegomena" to a history of the early development of the professional Roman auxiliary army. The method adopted will be to review the statements of the literary authorities on the auxiliaries within their historical context, so as to lay bare the main thread of the historical development as far as possible. Epigraphical evidence will be used for this purpose only when it is definitely dated. Then the epigraphical evidence will be investigated in an attempt to establish what it can contribute to an account of the historical development.

/Finally

Finally various specific problems that have been mentioned earlier will be studied in the light of the historical development and with the aid of all the available evidence. It is to be hoped that some of the results will be of wider application than merely to aspects of Roman military history¹⁴.

NOTES.

1. In what follows *ale* (and its plural *alae*) will be treated as English words (i.e. will not be enclosed in quotation marks), so as to correspond to "cohort" and "cohorts".
2. Cf. *Manier*, "J.R.S." 1955, 252 f. Two remarks by *Syme* may be quoted: "The Roman 'auxilia', it is true, can be more important for tactics, and also for strategy, than the legions" ("J.R.S." XLIX, 1959, 52) and "to neglect the 'auxilia' is elementary and superficial" (*ibid.* LII, 1962, 89).
3. The work will be cited simply as "*Cheesman*" in what follows.
4. To be cited simply as "*Wagner*".
5. "*Vraht*", followed by a numeral, will refer to the individual auxiliaries listed at the end of his work.
6. *Cichorius*, "R.E." I, 1893, 1224 ff.; IV, 1900, 231 ff.: to be cited as "*Cichorius*", the page number making it clear whether vol. I or vol. IV is being referred to. To avoid the unnecessary multiplication of references, the ancient evidence for a particular regiment will not normally be given if it is available in *Cichorius*. Hence if a regiment is mentioned without references, it can be assumed that it is recorded in one or the other of *Cichorius*' articles. Most questions on legionary matters will be referred to *Witterling*'s article "*legio*" in "R.E." XII, 1924, 1211 ff. (to be quoted simply as "*Witterling*" in what follows).
7. *Callies*, "B.M.G.R." 1964, 136, n. 16.
8. *Burn*, "C.R." 1966, 377 (in a review of "R.I.R."). This thesis is of course in no sense a reworking of *Cheesman*'s book, which ranges far beyond the limits set for investigation.
9. Cf. *Yoshimura*, "Hist." 1961, 476, n. 10, quoted below, p. //

10. The somewhat stricter definition in Kraft, p. 39, may be compared.
11. Cf. Syme's remark ("Hist." XIV, 1965, 361) : "now the Roman army functions as a channel of social advancement in patent - natives to the Roman franchise, soldiers to centurions, centurions to equestrian status, knights to eligibility for the upper order".
12. There is scant pre-Flavian papyrological evidence.
13. For these, cf. F. Imbert, "G.I." IV, 1962, 1656 ff.; A. Janssen, suppl. II, 1962, 1537 ff.; Kesselhauf's essays in G.I.I. XVI, p. 147 ff.
14. Most of this thesis was written in Southern Africa, where the libraries do not contain all the material relevant to Roman provincial studies. In particular many major epigraphical and archaeological publications are unavailable. However standard references have been given wherever possible.

II. THE "AUXILIA" OF THE PERIOD OF THE CIVIL WARS AT THE END OF THE REPUBLIC.

Appian¹ himself, in his account of the battle of Pharsalus, states that his Roman authorities paid little attention to the auxiliary contingents accompanying the Roman armies, since they consisted of foreigners and had little effect on the outcome of the engagement :

τὸ σπουδαίον αὐτῶν ἀξιωματικῶν οὐδὲ διακρίνουσιν ὡς ἑλλήνων καὶ ἱταλῶν ἐν πόλεσι αἱ ἐπικυρήσαντες χώραι ἔχουσιν.

The situation has not altered greatly in modern times : as Yoshimura² remarks, "es fehlt bis jetzt an eingehender Untersuchung der Milistruppen in der Bürgerkriegszeit". The difficulties involved in reconstructing the military history of the late republic are great, and the non-Roman forces, if mentioned at all, most frequently appear simply as the "auxilia", "equites", "equitatus" or "levis armatura". There are, however, sufficient references, especially in the account of the Civil War of 49 - 45 by Caesar and his continuators and in Appian, to provide the basis for an attempt to discover the character of the auxiliary forces from 49 to 31 B.C.

When Caesar arrived in Italy in 49 B.C., rumour³ had it that the greater part of his army consisted of barbarians. Cicero⁴ referred to his "auxilia Gallorum". Appian⁵ gives the strength of the army which accompanied him to Ravenna as 5,000 infantry and 300 cavalry. This number probably indicates military cavalry⁶, since the normal legionary cavalry was not mentioned separately as a rule. 22 cohorts, presumably legionaries, and 300 cavalry from the king of Bithynia reached Caesar just

/before

before the siege of Corfinium (Vestina)⁷. We learn of a garrison of "equites calli atque hispani"⁸ whom Caesar had stationed in Thurii and whom Milo⁹ attempted to bribe in 48 B.C.

Caesar drafted recruits from his old "prouincia" into formations that were closer to legionary than auxiliary units. Such were the "milites Glanici qui sub vexillo fuerunt"¹⁰. Glanum (Bouches-du-Rhône)¹¹ was a small enough town to provide sufficient soldiers to serve under a tribune and centurions, i.e., to form a cohort. Presumably the contingent represents a special effort on the part of the community for Caesar's mobilization of forces for the civil war. The names of the tribune, C. Licinius Macer, and of the "optim", Gn. Pompeius Cornutus, who erected the monument on which the inscription recording the contingent occurs, obviously derive from a Licinius Maccus and a Pompeius. They, and the use of "tribunus", "centuriones" "milites" "vexillum", point to a close identification with Roman military methods and suggest that Caesar was content to allow them to approximate to a legionary cohort. This recalls the legion described by Suetonius¹² as "ex Transalpinis conscriptam, vocabulo quoque Gallico - Alauda enim appellabatur -, quam disciplina cultuque Romano institutam et ornatae postea uniuersam ciuitate donauit". This legion was presumably enlisted in 51 B.C. of Gauls who at the time did not possess Roman citizenship.

The information on the auxiliaries of Pompey in Italy is even scantier. The fact¹³ that he acquired 500 cavalry by arming "serui" and "pastores" indicates a weakness in this aspect. At the siege of Brundisium

/Brindisi)

(Brindisi) he is found deploying "agittarii" and "funditores", types of auxiliary soldier familiar from earlier republican times¹⁴. As in the case of the rumour concerning Caesar's use of largely barbarian forces, so it was feared that Pompey might attack Italy with the forces of barbarian kings and "gentes ferac armatae"¹⁵.

In describing the Spanish campaigns of 48 B.C. Caesar¹⁶ details the auxiliary forces available to the Pompeians before the battle of Ilerda. The text of the passage is corrupt: "scutatae citerioris provinciae et castratae ulterioris hispaniae cohortes circiter LXXX equitumque utriusque provinciae circiter V milia". The number of auxiliary cohorts, 80, is far too large¹⁷: it is best, with Garcia y bellido¹⁸, to read 30. A further difficulty arises from the shields carried by the "auxilia": in a later passage¹⁹ it is the troops of Hispania Citerioris that are "castrati". "Castrati" are mentioned at a later stage²⁰, but not in such a way as to throw light on the problem. But, as Franke-Hofmann-Meusel²¹ point out, it is not necessary to assume that all the soldiers supplied by Hispania Citerior were "scutati". The tribes who supplied recruits are given as the Lusitanians, the Celtiberians, the Cantabrians and all the barbarians "qui ad Oceanum pertinent"²². Later, reference²³ is made to the "levis armatura" of the Lusitanians.

The statement²⁴ regarding Caesar's auxiliary forces also contains a textual problem: "auxilia posuit T milia T, equitum III milia, quas omnibus superioribus bellis habuerat, et parem ex Gallia numerum, quas ipse parauerat novinatim ex omnibus civitatibus nobilissimis et fortissimis quoque evocato; huc optati generis hominum ex Aquitania montanisque, qui Galliae provinciam attingunt, ... adiecerat". There is no sure means

of restoring the number concealed by "nulla" : 5000 and 10,000 have been proposed. It seems most natural to take "parum ... auterum" as a reference to the 3000 original cavalry rather than to the infantry auxiliaries preceding them. The capacity in which the Aquitanians and the "montani" served is not stated. However the arrival of Gallic cavalry and "eagittarii ex rut-nis"²⁵ is noted at a later stage, with the subsequent loss of 200 "eagittarii". This contingent of cavalry and the archers are distinguished from a motley crowd of about 600 with their slaves and children who arrived at the same time : "cuiusque generis hominum milia circiter VI cum seruis liberisque"²⁶. By comparison they appear ready for immediate fighting and can accordingly be regarded as part of the specially recruited cavalry and of the "optimi generis hominum ex Aquitania montanisque" : the contrast in quality is immediately apparent. The Rutenians²⁷ come from the district of Rodez and can be classified as "montani". In fact the connection of the Aquitanians and the "montani" with the infantry and the types of Gallic cavalry mentioned beforehand is not clear : the lacuna in the text is only tentatively filled by "adiecerat". There is a further reference²⁸ to Caesar's cavalry, archers and slingers and also to light-armed Germans. The first is too vague for further discussion, but the Germans can be regarded as part of the original auxiliaries of Caesar, since they are mentioned in the "Gallic war"²⁹. The 1200 cavalry that accompanied Caesar as a personal bodyguard³⁰ obviously formed no part of the forces discussed so far. During the course of the campaign certain of the Spaniards supporting the Pompeians deserted to

Caesar -

Caesar - a "cohors illurgavonenais"³¹ from a people on the Ebro in Hispania Citerior and others referred³² to as "castrati auxiliaresque".

At the siege of Massilia in 49 B.C., the Massiliotes were able to place a large number of archers on board their galleys and to make use of a client tribe, the Albicans³³. The latter were good fighters, and were described as "montani"³⁴. Domitius Ahenobarbus³⁵ manned the ships which he had for the assistance of the Massiliotes with the tenants and shepherds of his Italian estates, whom he encouraged to greater effort with the prospect of freedom³⁶.

The major concentration of forces in 48 B.C. occurred at Dyrrachium and Pharsalus. There are two main lists of the auxiliaries which Pompey had at his disposal, one in Caesar³⁷, the other in Appian³⁸. The Caesarian inventory is as follows:

3000 archers from Crete, Iaccdamon, Pontus, Myria and other states;

1200 slingers (described as "inditi ex cohortis paeccenarias II");

7000 cavalry: of these

600 were "Galli" supplied by Deiotarus³⁹;

500 by Arioberzanes of Cappadocia;

500 by Cotys of Thrace accompanied by his son Sadala;

200 by Rhascypolis of Macedonia;

500 were "Cabinien" Gauls and Germans;

800 had been drafted from Pompey's own slaves and shepherds;

500 were sent by Tarcondarion Cantor and Domnilius of Gallograecia;

200 by Antiochus of Commagene from Myria, mostly "hippotoxotae".

/125

The rest were Germanians, Bessians, Macedonians, Thessalians and members of other tribes and communities.

The "Galli" of Delotarus and the "Gallograeci" of Tarcondarion Gaster and Domnileus are more commonly known as Galatians⁴⁰. The contingent sent by Rhascypolis⁴¹ was probably Thracian, although technically despatched from Macedonia. As Caesar⁴² himself explains, the "Gabinian" Gauls and Germans were troops "quos ibi (i.e. Alexandria) A. Gabinus graecis causa apud regem Ptolomaeum reliquerat". They were part of the army left by Gabinus in 55 B.C. in support of Ptolemy Auletes⁴³. The "hippotoxotae" were mounted archers such as had made the Parthians so effective in desert warfare⁴⁴.

Appian prefaces his list by stating that Pompey had brought five legions from Italy and "the cavalry attached to them". The contingent drafted from Pompey's slaves and shepherds, mentioned by Caesar, and the Gauls, mentioned by Appian, must have belonged to this category. When Appian turns to Pompey's complete forces, he confirms Caesar's total of 7000 cavalry in all. This figure is given by Plutarch⁴⁵ too. Appian does not break this figure down into detail, but specifies the origin of most of the contingents. He does not specify Delotarus, Tarcondarion Gaster or Domnileus in this passage, merely referring to eastern Galatians. Delotarus, however, is mentioned by name in the list of allies at the battle of Pharsalus and his assistance is confirmed by Cicero⁴⁶. The "Gabinians" are recorded, but not as Gauls or Germans. Cappadocian horse is also mentioned by Appian, but without the name of Ariobarzanes.

/in

In the Pharsalan list his brother Ariarathes is named as the contributor from Cappadocia. Appian records the assistance of Antiochus of Commagene, without reference to the mounted archers. Thracian cavalry is not specifically recorded, although Thracians appear in the general Pharsalan list. Dio⁴⁷ mentions Badaia twice. Appian records Macedonian assistance, but does not refer to the Bardonians, Bessians or Thessalians. He does, however, refer to Cilician cavalry, which is not listed by Caesar⁴⁸.

When the two authors' accounts of the infantry auxiliaries are compared, Caesar's Breton archers are confirmed, but the Lacedaemonians appear first as general Peloponnesian auxiliaries, later as Laconians (in the Pharsalan list). The Pontic contingent is not formed of archers, but javelin-throwers. Syria appears generally only in the Pharsalan list. Caesar does not give the nationality of the slingers in his catalogue, but Appian says that Pompey had Thracian slingers. There may, of course, have been others.

Peoples not listed by Caesar, but in Appian, are
Ionians⁴⁹,

Peloponnesians (who are distinguished from the Laconians in the
Pharsalan list),

Leander Armenians,

Amphylians,

Pinidians.

In the Pharsalan list other peoples and countries are named :

/Athenians, ...

Athenians,
Hellespont,
Bithynia,
Thrygia,
Lydia,
Phoenicia,
Jews,
Arabs,
Cypriots,
Rhodians,
Greater Armenians⁵⁰.

Other statements on Pompey's "auxilia" occur in the Caesarian corpus. At Oricum (Avlona) he had a "praesidium parthinorum", the Parthinians being a local Illyrian tribe⁵¹. Juba⁵² had sent a large force from north Africa. The German and Gallic cavalry, which Labienus⁵³ was able to use in the African campaigns, came from Pompey's forces at Pharsalus: presumably it was part of the cavalry originally brought from Italy⁵⁴.

The motley character of Pompey's auxiliaries appealed to Dio⁵⁵, who emphasized the use of foreigners against citizens, and the fact that many were Asiatics and untrained. Cicero⁵⁶, too, was dismayed, referring to Colchis and the Getans. Caesar⁵⁷, however, was more soldierly and noted Pompey's superiority in cavalry and his good supply of archers and slingers. For not all the auxiliaries were used in the major battles.

Far less has survived on the composition of Caesar's "auxilia"

/for

for the Balkan campaigns. Appian⁵⁸ gives the impossible figure of 10,000 for his cavalry, and calls them all Gauls. This is far greater than Pompey's total of 7,000 and contradicts Caesar's⁵⁹ statement just noted concerning Pompey's superiority in cavalry. Plutarch⁶⁰, on the other hand, gives a figure of 10,000. Caesar⁶¹ himself states that he crossed from Brundisium with 500; Appian⁶² and Plutarch⁶³ give 600 instead. Caesar⁶⁴ had among his cavalry a contingent of Allobroges under the command of two brothers, Moucellus and Egus. The brothers and some of their adherents defected to Pompey. No figures are given, but the tone of the incident suggests that the contingent was comparatively large. Appian⁶⁵ mentions Germans who got drunk at Gomphi (Palaeo-Spiakopi) in Thessaly: these probably included cavalry. In the Thracian list of auxiliaries he mentions cavalry from both Transalpine and Cisalpine⁶⁶ Gaul. Dio⁶⁷ mentions Spanish "auxilia": presumably cavalry were included. Gabinus had attempted to bring 3,000 horse to Caesar through Illyricum with 15 cohorts of legionaries: most of these, however, were destroyed⁶⁸. Antony brought 800 horse to Dyrrachium, sending back to Italy for more⁶⁹. How many, if any, came, is not known. Taking the 500 - or 600 - which Caesar brought and the 300 of Antony, 1300 or 1400 are known to have reached Caesar. Possibly more were still expected from Italy. If the 500 of Gabinus be added, it may be assumed that Caesar was working to a figure of 4000 to 5000 cavalry. Due to the losses of Gabinus and of Caesar himself at Dyrrachium, when 200 cavalry fell⁷⁰, the figure of 1000 cavalry at Pharsalus does not seem far wrong⁷¹.

/At

- 20 -

At the end of 48 B.C. Caesar became involved in the Alexandrine war, which occupied him till the beginning of 47, when he went to Asia Minor to deal with Pharnaces. He took 800 cavalry to Alexandria⁷². After the outbreak of the war he summoned Cretan archers and cavalry from the Nabataean Arabs under Malchus⁷³ to his assistance. Other unspecified "auxilia" are mentioned⁷⁴. During the fighting, light armed troops and Gallic cavalry are mentioned⁷⁵; presumably the latter were part of the 800 that had accompanied him at the outset. Some of his cavalry were Germans⁷⁶. Meanwhile Mithridates⁷⁷ of Pergamum brought him reinforcements from Syria and Cilicia. Antipater⁷⁸ got further assistance from Syria and Arabia and sent Caesar a force of heavy infantry.

Appian⁷⁹ states that Pharnaces had been encouraged to resist Caesar by the Pompeians after Pharsalus. Pharnaces, however, claimed that he had not sent "auxilia" to Pompey⁸⁰. In the first stage of the war, Domitius Calvinus⁸¹, Caesar's legate, was supported by Delotarus, who had joined the Caesarian cause after the defeat of Pompey. He provided two legions "quas ille disciplina atque armatura nostra compluris annos constitutas habebat" as well as 100 cavalry: Ariobarzanes of Cappadocia also supplied 100 cavalry. "Auxilia" were also summoned from Cilicia⁸². Domitius Calvinus was further supported by a "legio Pontica" described as follows "quae ex tumultuariis militibus in bello confecta erat"⁸³. The greater part of this legion and Delotarus' forces were killed in the ensuing engagement with Pharnaces⁸⁴. When Caesar arrived at the sphere of operations, he ordered Delotarus to bring his legion "quae ex genera civium /suorum

suorum Deiotarus armatura disciplinaque nostra constitutam habebat" - obviously what remained of his earlier two legions - and all his cavalry⁸⁵.

At the end of 47 B.C. Caesar was in Africa when he narrowly avoided defeat at the engagement of Ruspina. In 46, however, he emerged the victor at the battle of Thapsus. Before considering the "auxilia" involved in Caesar's "African War", the African campaign of Curio⁸⁶ in 49 can be noticed. Curio arrived in Africa from Sicily with 500 cavalry⁸⁷ and light-armed troops⁸⁸. Later he sent to Sicily for further cavalry⁸⁹. The auxiliaries comprised Gauls and presumably Germans, since these were later incorporated in the army of Labienus⁹⁰. The Gauls included Allobroges⁹¹.

The only "auxilia" of L. Attius Varus⁹² that are recorded are those supplied by Juba⁹³, the king of Numidia. These included 600 Numidian cavalry and 400 infantry, and 2000 Gallic and Spanish cavalry from the king's personal bodyguard⁹⁴.

The author of the "Bellum Africanum"⁹⁵ assigns Labienus a speech in which he lists his auxiliaries. These comprise

- Numidian cavalry and light-armed troops;
- German and Gallic cavalry;
- conscripts from "hibridi", freedmen and slaves;
- royal "auxilia";
- 120 elephants;
- innumerable cavalry;

12,000 men in legions conscripted "ex cuiusque modi generis";

Then Labienus is credited with having :

1600 Gallic and German cavalry;

8000 Numidian cavalry;

1000 cavalry brought by M. Petreius;

4 times as many infantry and light-armed troops;

archers;

slingers;

several "hippotoxotae".

There are two separate lists here : it is difficult to reconcile them.

The difficulty is increased by textual uncertainties. The Numidian cavalry number 7000 in a variant reading⁹⁵. Some of the German and Gallic cavalry had come from Marcellus; others were taken over from the defeated forces of Curio⁹⁷. It is not clear whether the "hibridi" were half-Roman, half-native, or half-free, half-slave. These, together with the slaves and freedmen, had been trained as orthodox cavalry. The royal "auxilia" recall the 4 "royal legions" mentioned in the first chapter of the work, and the 120 elephants and "innumerable cavalry"⁹⁸ are recorded in the same place. The "innumerable cavalry", therefore, do not conceal a separate entry. The 12,000 legionaries "of all sorts" of men would have formed 2 complete legions. In chapter 1 Scipio⁹⁹ has 10 legions. Presumably the 12,000 were not actual legionaries in the sense of Roman citizens, but provincials trained in legionary formation. M. Petreius¹⁰⁰ is earlier credited with bringing 1100 (or 300 in a variant version)

/se. act

select Numidian cavalry and infantry of the same people. He was accompanied by Cn. ¹⁰¹ who earlier had 3,000 "Mauri". The latter appear to have been part of Juba's forces ¹⁰². As the phrase stands, the "four times as many infantry and light-armed troops" would naturally refer to the 16,000 cavalry of Petreius: it may be intended to balance the 12,000 "legionaries of all sorts" above. Or it may refer to the novel tactic adopted by Labienus of intermingling light-armed infantry and archers with his cavalry ¹⁰³ and be an attempt to give the proportion involved.

On his arrival ¹⁰⁴ in Africa Caesar had scarcely 6,000 cavalry, but it was not long before he had up to 20,000 ¹⁰⁵. Some of these, if not all, were Gauls, to judge from the statement ¹⁰⁶ that 30 Gallic horse routed 2,000 of the "Mauri". His archers are also mentioned ¹⁰⁷.

The forces of the Pompeians were consolidated in the succeeding months. Scipio had 3,000 cavalry ¹⁰⁸ and 30 elephants supplied by Juba ¹⁰⁹. His forces included Numidians and Maetulians ¹¹⁰. Attius Varus made use of Maetulians as rowers and marines ¹¹¹. P. Considius Longus protected himself with a mercenary band of Numidians and Maetulians, later arming his slaves and some gladiators too ¹¹². Appian ¹¹³ states that, at the battle of Thapsus, Scipio had 20,000 cavalry, the majority of whom were ¹¹⁴, presumably Numidians. Earlier, Labienus was credited with 11,500 (or 10,000) cavalry together with an unnamed number of cavalry from "hibridi" and servile sources. Scipio's 3,000 would bring the total to 14,500 (or 13,500) +.

Added to these were the forces of Juba, given by Appian ¹¹⁴ as 30,000 /infantry, ...

infantry, 20,000 Numidian cavalry and 60 elephants, besides "many" pikemen. The figures in the "Bellum Africanum"¹¹⁵ are 3 legions (i.e. up to 18,000 men), a "large number" of light-armed troops (presumably included in Appian's "infantry"), 3 elephants, 800 cavalry with bridles and a "large number" of Numidian cavalry without bridles. Suetonius¹¹⁶ makes Caesar exaggerate these figures deliberately for the psychological effect on his troops and so cannot serve as a check.

Cato's forces were used for the defence of Utica. He had brought cavalry¹¹⁷ to Africa from the aftermath of the battle of Pharsalus. At Utica he held levies of freedmen, "Afri", slaves and men "cuiusque sodi generis"¹¹⁸.

On the other side, Caesar's forces continued to grow from supplements from Sicily and by desertions from the Pompeians¹¹⁹. At his camp outside Augusta Caesar armed his Gallic and Rhodian marines as infantry auxiliaries¹²⁰. His cavalry included Gauls, Spaniards, and, by desertion, Caetulians¹²¹. His archers came from Iudaea and Syria, among other unnamed places¹²². He had elephants brought from Italy, less for fighting purposes than to accustom his men and their horses to them¹²³. In a raid he acquired 22 of Juba's camels¹²⁴. By the battle of Thapsus Caesar had at least 2000 archers and slingers, 4000 to 5000 cavalry, light-armed troops and deserters. He was assisted by Sittius¹²⁵, a Roman who had taken service under Bocchus¹²⁶ of Mauritania with a band of Italian and Spanish followers who had accompanied him to Africa after he had been compromised

/In

in the Catilinarian conspiracy. He was not present at Thapsus, but was of great service, since he prevented Juba from opposing Caesar with all his forces by attacking him in the rear.

Prior to the battle of Munda in 45 B.C. the sons of Pompey the Great had been organizing resistance to Caesar in Spain. Of the legions available to the elder, Cn. Pompeius, the author of the "Bellum Hispaniense" says that¹²⁷ "dum fuerunt uernaculae, quae a Trebonio transfugerant; una facta ex coloniis quae fuerant in his regionibus; ... { reliquae ex fugitiuis auxiliareis consistebant }" (thus the Oxford Classical text). Whether the above reading or that of Mommsen "uernacula et ii."¹²⁸ be accepted it is clear that Cn. Pompeius was being forced to use non-citizens in his legionary formations. That this was so is not surprising, for, as the passage states, he had other "legions" consisting of runaway slaves and auxiliaries (accepting the emendation "auxiliariae"). The legion from¹²⁹ the colonies, however, would have comprised Roman citizens¹²⁹. The auxiliaries proper were drawn from the Spaniards and the Celtiberians according to Appian¹³⁰. Lusitanians, however, also participated and were prepared to continue resistance to Caesar even after Munda¹³¹. Cn. Pompeius also had¹³² some Allobroges that Juba had given to him from the captives taken after the defeat of Curio : these later deserted to Caesar¹³². According to Dio¹³³, the Pompeians were supported by Bocchus, who sent his Maŕpot and his sons to them. At the battle of Munda their auxiliary forces are said to have totalled 6000 light-armed and the same number of "auxiliares", presumably mainly cavalry¹³⁴.

Caesar's

Caesar's auxiliaries included Gauls¹³⁵; he was later joined by Curio's Allobroges, as mentioned above. He had hoped for Spanish cavalry prior to his arrival, but this did not materialize¹³⁶. Later a Spanish chieftain - "rex nomine Indo"¹³⁷ - joined him. He received help from Bogud of Taurvetania¹³⁸. By the final engagement his cavalry was said to number 800¹³⁹.

Little can be recovered concerning the non-civil wars during the dictatorship of Caesar. When Vatinius was sent to Illyricum in 47 he was given 3 legions and a large force of cavalry¹⁴⁰. For Caesar's projected expedition against the Indians and the Parthians 10,000 Cavalry were assembled in Italy for transport across the Adriatic¹⁴¹. Archers and light-armed troops were also gathered¹⁴². Meanwhile Cassius¹⁴³ had turned against Caesar in Syria. Antipater in Judaea sent the Caesarians assistance¹⁴⁴, while Ptolemy gained the support of Alchaeus, an Arab¹⁴⁵, as well as of the Parthians¹⁴⁶. The incident dragged on after the death of Caesar.

NOTES

1. "B.C." II, 10, 72, 289.
2. "Hist." 1961, 476, n. 10.
3. Dio XII, 8, 6.
4. "Att." IX, 13, 4.
5. "B.C." II, 5, 32, 124. Cf. Plut. "Pomp." 62, 1; "Caes." 32, 1.
6. On the equites in a legion cf. Kübler, "R.E." VI, 1907, 279; 282; Barker, 1928, 210 f.
7. "B.C." I, 18, 5.
8. III, 22, 3.
9. Fleba, "R.E." I, 1894, 2271 ff. (no. 67).
10. "R.E." 1954, 103; 1964, 146 bis. For a discussion of the date, cf. Picard, "Gallia" 1964, 18 ff.
11. Ihm, "R.E." VII, 1910, 1380 f.
12. "Jul." 24, 2 and Cary ad loc. for the date.
13. Caes. "B.C." I, 24, 2.
14. ibid. I, 27, 5. For such auxiliaries, cf. Cheesman, 1914, 8 ff.
15. Cic. "Att." VII, 11, 2; Dio XII, 13, 3, cf. p. // above.
16. "B.C." I, 39, 1.
17. For a discussion of the figures involved cf. Rice Holmes, 1923, vol. III, 388 ff., and for the Spanish "auxilia" cf. Garcia y Bellido, "Emer." 1963, 220 ff. For "castrati" cf. von Domaszewski, "R.E." III, 1897, 1322 f.
18. "Emer." 1963, 220 f.
19. Caes. "B.C." I, 48, 7.
20. I, 55, 1; 70, 4; 75, 2; 78, 1.
21. ad I, 48, 7.
22. Caes. "B.C." I, 38, 2.
23. I, 48, 7.
24. I, 39, 2.
25. I, 51, 1; 3.
26. I, 51, 2.
27. Haug, "R.E." I, 1914, 1246 f.
28. I, 83, 2.

/2/.

29. VIII, 10; 36.
30. "B.C." I, 41, 1.
31. I, 60, 4.
32. I, 78, 1 - 2 : it can be assumed from 2 that the deserters were not confined to the legionaries.
33. I, 34, 4; 56.
34. I, 57, 3.
35. Münzer, "R.E." V, 1903, 1334 ff. (no. 27).
36. I, 56, 3; 57, 4.
37. III, 4, 3 - 6.
38. Appian catalogues Pompey's "auxilia" in two separate places, "B.C." II, 8, 49, 202, before the battle of Dyrrhachium, and II, 10, 70, 292 ff., before the battle of Pharsalus.
39. For the client kings referred to, cf. Yoshimura, "Hist." 1961, 480 ff. Yoshimura lists Pompey's "auxilia" on 477 ff. In spite of his remark that Lucan gives non-historical participants, he quotes his evidence. This, however, has no independent value. Cf. Nierhaus "B.J." 1953, 46 ff.
40. On the names for Galatia cf. Brandis, "R.E." VII, 1910, 534 ff.
41. Rhascypolis was more commonly known as Rhascuporis; cf. Kahrstedt, "R.E." IA, 1914, 255 f.
42. "B.C." III, 4, 4. Cf. 103, 5.
43. H. Volkmann, "R.E." XLIII, 1959, 1756 f. (no. 35).
44. Lammert, "R.E." VIII, 1913, 1425 f. refers only to the pre-Roman period; for the Roman period cf. Fiebiger, *ibid.*, 12, 1920, 1744.
45. Plut. "Rom." 64, 1; "Gaes." 42, 2. Plutarch's description of the cavalry is as follows : *Ἰταλῶν καὶ Ῥωμαίων καὶ ἑλλήνων καὶ ἀσσυρίων, ἑσπερίων, γαλατίας, ἰνδοῦ καὶ κελτικῆς καὶ ἰσπανίας*.
Romans and Italians, however, could have formed only a small part of the cavalry.
46. "Reg. Aetiot." 5, 13; 10, 28. During his governorship of Cilicia, Cicero ("Att." VI, 1, 14) noted that *Caecilius* "habet cohortes quadringenarias nostra armatura XXX, equitum 4000".

47. ALI, 51, 2; 63, 1.
48. Caesar does, however, mention a fleet and a legion from Cilicia ("B.C." III, 3, 1; 4, 1).
49. From the list of edicts quoted by Josephus ("A.J." XIV, 10, 13, 228; 230; 10, 14, 232; 10, 16, 234; 10, 19, 240) regarding Caesar's exemption of Jews from military service it is clear that, in particular, there had been recruiting in Ephesus and Sardis. A similar decree exists for Delos (XIV, 10, 14, 231 - 2).
50. Caesar mentions Asia, which would include Appian's Ionia, Pamphylia, Hellespont, Lydia, Athens, Bithynia, Phoenicia and Rhodes ("B.C." III, 3, 1, 5, 3), only in connection with the fleet.
51. Cass. "B.C." III, 11, 3.
52. "B. Alex." 51, 1.
53. Münzer, "K.K." XII, 1924, 260 ff. (no. 6).
54. "B. Afr." 19, 3, reading "butnroto".
55. ALI, 54, 2; 61, 1.
56. "Att." 12, 10, 3.
57. "B.C." III, 43, 3; 86, 4; 44, 6.
58. "B.C." II, 8, 49, 201.
59. Cf. n. 57 above.
60. "Caes." 42, 2.
61. "B.C." III, 2, 1.
62. "B.C." II, 8; 54, 221.
63. "Caes." 37, 2.
64. "B.C." III, 59 f.
65. "B.C." II, 10, 64, 268.
66. II, 10, 70, 291 : "Cisalpine" depends upon a reasonable emendation.
67. ALI, 55, 2.
68. App. "III." 3, 12 (cf. Plut. "Ant." 7, 2); "B.C." II, 9, 59, 242.
69. Cass. "B.C." III, 29, 21 Plut. "Ant." 7, 2.
70. Cass. "B.C." III, 71, 1.

/71.

71. III, 84, 4. That Caesar was inadequately supplied with cavalry at the battle is shown by his use of "antesignani" with the horsemen (84, 3). Appian ("B.C." II, 13, 70, 289) also gives a figure of 1000 for the actual battle. Plutarch's figure of 1000 ("Caes." 42, 2) must refer to the battle itself only.
72. Caes. "B.C." III, 106, 1.
73. Flues, "R.E." XIV, 1920, 857 f. (no. 3).
74. "B. Alex." I, 1.
75. 17, 3.
76. 29, 4.
77. 26, 1; Jos. "A.J." XIV, 8, 1, 128. For Mithridates, cf. Geyer, "R.E." XV, 1932, 2205 (no. 15).
78. Jos. "B.J." I, 9, 3, 187; cf. "A.J." XIV, 8, 1, 128 - 9; 8, 2, 139; give 3000; 10, 3, 193, however, 1500 is the figure. For Antipater, cf. Wilcken, "A.J." I, 1894, 2509 (no. 17).
79. "B.C." II, 12, 87.
80. "B. Alex." 69, 3; cf. Dio XLI, 55, 3.
81. Münzer, "R.E." V, 1903, 1419 f. (no. 43).
82. "B. Alex." 34; cf. Dio XLII, 40, 2. Rice Holmes (1923, vol. III, 506) objects to the figure of 100 cavalry supplied by each of the kings. It sounds small, but may have been determined by what was then available rather than by what was necessary.
83. "B. Alex." 34, 5.
84. 40, 4.
85. 68, 2.
86. Münzer, "R.E." III, 1921, 847 ff. (no. 11).
87. Caes. "B.C." II, 23, 1.
88. App. "B.C." II, 7, 46, 1A.
89. Caes. "B.C." II, 37, 4.
90. "B. Afr." 40, 5.
91. Dio XLIII, 30, 3.
92. Klebs, "R.E." II, 1896, 2250 f. (no. 32).
93. App. "B.C." II, 7, 44, 175; Dio XLI, 41, 3. For Juba, cf. Lenschau, "R.E." IX, 1916, 2581 ff. (no. 1) and above, p. 18

794.

94. Caes. "B.C." II, 25, 3; 40, 1.
95. "B. Afr." 19, 3.
96. Other references to Labienus' cavalry do not give figures or nationalities: 13, 1; 15 - 15; 61, 2 (the latter, since "frenati", probably of "hibridi" and of servile origin).
97. Cf. pp. 18; 21 above.
98. "B. Afr." 1, 4: "equitatus infinitus" as compared with "equitatus innumerabilis" (which should be ablative) in 19, 3.
99. Münzer, "R.E." III, 1897, 1224 ff. (no. 99).
100. 18, 1. For Petreius, cf. F. Münzer, "R.E." XIX, 1937, 1182 ff. (no. 37).
101. "B. Afr." 18, 1; cf. 3, 1. For Piso, cf. Münzer, "R.E." III, 1897, 1391 f. (no. 9).
102. Cf. "B. Afr." 6, 1 - 3, where the "Mauri" are part of Juba's forces.
103. 13, 1.
104. In 43 B.C. his governor in Nither Spain, Cassius Longinus (cf. Münzer, "R.E." III, 1899, 1740 ff. (no. 70)) had been ordered to collect "auxilia" for an attack on Juba. He is known to have had at least 3000 cavalry ("B. Alex." 50, 4; 50, 3).
105. "B. Afr." 1, 1; 1, 5; 2, 1.
106. 6, 3. Cf. above, p. 22.
107. 12 - 13.
108. 20, 2.
109. 25, 5.
110. 32, 3; cf. 61, 2.
111. 62, 1.
112. 43 (reading "atipendiarius"); 93, 1. For Considius Longus cf. Münzer, "R.E." IV, 1898, 912 f. (no. 6).
113. "B.C." II, 14, 96, 401.
114. *ibid.*
115. "B. Afr." 48, 1.
116. "Jul." 66.
117. Plut. "Cat. Min." 50, 5.
118. "B. Afr." 36, 1; Plut. "Cat. Min." 61, 1.

/119.

119. Cf. the useful discussion in Rice Holmes, 1923, vol. III, 534 ff., whose figures are used below.
120. "B. Afr." 20, 1.
121. 34, 4; cf. 29, 1, for fraternization between Caesar's cavalry and Labienus' Gauls and Cerauna; 39, 2; 56, 3; Dio XLIII, 4, 2.
122. "B. Afr." 20, 1.
123. 72, 3; Dio XLIII, 4, 1.
124. "B. Afr." 68, 4.
125. 48, 1; cf. 25, 2; 36, 4; 93, 3; 95, 2; 96; App. "B.C." IV, 7, 54, 230 - 5; Dio XLIII, 3, 1 - 4. For Sittius, cf. Münzer, "R.E." IIIA, 1927, 409 ff. (no. 3).
126. Klebs, "R.E." III, 1897, 575 f. (no. 2).
127. "B. Hisp." 7, 4 - 5.
128. Yoshimura, "Ann. let. Giappone" 1963/4, 105, n. 1, prefers the reading of Mommsen that gives only one "legio uernacula" : Garcia y Bellido, "Iber." 1936, 222, accepts two "legiones uernaculae". The number is not of such consequence here, although there is no reason to assume that because Caesar ("B.C." II, 20, 4) mentions only a single "uernacula" under Varro, that there was not a second by this date. There were slaves in these legions ("B. Hisp." 12, 1; for other slaves in legions cf. 34, 2. App. "B.C." II, 15, 103, 477, where their training is said to have lasted for four years; cf. 12, 87, 366).
129. Cf. the "equites Romani partim ex urbe partim ex prouincia ad milia III" who fell at Munda ("B. Hisp." 31, 9).
130. App. "B.C." II, 12, 87, 366.
131. "B. Hisp." 18, 6; 35, 3; 38, 3; 40.
132. Dio XLIII, 30, 3.
133. XLIII, 30, 1. Klebs (l. c. n. 126 above), Rice Holmes (1923, vol. III, 543, n. 1) and Romanelli (1959, 157, n. 1) deny this, but sudden changes of sides in such wars are not unknown. It may be noted that in an internal dispute in Africa, Bogud, (Klebs, "R.E." III, 1897, /608 f.

608 f. (no. 2), who had rendered Cassius assistance in 47 B.C. ("B. Alex." 58 - 9) and Arabis (Alota "R.E." II, 1895, 363), whose men had been trained by the sons of Pompey (cf. App. "B.C." IV, 7, 54, 234), supported Sextus, the Caesarian governor of Numidia.

134. "B. Hisp." 30, 1.
135. 32, 2.
136. 2, 2 - 3.
137. 10, 3.
138. Dio XLIII, 36, 1.
139. "B. Hisp." 30, 1.
140. App. "Ill." 3, 13.
141. "B.C." II, 16, 110, 460.
142. III, 3, 24, 92.
143. Münzer, "R.E." III, 1877, 1170 f. (no. 361).
144. Jos. "B.J." I, 10, 10, 217; "A.J." XIV, 11, 1, 268. For Antipater, cf. above p. 20.
145. Dio XLVII, 27, 3. For Alchædæus (spelt Alchandonius in Dio), cf. Altheim & Stiehl, I, 1964, index, s.v. Delotarus was accused of having entered into correspondence with Hannibal at his trial before Caesar (Cic. "Delot." II, 237).
146. Cic. "Att." XIV, 3, 3.

III. THE "MAJILLA" OF THE LATE REPUBLICAN PERIOD :

B. THE SECOND TRIUMVIRATE.

Cicero¹ was able to castigate Antony for surrounding himself with a bodyguard of Ituraeans, even in the senate.

The first large concentration of troops after the death of Caesar was used at the battle of Mutina in 43 B.C. In a speech put in his mouth by Dio², Cicero accused Antony of using barbarian troops against Italy. Similar charges occur in Cicero³ himself. Once there is a concrete reference to Gaul and Germania⁴. Antony was able to escape from Mutina with 200 cavalry, many of them unarmed⁵. He proceeded to recruit men by opening slave barracks on country estates and taking "omne genus hominum"⁶. Later Decimus Brutus' auxiliaries defected to him⁷. After joining Lepidus in Gaul, Antony was able to return to Italy with 10,000 cavalry⁸.

Dio⁹ informs us that, at an early stage of the hostilities, Octavian was able to win over Antony's elephants and German cavalry. Cicero¹⁰ adds that archers were also involved. Decimus Brutus had a great number of "auxilia omnis generis"¹¹. Some of his Gallic cavalry remained true to him even after he was forced to flee, serving as his bodyguard¹². He had also trained a large number of gladiators¹³.

Events next transferred to the East, where the triumvirs accused Marcus Brutus and Cassius of seeking the assistance of barbarians¹⁴.

Appian¹⁵ lists the auxiliary forces of Brutus as follows :

/1000

4000 Gallic and
Lusitanian cavalry;
2000 Thracian,
Illyrian,
Parthian¹⁶ and
Thessalian cavalry.

Earlier he¹⁷ had stated he had light-armed troops and archers. He had also recruited two legions of Macedonians whom he had trained in the Roman way¹⁸. Plutarch¹⁹ records his acquisition of 500 cavalry intended for Dolabella, and his being promised assistance by client kings.

Cassius was assigned the following by Appian²⁰:

2000 Spanish and
Gallic cavalry;
4000 "hippotoxotae" - Arabs,
Medes and
Parthians,

5000 cavalry from the client kings of Asia²¹;

a large force of infantry from the same source.

Earlier he had mentioned the support of Rhodopolis of Thrace, who had 5000 cavalry and from this we learn that he acquired some of Dolabella's cavalry in Syria together with Cilician and Asiatic support²². The extent of the Parthian assistance given to Cassius is difficult to determine.

Cicero²³ had scorned Pompey's unsuccessful attempt to get Parthian aid.

Caecilius Bassus had received some Parthian troops, but they had not stayed long enough to render him effective aid²⁴. A certain number of Parthian

/"hippotoxotae"

"hippotoxotae" had joined Cassius when he defeated Dolabella, apparently on an unofficial basis: Appian²⁵ says that they were attracted to him because of the reputation he had gained as Crassus' quaestor before the battle of Carrhae. These Cassius sent back to the king of Parthia, with a request for a larger force of auxiliaries. However, these arrived too late²⁶. Their non-participation is confirmed in Appian's²⁷ account of Brutus and Cassius after their final defeat. Yet he²⁸ ascribes them a total of 20,000 cavalry, which can only be derived from the figures given earlier if the 4000 "hippotoxotae" are included. Presumably only "non-official" Parthian "hippotoxotae" were included in the 4000. It would appear that the Parthians were not as yet prepared to commit themselves to open assistance of a Roman general. According to Josephus²⁹ Cassius decided to give military support to Artabanus in Armenia in the hope of receiving great assistance from him in return when he was more securely in control of the kingdom. He actually placed him in command of a Roman force of infantry and cavalry, and assigned him tribunes, presumably as military experts.

Much less is known about the auxiliaries assisting the triumvirs at Philippi. The Rhodians and Lycians were said³⁰ to have been friendly to them. This is not surprising, in view of the harsh treatment meted out to them by Brutus and Cassius, but no actual aid on their part is recorded. Octavian had the support of some 2000 Macedonians³¹. "Mascupolis" brother, and joint-ruler of Thrace, Rhassus, decided to support Antony rather than the Republicans and gave him 3000 horses³². In all, Octavian

/and

and Antony were credited with 13,000 cavalry³³.

In the year after Philippi, 41 B.C., Octavian fought L. Antonius, the brother of Mark Antony, in the Perusine War. Mention is made in general terms of L. Antonius' cavalry : he was able to despatch a raiding party of 4000 horse during the siege of Perusia (Perugia) and the cavalry of the Antonine generals supporting Lucius was said to have numbered 6500 after the hostilities had ceased³⁴. His gladiators rendered him useful service³⁵. Nothing has survived concerning Octavian's auxiliaries.

Though the contest between Sextus Pompeius and the triumvirs which ended at the battle of Naulochus in 36 B.C. was largely naval, both sides collected supporting armies which marched on land. Many of S. Pompeius' recruits were of servile or freedman status, and were drawn from Italy³⁶. While still in Spain in 45 B.C. he had been joined by Amilcar, a dispossessed king from Mauritania³⁷. Amilcar then succeeded in returning to Africa, from where he sent detachments for training to S. Pompeius in Spain. But he soon changed allegiance, supporting the Caesarian governor of Africa³⁸. Whether he later decided to render assistance to Pompeius or not, is not known. Pompeius was able to deploy light-armed Numidian troops in Sicily, but their origin is not stated³⁹. Reference is also made to 500 spears which joined him at an early stage⁴⁰, and to cavalry which he used in Italy and Sicily⁴¹.

Octavian, on the other hand, managed to gather 20,000 cavalry and more than 5000 light-armed troops in Sicily⁴². The light-armed

/troops

troops were partly acquired from those brought to him when Pompeius' admiral, Menodorus, deserted to him⁴³. 1000 others were with him when he first landed in Sicily⁴⁴. On that occasion he was accompanied by 500 cavalry, and 2000 ~~volunteers~~ ~~of various~~ ~~types~~ ~~and~~ ~~nationalities~~.

These must be men who volunteered from or were drafted from colonies in Italy, but not enrolled in Octavian's legions. The auxiliaries included Gauls - we hear of armour bearers who protected Octavian from the rain by holding a Gallic shield over him - and Germans, who were frightened by the volcanic noises of Mt. Atna⁴⁵. When he united the forces of Pompeius and Lepidus after Nauclochus, Octavian had 25,000 cavalry and "one and a half times" that number of light-armed troops⁴⁶. Lepidus' cavalry included 200 auxiliaries that he had brought over from Africa⁴⁷.

Pompeius managed to escape. He entertained two plans, according to Appian⁴⁸. The one was to go through Thrace and continue to Armenia, the other to imitate M. Antonius and become a "general" of the Parthians. This implied that he had serious hopes of assistance from these peoples. They are all known to have supplied "auxilia" in earlier wars. When finally cornered in this minor, he had at least 200 horse and 300 light-armed troops. In his final flight, he was pursued by Kaytan of Calatia who had 1500 cavalry⁴⁹.

The auxiliaries of what may be called the foreign rather than the civil wars of the period of the second triumvirate may now be considered. Major operations were undertaken on the Parthian front.

/reference⁵⁰

reference⁵⁰ has already been made to the fact that, before the battle of Philippi, Cassius had sent his Parthian troops back to the Parthian king, with a request for a larger force. Appian⁵¹ reports that when this force arrived after the battle, it ravaged Syria and other nearby areas. He does not make clear how an ostensibly allied force turned into enemies and caused extensive damage. The Parthians, however, can hardly be other than those who accompanied P. Labienus⁵² into Syria and Asia Minor in the winter of 41/40 B.C. What Labienus' precise position was, and what his relationship to the Parthians was, is most obscure⁵³, but the assistance rendered to him by the Parthians was far removed from the traditional pattern of the auxiliaries of the Romans. The Parthians had not been prepared to assist Pompey, or even Caesar in any substantial way, and were now intervening on their terms. This was the situation which faced Antony when he assumed responsibility for the eastern parts of the Roman empire.

Some indications survive concerning the role of the "auxilia" in his Parthian expeditions. He, or Ventidius, who was operating against the Parthians on his behalf in the early stages, decided to support Herod of Judaea with Roman troops, an action he had done. In 37 he sent of troops that comprised at least five Roman cohorts⁵⁴. These cohorts, if not of full Roman legionaries, were presumably at least partially trained and drawn up in legionary cohort formation. In 36 Herod received two legions and a thousand cavalry⁵⁵. The cavalry must have been auxiliaries, and Josephus later says of five "cohorts" that they had recently been recruited in Syria and did not contain the normal stiffening of seasoned troops⁵⁶.

troops⁵⁶. In 37 the Romans supported Herod with "cavalry and infantry" again, elsewhere specified as two legions and a considerable force of Syrian auxiliaries⁵⁷. Whether this distinction is meant to imply that the "legions" in this case were not comprised of Syrian recruits cannot be definitely decided. It must have been numbers rather than quality or nationality that counted.

Such were the military measures taken to secure one area of strategic importance in a confrontation with Parthia. Antony settled the affairs of other client kingdoms in the Eastern world⁵⁸, but no such details concerning military arrangements survive. At the end of 37 he profited from an internal Parthian dissension which resulted in several Parthian nobles and their followers joining him, but as their chief figure was later allowed to return to Parthia, it is not known whether any Parthian soldiers remained in Antony's forces⁵⁹. Plutarch⁶⁰ mentions some of the auxiliaries whom he had in Armenia in 36. These included 10,000 Spanish and Gallic⁶¹ cavalry, described as heavy-armed and distinguished from 30,000 cavalry and light-armed troops of other nations. In a later passage⁶² javelin-throwers and slingers are named. Antony was supported by many allied kings, one of whom was Seleucus of Pontus⁶³; the most important however was Artavasdes of Armenia (who however later left him in the lurch) who brought 6000 cavalry⁶⁴ and 7000 infantry. These contingents of the allied kings are presumably to be regarded as forming part of the figure of 13,000.

30,000. In the expedition Antony lost 4000 cavalry, and interestingly blamed his defeat on the lack of a sufficiently large force of cavalry and archers⁶⁵.

The non-civil wars in the west that offset Antony's Parthian campaigns were largely confined to Gaul, Spain and Illyricum⁶⁶. They were on a smaller scale, and nothing has survived concerning auxiliaries involved in them.

In the absence of Appian, Plutarch is our main source for the forces gathered for action in 31 B.C. As had happened to Pompey before Pharsalus, almost all laid upon the western element in Antony's army⁶⁷. Carithausen⁶⁸ puts this in a striking light: "wie geschahen die Fürsten der hellenischen und lateinischen Völker, die versammelten antonius die Könige des griechischen orients an sich und kämpfte gegen ihn." Iarn⁶⁹, however, has shown that the character of Antony's army remained basically Italian.

Plutarch⁷⁰ given the following names of those who either came to Antony or sent him ministers:

- Pocchus of Libya (a mistake for Bogud of Mauretania),
- Larcondesius (the hellenized form of Larcondianus) of Cilicia,
- Archelaus of Cappadocia,
- Philadelphus of Pontus,
- Mithridates of Commagene,
- Adalms of Thrace,
- Polemon of Pontus,

Phileas

Malchus of Arabia,

Herod of Judaea,

Amyntas of Lycaonia and Galatia,

the Medes.

He also states that assistance had been promised by Dicomus of the Getae⁷¹, and that Antony had 12,000 cavalry⁷² and was able to put 2000 archers⁷³ on board for the naval engagement. Dio⁷⁴ adds the names of other allies: Iamblicus, an Arab, who was tortured for suspected treachery, and the Mysians, who deserted to Octavian⁷⁵, and mentions a force of gladiators⁷⁶ at Cyzicus that remained loyal to the end.

Further items of information can be gathered concerning some of these allies. Philadelphus of Cappadocia went over to Octavian⁷⁷. Antony hoped to enlist other Thracians besides those that came with Sadaia: according to Dio⁷⁸ he sent to Thrace and Macedonia for mercenaries. At first sight it may appear strange to put Macedonia in the East, but it is so classified in Plutarch⁷⁹ in the passage referred to above, where the East, which is given as Antony's sphere of influence, is made to reach Illyria. The contribution of Herod of Judaea was small, and was diverted to Arabia⁸⁰. Amyntas and Deiotarus defected with their Galatians to Octavian⁸¹. The Medes were presumably those for whom Antony had exchanged Roman soldiers with the Median king in 33 B.C.⁸².

In the above list there is no mention of western auxiliaries, especially Gallic and Spanish cavalry. As noted above⁸³, Antony had

/10,000

10,000 of these on his Parthian expedition in 36 B.C., in which he lost a total of 4000 cavalry. This means that at least 6000 of the Gauls and Spaniards were still available. After the death of Cleopatra, Octavian gave Herod 4000 Gauls who had served as her bodyguard⁸⁴, which is another indication that Gauls were available to Antony. Horace's⁸⁵ reference to the defection of "Galli" to Octavian at the battle of Actium -

"at huc frementis uerterunt bis mille equos

Galli canentes Caesarem" -

is commonly⁸⁶ equated with that of the Galatians under Amyntas and Deiotarus mentioned above. It is true that "Galli" can refer to Galatians in Latin literature⁸⁷, but at first sight the meaning of Gauls would be the natural one, especially since they chanted the name of Caesar. It is possible, then, to take this passage as a reference to Gallic, rather than Galatian, cavalry in Antony's army. On general grounds the presence of western "auxilia" is most likely.

Reference has already been made to the defections of auxiliaries from Antony to Octavian. Octavian had some Eastern supporters of his own, such as Eurycles the Spartan⁸⁸. The role of the Dacian Cotiso is not clear. According to Dio⁸⁹ the Dacians had approached Octavian, but failing in their requests, had gone over to Antony, without however rendering him any real assistance. Suetonius⁹⁰ retails an item of Antonine propaganda against Octavian, that he had betrothed his daughter Julia to Cotiso⁹¹, "Getarum rex". These references to Dacians and Getans,

/um

as well as the hoped-for assistance from Dicones already referred to, make it likely that both Antony and Octavian felt it necessary to secure, if not the active co-operation, at least the neutrality or favour of this area on the lower Danube as part of their over-all strategy. It is unlikely that the negotiations resulted in the actual dispatch of auxiliaries. Nothing more can be recovered about Octavian's "auxilia", except that Plutarch⁹² credits him with about the same number of cavalry as Antony had, which was 12,000.

NOTES.

1. "Phil." II, 44, 112; cf. 8, 19; XIII, 8, 18. Cavaignac, "R.E.L." 1952, 228, regards these as foreigners drafted into the legions by Antony.
2. Dio XLV, 22, 4.
3. Cf. Jal, "Lat." 1962, 37.
4. Cic. "Phil." V, 2, 6.
5. Thus Pollio to Cic. ("Fam." I, 33, 4). D. Brutus (XI, 10, 3 - 4) states that he had only a small band of infantry, but many "equites".
6. XI, 10, 3.
7. App. "B.C." III, 14, 47, 402. For Decimus Brutus, cf. Münzer, "A.L." Suppl. V, 1931, 37 ff. (no. 524).
8. Plut. "Ant." 18, 4.
9. XLV, 13, 4; XLVI, 37, 2.
10. "Phil." V, 17, 46.
11. "Brut." I, 10, 2.
12. App. "B.C." III, 19, 47, 402.
13. III, 8, 4), 201.
14. IV, 2, 8, 55.
15. II, 88, 373.
16. For the Martini, cf. above, p. 18.
17. "B.C." IV, 10, 75, 318.
18. Ibid.; III, 11, 79, 324.
19. "Brut." 25. For Dolabella, cf. Münzer, "A.L.", 1900, 130 ff. (no. 141).
20. "B.C." IV, 11, 88, 373.
21. Cf. Cic. "Phil." XI, 13, 33.
22. App. "B.C." IV, 11, 87, 369; Dio XLVII, 26, 1 f.
23. "B.C." III, 82, 4; cf. App. "B.C." II, 12, 83, 390; Plut. "Pomp." 76, 5; Dio XLII, 2, 5, for the suggestion that Pompey flee to the Parthians after Pharsalus.
24. Cic. "Att." XIV, 9, 3; Dio XLVII, 27, 5; for Cassius, cf. above, p. 26.

25. "B.C." IV, 8, 59, 257.
26. 8, 63, 271; cf. Dio XLVIII, 24, 5.
27. "B.C." IV, 17, 133, 558.
28. 14, 106, 454; 17, 133, 557.
29. Jos. "B.C." I, 11, 4, 225; 11, 6, 230; cf. "R.H." XIV, 11, 6, 288 ff.; 15, 11, 452. Cf. Buchheim, 1961, 63.
30. App. "B.C." IV, 9, 65, 277.
31. Plut. "Brut." 41.
32. App. "B.C." IV, 11, 87, 369.
33. 14, 108, 454.
34. V, 4, 30, 117; 4, 32, 128; 6, 50, 208.
35. 4, 30, 117; 4, 33, 134; Suet. "Aug." 14.
36. App. "B.C." IV, 11, 85, 355; V, 8, 72, 304.
37. IV, 11, 83, 348. For Arabio, cf. above, p. 33, n. 133.
38. 7, 54, 234 ff.
39. V, 12, 113, 474.
40. V, 3, 25, 100.
41. 6, 56, 239; 12, 110, 457; 12, 113, 474.
42. 12, 116, 481.
43. 9, 78, 332. For Menodorus, cf. Münzer, "R.H." XV, 1931, 896 ff. (no. 1).
44. 12, 110, 461.
45. 12, 117, 485 f.
46. 13, 127, 526.
47. 11, 98, 406.
48. 14, 133, 551 ff. For Labienus, cf. below, p. 39.
49. 14, 137, 571; 140, 502; 142, 594. For Amyntas, cf. R. v. Rohden, "R.H." I, 1894, 2007 f. (no. 21).
50. Cf. above, p. 36. For Cassius' Parthian policy, cf. Buchheim, 1961, 25 ff.
51. IV, 8, 63, 271.
52. Plut. "Ant." 28, 1; Dio XLVIII, 29. For Labienus, cf. Münzer, "R.H." XII, 1924, 258 ff. (no. 5).
53.

53. Cf. the discussion in Buchheim, 196-, 75 ff.
54. Jos. "B.J." I, 13, 6, 298; 301 - Josephus' actual words are
... , balanced by five Jewish cohorts.
55. "A.J." XIV, 15, 7, 434; "B.J." I, 16, 6, 317, where *ἐθνη*
is used.
56. I, 17, 1, 324, where *ἐθνη* and *τῶν ἐθνῶν στρατιῶν*
are the words used. Cavaignac, "R.E.L." 1932, 228, regards these
Syrians as foreigners drafted into the legions.
57. Jos. "A.J." XIV, 16, 1, 465; "B.J." I, 17, 2, 327; 9, 346; where
ἐθνη and *τῶν ἐθνῶν στρατιῶν* appear.
58. App. "B.C." I, 8, 73, 319.
59. Plut. "Ant." 37, 1 - 2; Dio CLX, 23, 5.
60. Plut. "Ant." 37, 3.
61. Also mentioned in 41, 5.
62. 41, 4.
63. 38, 3.
64. The 16,000 of 50, 2 seems too large a figure, so the 6000 of 37, 3
is to be preferred.
65. 50, 1; 52, 2.
66. Cf. Schmitthelner, "Hist." 1958, 189 ff., for the perspective in
which Octavian's Illyrian campaigns are to be viewed.
67. "Ant." 56, 4; cf. Dio L, 6, 5.
68. 1891 (1864), 359.
69. "C.J." 1932, 8..
70. "Ant." 61, 1. For Bocchus/Bogud, cf. Romanello, 1957, 149 f.,
and above, p. 25 and p. 32, n. 133. For Iarcondimotus, cf. Stein,
"R.E.L." IV A, 19, 2, 2297 ff. For Archelaus, cf. Wilcken, "R.E.L." II,
1895, 451 (no. 15). For (Meiotarus) Philadelphus, cf. Hiese,
"R.E.L." IV, 1901, 2404 (no. 4). For Mithridates, cf. Geyer, "R.E.L."
AV, 1932, 2213 f. (no. 30). For Sadala, cf. above, p. 15, 171.
For Polemon cf. above, p. 40. For Balchus, cf. above p. 20.
For Amyntas, cf. above, p. 38.

IV. AUGUSTUS.

The evidence for the "auxilia" under Augustus is highly unsatisfactory. Auxiliary regiments had not started producing stamped military tiles as yet. One or two inscriptions recording the auxiliaries can be dated to the Augustan period, and inferences can be drawn from others. Consideration of the epigraphical evidence, however, will be left to a later chapter¹. Literary references are scattered. Tacitus does not describe the principate of Augustus. Suetonius' biography of the emperor is hardly concerned with details of military organization. Dio is insufficiently detailed. Velleius Paterculus makes some useful remarks on the subject, but does not turn his attention to the "auxilia" as such. All that can be done is to review the major wars fought under Augustus and consider any mention of non-legionary troops.

Nothing survives concerning the subjugation of the Helaseians and other peoples in North Italy in 25 B.C. The wars in Aquitania and the rest of Gaul at the outset of Augustus' principate are equally obscure, although the cavalry² overwhelmed in the Collian disaster may have been auxiliaries. In spite of Augustus' participation in the early stages, the wars in Spain³ from 27 to 19 B.C. do not produce a reference to the "auxilia" involved. Strabo⁴ however relates that, instead of plundering the allies of the Romans, the Cantabrians⁵ were now fighting for them. "Now" is difficult to interpret: Strabo is generally thought to have written most of the "Geography" under Augustus, with additions under

/Tiberius.

Tiberius. Since in the next sentence here he refers to an action of Tiberius in Spain, it is not clear whether the remark should be taken of the Tiberian period, or whether it can be made to refer to the time of the end of the Spanish wars under Augustus. Strabo does not specify the capacity in which the Cantabrians fought for Rome : Dio⁶ says that they were good javelin throwers.

As a prelude to the great attack on Germany, campaigns were undertaken against the Suetians and the Noricans and successfully concluded by Drusus and Tiberius in 15 B.C. Dio⁷ reports an interesting measure adopted by the Romans to ensure the peace :

καὶ ἀφαιρῶν τι γαστήρην, τὸ τι ἀριστερόν καὶ τὸ δεξιό-
ν τε ἰσχυρὰν εἰσὶν ἐδράμεν, ἀποστέλλει τούτους ὅσοι τὴν
μὲν γαστὴρ οἶκεν ἰκανοὶ νεοχρῆσται δὲ τι δόξαν ἔχοντες ἴσαν.

The strongest element and those whose age qualified them for military service were "removed" from their homes. Since it is not specifically stated that they were sold into slavery, it is possible to surmise that some at least were drafted into auxiliary service.

The long German wars of the principate of Augustus started with the expedition of Drusus across the Rhine in 12 B.C. A few items concerning the "auxilie" in this sphere survive. In 12 B.C. Drusus was supported by Frisian infantry⁸, and in 10 by Nervians led by the tribal commanders Chumetinctus and Avectius, called "tribuni" by the epitomator of Livy⁹. The Varian disaster of 9 A.D. brings the next notice. Just
before

before the outbreak of the revolt, Varus¹⁰ was waiting for assistance from leaders of the Cherusci¹¹ who were at that stage still ostensibly loyal. From the fact that the leader of the rebellion, Arminius, ordered the arrest of the chief of the Cherusci during the revolt, it is probable that the Germans had received auxiliary assistance from that tribe as well¹².

Velleius Paterculus¹³ describes the troops slain as follows: "tres legiones totidemque alae et sex cohortes" (Suetonius¹⁴ merely says "tribus legionibus ... et auxiliis omnibus caesis"). This amounts to three cavalry and six infantry auxiliary regiments involved in the battle itself. It is presumably these to which Dio¹⁵ refers in his enumeration of the losses:

τὸ συνέχον, ἂν καὶ οἱ ἑσπεροὶ τοῦ ἐπικυράτου (whether the archers, presumably auxiliaries, who helped to harass the Germans in their assault on the final Roman position, are to be included among these can of course not be definitely decided¹⁶). These "allied forces that were of any use", corresponding to Velleius' alae and cohortes and Suetonius' "auxilia" imply that there were other auxiliaries available, who were probably either less reliable or inadequately trained and equipped. Dio's phrase occurs immediately after a statement that there was a critical shortage of recruits for the legions. It implies that the emperor was almost as concerned with "useful" auxiliaries as with legionary material.

Prior to his change of front against the Romans, Arminius¹⁷ had been granted Roman citizenship and equestrian status for military services rendered as leader of a Cheruscan contingent. Tacitus merely says of him "in castris Romanis ductor, popularius meruit", but Velleius calls him

"assiduus

"addidit militiae nostrae prioris coem". If the term "militia nostra prior" could be definitely interpreted, it would be possible to discover where Arminius had served with his Cheruscan soldiers: Velleius is known to have served in Thrace, Armenia, Germany and Pannonia¹⁸. One approach¹⁹ has been to regard Arminius as a regular "praefectus alae" in the Roman sense who can be associated with suitable stages of Velleius' career. This would imply he had seen professional service in the Empire as if he had been a native Roman of equestrian status. But in view of the possibility of understanding "militia" in the sense of "expedition", it seems preferable to take the phrase in the sense of Velleius' former expedition or campaign, as, most recently, von Helldorff²⁰. He, however, takes as Velleius' starting point his last campaign under Germanicus and refers the joint service of Velleius and Arminius to the Pannonian campaigns of Tiberius. But in the context immediately preceding the remark about Arminius, Velleius had regularly been speaking of his service under Tiberius, first in Germany, then in Pannonia (4 - 6, 6 - 7 A.D. respectively).²¹ It seems safer to return to the older view²² and relate Arminius' main services to Tiberius' campaigns in 4 - 6 A.D. The Velleian passage cannot be taken as evidence for the service of Arminius, let alone of a Cheruscan contingent, outside Germany.

The consequences of the Varian disaster should be noted. Augustus felt that the Gauls and Germans in his bodyguard now posed a threat to security and sent them away from Rome to an island. He had been using German "corporis custodes" since the battle of Actium, when they had replaced

replace a "manus Calagurritanorum" (from Calahorra in Spain). Augustus was continuing the use of foreign bodyguards that had been a feature of the late republic²³. To deal with the critical shortage of suitable recruits for the army at this juncture, he resorted for the second time to another late republican device, the enlisting of freedmen. These were kept apart from the citizen soldiers and armed differently²⁴.

The Canabian revolt of 6 to 4 B.C. produces some information concerning "auxilia" but earlier fighting in the Danubian area had led to a series of alliances and concessions that should be noted first. Licinius Crassus was engaged in warfare there in 29 B.C. At one stage he was assisted by Koler, a Getan chief. As a result of the services which he rendered, Koler was later recognized by Augustus as a friend and ally of the Roman people²⁵. The Dacian tribe of the Iudaei was spared when the rest of the Dacians were punished for not having remained "friendly" to the Romans²⁶. It is more than likely that they had supplied the Romans with auxiliaries as a sign of their friendliness.

In the course of his campaigns against the Sarmatians in 12 B.C. Valerian was able to use the auxiliaries as allies, useful, as Dio²⁷ says, because they were descendants of the Macedonians and had the same methods of fighting.

In 6 B.C., when Valerian was emperor, his great offensive against Vardagane, the Palastians were ordered to supply what Dio²⁸ calls a "Macedonian" to his army that was then made of Illyrians, Valerian

Valerius Messallinus, was collecting for Tiberius. When they assembled, they realized their strength, and revolted. The assembling of the troops must have taken place without Roman supervision. They must have formed a contingent of "socii" under native control and direction. Presumably other tribes in the area had also been required to contribute men. One thinks of the Pannonians, who, according to Velleius²⁹, had a knowledge of Roman discipline which they could only have gained from extensive co-operation with the Romans as auxiliaries. The rebels had available about 20,000 infantry and 9000 cavalry.

Velleius refers to concentrations of Roman troops comprising auxiliaries on three occasions. The first two report a disaster in which the Romans were surrounded: "pars ... circumfusa quinque legionibus nostris auxiliaribusque et equitatu regio (quippe magnus Thracum manus ... Rhoeetalces, Thraciae rex, in adiutorium eius belli secum trahebat) ... cladem intulit"³¹ (where it is clear that "auxiliares" are kept distinct from the allied Thracian cavalry); "fugata regionis equestria acies, fugatae alas, convergens cohortes sunt, apud signa quoque legionum trepidatus"³². The royal cavalry are distinguished from the "auxiliares", who comprise units of cavalry, "alas", and infantry, "cohortes". On the third occasion, Velleius³³ supplies Tiberius' total forces: "decem legionibus, LXX amplius cohortibus, XLIII *** et pluribus quam decem veteranorum milibus, ad hoc magno voluntariorum numero frequentique equite regio". Besides the legionaries and the veterans, there is the same
/distinction

distinction between the Thracian cavalry and the units of auxiliary cavalry and infantry, with the number specified in each case. The "voluntarii"³⁴ were freedmen whom Augustus had drafted to help meet the emergency. The distinctions made by Velleius do not appear in Suetonius, who merely refers to "legiones parvaeque auxiliorum copiae"³⁵.

Unfortunately Velleius does not name the *ala* and cohorts involved. However from Dio³⁶ we know of a certain *Novellus* *Isidore* who distinguished himself. Probably he was serving in a Gallic *ala*. From the long service which Flavius, Arminius' brother, had given to the Romans, Gerdthausen³⁷ has argued that he was among the auxiliaries used in the Pannonian revolt. It is not clear what rank he held³⁸ in the Roman service: he may not have been a commander of a tribal contingent like his brother, whose service in this capacity was probably confined to Germany. This passage is insufficient evidence for his having served in the Pannonian revolt. Tacitus³⁹ describes a Parthian *cruspades* in the following terms: "exul quondam et liberio, cum Delmaticis bellum conficeret, haud inglorius auxiliator eoque civitate Romana donatus". He had however later returned to Parthia where he found favour with the king again. Presumably he had had a following when he served Tiberius in the Pannonian revolt. It would therefore not be safe to regard him as a leader or a member of an *ala*, but rather as assisting on a less formal basis like *choeratalces*.

The record of the East and Africa under Augustus is even less
/satisfactory.

satisfactory. When Aelius Gallus set out on his Arabian expedition in 25 B.C., he was accompanied by about 12,000 infantry, whom Strabo⁴⁰ describes as Romans from Egypt, who were presumably mainly legionaries, and their allies. The latter comprised 10,000 Nabataeans and 500 Jews. Josephus⁴¹ states that the 500 Jews were picked men from Herod's bodyguard.

When Petronius, as prefect of Egypt, repelled an Ethiopian attack on Egypt by invading Ethiopia herself in 24 B.C., he took less than 10,000 infantry and 800 cavalry against a force alleged to number 30,000⁴¹. Strabo⁴² gives the total forces of Egypt as 3 legions, and 3 cohorts - three of which were established in Syene (Savan) near the Ethiopian border. It was these 3 cohorts that had been attacked by the Ethiopians⁴³. There were also 3 units of cavalry - at different points of the province. The cavalry of the province were clearly auxiliaries, but the character of the cohorts cannot be easily established. That Strabo calls them "of Romans" may mean that they consisted of non-local soldiers drafted away from their homes, not necessarily that they were composed of Roman citizens.

When Tiberius went to Armenia in 20 B.C. he was assisted by Archelaus of Cappadocia⁴⁴. It may be assumed that the king provided troops.

Auxiliaries in the East are next heard of in Josephus' accounts of the troubles that broke out in 4 B.C. when the Jewish Archelaus succeeded his father Herod in Judaea. Archelaus is said to have sent

a "tribune with a cohort"⁴² into a rioting mob in Jerusalem to restore order, but in spite of the Roman-sounding terms employed, the reference must be to the royal Jewish troops. When the imperial procurator of Syria, Labinus, attempted to gain possession of Herod's treasure against the orders of Varus, then governor of Syria, he armed some of his own slaves to supplement the legion which Varus had given him⁴³. In the fighting which broke out in the temple between the Jews and Labinus' forces, the skill of the Jewish slingers and the presence of Jewish archers is noted⁴⁴. When revolts spread throughout Judaea, certain elements of the royal Jewish army remained loyal to the Romans. These included "the most warlike element", 3000 Sebasteniens, i.e., Samaritans, since Samaria was known as Sebaste at this period, and archers from Trachonitis⁴⁵.

The revolts were serious enough to need the presence of Varus, who came in from Syria. He brought two legions and the four alae of horse attached to them, and ordered neighbouring kings and dynasts to supply auxiliaries. The city of Berytus (Beirut) supplied 1500 heavy armed soldiers⁴⁶. Aretas the Arab brought a large force of infantry and cavalry, but later went beyond the bounds of what was expected of an ally: he used his presence in Judaea to satisfy his private feud with the house of Herod⁴⁷.

Finally, there are general references to auxiliaries in Tacitus, Suetonius and Dio. Tacitus⁴⁸ states that Augustus left a document behind at his death which mentioned "quantum civium sociorumque in armis". The passage refers only to auxiliaries as contrasted with legionaries:

Whether

whether the "socii" included "ad hoc" troops supplied by the "regna" that are mentioned in the next phrase cannot be decided from the context. The fact that the number of the "socii" could be stated suggests, however, that the "socii in armis" were on a basis secure enough for meaningful record keeping. Suetonius⁵² statement that "ex militaribus copiis legiones et auxilia prouinciatis distribuit" takes us no further. Cassius has argued that certain "cohortes" who were punished by decimation and by being given rations of barley⁵³ were auxiliaries. The previous sentence gives milder punishments to legions: hence these were auxiliaries. But the use of "cohortes" in the sense of auxiliary infantry regiments so soon after the term legion does not seem natural. The difference is more likely to be found in the offence: the "cohortes" were being so punished for yielding their position in battle: the legions had merely shown insolence. "Cohortes" then refers to the tactical division of the legion, not to the auxiliary unit. Suetonius also refers to auxiliary commanders. He says that Augustus allowed the sons of senators to start their careers not only with legionary tribunates but also with cavalry commands ("praefecturae alarum"). Sometimes 2 such "laticlauii" were placed in command of one ala ("binos plerumque laticlauios praeposuit singulis aliis")⁵⁴. Dio's⁵⁵ statement is also general, with a disclaimer that he is not able to supply figures:

καὶ ἱππέων καὶ πεζῶν ἀριθμὸν οὐ δύναται εἰπεῖν· οὐ γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ αὐτῶν.

1. Cf. below, p. 243
2. Dio LIV, 20, 5. For n. Lollius, cf. Grogg, "A.A." XIII, 1927, 1377 ff. (no. 11); Aitterling-Stein, 1932, 5 (no. 8).
3. Brancati, 1963, does not discuss the question of the "auxilia" in Spain.
4. III, 3, 8, 136.
5. For the Cantabri, cf. Hübner, "A.A." III, 1899, 1491 ff.
6. LIII, 25, 6.
7. LIV, 22, 5.
8. Dio LIV, 32, 5.
9. Livy "ap." GAI. Obviously the use of the Roman military term "tribunus" cannot be given much weight: cf. van de Noord, "A.A." 1936, 352; Gander, "Gymn." 1955, 94. For Avestius, cf. "V.I.R." A 1337, for Cnusatinctus, 2 729.
10. For P. Quinctilius Varus, cf. A. John, "A.A." XLIV, 1963, 907 ff. (no. 20); Aitterling-Stein, 1932, 12 (no. 19).
11. Dio LVI, 13, 4. For the Cherusci, cf. Ihm, "A.A." III, 1897, 227 ff.
12. Tac. "Ann." XLII, 25, quoted below, p. 121, n. 43. For the Ampsivarii, cf. Ihm, "A.A." I, 1894, 1953.
13. II, 117, 1. For a discussion of Velleius' use of the terms "alae et cohortes", cf. below, p. 228: Velleius and his father had both been "praefecti equitum" II, 114, 31.
14. "Aug." 23, 1.
15. LVI, 23, 1.
16. 22, 2a.
17. "V.I.R." A 1363. The phrases discussed are Tac. "Ann." II, 181 Vell. II, 115, 2.
18. For Velleius' career, cf. Dillie, "A.A." VIII 4, 637 ff.
19. Gander ("Gymn." 1955, 87 ff.) has been the last to defend this view in detail. He would however separate Arminius' activity as "praefectus /alae"

- alae" from his leading of a Cheruscan contingent, which, in his opinion, occurred during Tiberius' German campaigns in 4 - 6 A.D.
20. "H.G.", 1966, 177 f., developing a suggestion of Koestermann, "Hist." 1957, 435 f., n. 17.
 21. Cf. II, 104 ff., esp. 114, 1; 115, 5.
 22. as, e.g., in Wardhausen, 1904, vol. 1, 120 and II, 797, n. 24; Bang, 1926, 29. Cf. Hübner, l.c.n. 13, and Gallien, "H.G.G.R." 1964, 143 f., who does not accept Hübner's position on Arminius as "praefectus alae".
 23. Dio LVI, 23, 4; Suet. "Aug." 45, 1, and above, p. 34, and for the "corporis custodes", below, p. 388.
 24. Suet. "Aug." 25, 2; Dio, LVI, 23, 3.
 25. Dio LI, 24, 5 f. For M. Licinius Crassus, cf. Grogg, "H.G." VIII, 1926, 270 ff. (no. 58).
 26. 25, 4. The circumstances behind the "unauthorized" war against the Sudryans (Lenk, "H.G." VIII, 1957, 1900 ff.) of M. Primus (LIV, 3, 1) a few years later are obscure.
 27. LIV, 31, 3. For the Scordisci cf. Fluss, "H.G." II A, 1921, 831 ff.
 28. IV, 29, 1. For Maroboduus, cf. Stein, "H.G." XIV, 1932, 1907 ff., and for M. Valerius Messalla Messallinus, Lunzer, "H.G." VIII A, 1955, 159 ff. (no. 264).
 29. II, 110, 5.
 30. 110, 3.
 31. 112, 4. For Phoenetelces, cf. Dio LV, 30; Sahrstedt, "H.G." I A 1914, 1003 f. (no. 1). It is to be noted that some years earlier M. Lollius (cf. above, p. 47) had given this king support when he needed it (Dio LIV, 20, 3). As in the case of Herod in the late republican period (cf. above p. 396) Roman military assistance to a client king produced a good dividend.
 32. Tell. II, 112, 5.
 33. 113, 1. Unfortunately the reading is disputed: Laurent suggested "X alis et", Lipsius "XIII alis et" for the lacuna. What is in doubt is not the "alae", but their number.

34. Cf. III, 1, and above p. 53.
35. "Tib." 16, 1. Suetonius gives the impossible figure of 15 for the number of legions involved. This Syme, "J.R.S." 1973, 27 f., plausibly explains as a general estimate of the total of legions on the Rhine and Danube together.
36. XVI, 11, 2. "rusio" appears neither in Holder, 15 f., 1961, nor in Schönfeld, 110, 1965. For Dio's use of *ῥυσίος*, cf. Boissac's edition, index, s.v.
37. 194, 117c, on the basis of Tac. "Ann." II, 9. For Flavius, cf. "P.L.A."² 450.
38. He is called an "explorator" in Tac. "Ann." II, 16, but the term there is intended to be deliberately disparaging. His "dona militaria" (for which cf. Fiebinger "M.A." I, 1903, 1528 ff.) included a "corona" (Tac. "Ann." II, 9), normally not given to those under the rank of centurion. But the "dona" had not been systematized by this date.
39. "Ann." VI, 37.
40. XVI, 4, 23, 78c. For Gellius Gallus, cf. "P.L.A."² 1791. Stein, 195, 16 f.
41. "A.J." XV, 9, 3, 317.
Strabo XVII, 1, 54, 820. For Petronius, cf. Stein, "M.A." III, 1937, 1177 ff. (no. 21); A. Stein, 1930, 17 f.
42. XVII, 1, 12, 797.
43. Ibid., 54, 821. These cohorts were not kept up to full strength according to 55, 819.
44. Jos. "A.J." IV, 4, 3, 125. For Archelaus, cf. "P.L.A."² A 1023, and above, p. 41.
45. *ἡγεμὼν τοῦ στρατοῦ* - Jos. "A.J." II, 1, 3, 11.
For Archelaus, cf. "P.L.A."² A 1023.
46. Jos. "A.J." II, 3, 1, 117. "A.J." XVII, 10, 1, 252 - 3 + Labinus used them as *βοητάς*. For Labinus, cf. Stein, "M.A." I A, 1920, 1595 (no. 4), and for Varus, above, p. 51.

47. Jos. "A.J." XVII, 10, 2, 259.
48. "D.J." II, 3, 4, 52; 4, 2, 50. For Trachonitis, cf. G. Hölcher, "D.J." II, 3, 4, 52; 4, 2, 50. For Syria, Beer, L. 1923, 2102 ff. (esp. 2104).
49. 3, 1, 67; "A.J." XVII, 10, 2, 259 - 7. However, since Berytus (cf. Henzinger, "H.J." III, 1947, 322 ff.) was a colony, these were probably legionaries.
50. "E.J." II, 3, 1, 68; 5, 3, 76. For Aretas, cf. "P.L.N."² A 1033.
51. "Ann." I, 11. The "cohortes civium romanorum" are mentioned in I, 3, where they received the same donative in Augustus' will as the legionaries.
52. "Aug." 49.
53. "Aug." 24, with notes ad loc. Levi (ad loc.) does not discuss the point.
54. 38, 2.
55. Dio LV, 24, 5.

V. FIBRIUS.

In this chapter account will not be taken of the slight epigraphical evidence. The main source of information is Tacitus, although other early imperial writers supply a few facts. What references to auxiliaries there are will be discussed region by region.

When a serious disturbance broke out in the North Italian town of Pollentia (Pollenzo), Tiberius sent two detachments to restore order. Suetonius¹ describes these as "cohortes ab urbe et alias a Cottio regno". The cohort from Rome could have been either a cohort of the praetorian guard or a "cohorta urbana": the former is more likely in view of the distance involved. The second cohort, however, was most probably an auxiliary unit. The Cottian Alps formed at this time a client kingdom. The cohort there may have been either a unit supplied by the Romans to strengthen Cottius or a local Alpine force of Cottius' trained and organized on the model of a Roman cohort.

Under 19 A.D. Tacitus² refers to actions taken against observers of Egyptian and Jewish religious rites. These included the sending of 4000 freedmen of the sect involved to Sardinia, where they were to put down brigandage (or else perish because of the bad climate). Since Tacitus uses the singular for the religion involved ("superstitione"), it is not clear from him whether the freedmen were Egyptians or Jews. However the parallel account in Josephus³ makes it plain that the freedmen involved were Jews. What kind of military unit was formed

/out

out of these Jews is not known. Suetonius⁴ describes the incident as follows: "Iudaeorum iuuentutes per species sacramenti in provincias grauioris caeli distribuit". The reference to the harshness of the climate must mean that Cardania was involved. "iuuentus" represents Tacitus' "quis idonea aetas (sc. est)". But the "form of the military oath" is not found in Tacitus⁵: something analogous to an auxiliary unit or a "cohors urbana" or a "cohors uigilum", as at Rome, must be implied.

The revolt of Flarua and Macrovir in Gaul in 21 A.D. was dependent upon Gallic auxiliaries for its initial impetus. These are referred to as "armatae cohortes", who formed the nucleus of Macrovir's forces. They were supported by "iuuentus" amounting to 40,000 of whom a fifth had legionary equipment that was manufactured locally, and the rest various agricultural and hunting implements as weapons. The rebels also deployed "crupellarii", defined as gladiatorial slaves completely covered in plated armour⁶. Tacitus⁷ keeps these three elements distinct under the heading of "cohortes", "auxilia" and "ferrati" in his description of the final engagement.

The Romans were taunted with having nothing of value in their forces except what was foreign - "nihil ualidum in exercitibus nisi quod externus"⁸. This may refer to legionaries of non-Italian origin, although at this date they were proportionately few in number⁹. More likely the auxiliaries are meant. Even when the exaggeration in the rhetorical taunt is discounted, it is significant that this aspect of the Roman army could

/be

be stressed with some degree of plausibility. The actual non-legionary units that are mentioned by Tacitus are as follows. The cohort "quae Lugduni praesidium agitabat" was an urban cohort, technically part of the city forces of Rome and therefore not an auxiliary regiment¹⁰. Gallic chieftains rendered assistance ("auxilium") : this probably included men, as well as supplies and money, who would have been under local control rather than professional auxiliaries. But the "ala equitum quae conscripta e Treveris militia disciplinaque nostra habebatur" must have been a regular regiment : the reference to conscription and Roman military discipline makes this clear¹¹. Julius Arminius, a pro-Roman Treveran leader, was entrusted with a particular mission "cum delecta manu" : this force is later described as "una ala Treverorum"¹². This must have been a second regular auxiliary unit. When T. Silius, legate in upper Germany, approached the scene of the rebellion with two legions, he sent on ahead a force described as an "auxiliaris manus". This is referred to, deliberately disparagingly, by Silius himself as "paucula ... turmae", which implies that the force consisted of at least one, if not more, alae¹³.

Tacitus' account of the mutiny on the Rhine and Germanicus' subsequent campaigns against the Germans (14 - 16 A.D.) at the outset of Tiberius' principate provides a certain amount of material on the auxiliaries in the Rhine area. The number of auxiliaries available to Germanicus on the Rhine is said to have been a factor in Tiberius' fear of his adopted son : he had in his power "tot legiones, immensa sociorum auxilia"¹⁴. The phrase is obviously rhetorical, and cannot be assessed as

if it were precise terminology. A plan put forward during the mutiny was to arm the "auxilia et socii"¹⁵ against the rebellious legions. Purreaux¹⁶ is inclined to distinguish the terms, understanding "socii" as those who were still to be enrolled. This is possible, but, as in the previous phrase, the wording cannot be pressed. Germanicus makes a reference to an offer by the Belgians to protect the Roman empire from the Germans in the place of the legions - but this occurs in a highly emotional context intended to shame the mutineers¹⁷. The "praesidium auxiliarium equitum"¹⁸, however, that was assigned to one of the ambassadors from the senate whom the rebels rejected, was obviously a regular unit or part of one.

For the first German campaign, late in 14 A.D., Germanicus prepared a force of "arma classica sociis"¹⁹, where auxiliaries are clearly distinguished from the legionaries (here "arma") by the old term "socii". Actual details of the land force are given later: Germanicus was accompanied by "duodecim milia e legionibus, sex et viginti socias cohortes, octo equitum alas"²⁰. The detachments from the legions amounted to the equivalent of 2 normal legions. This makes the number of auxiliary cohorts appear very large, in spite of their loyalty which Tacitus goes on to stress. If the cohorts were also quinquerary, the number of auxiliaries totalled 15,000 infantry and 4,000 cavalry. The alas are later referred to as "equites", the infantry auxiliaries as "auxiliariae cohortes" and "ceteri socii"²¹. Some, if not all, the cohorts were lightly armed ("expeditae cohortes", "laeves cohortes"²²).

The forces for the campaign of 15 A.D. are characterized as

/"pedes, ...

"pedes, eques, classis", a phrase obviously parallel to the "arma classem socios" of the year before, except that "pedes" must have included both the auxiliary and the legionary infantry²³. At the outset the army was divided into two. Germanicus gave Caecina, the legate of the army in Lower Germany, 4 legiones and 5,000 "auxiliares": the latter presumably included cavalry and infantry. He also had "tumultuarias catervas Germanorum cis Rhenum colentium": these would have been drafted for the occasion, no doubt from the Ubians and neighbouring tribes on the Rhine. From the point of view of nomenclature, it is interesting to note that the units of free Germans across the Rhine who were supporting Arminius are also called "catervae": the term here is intended to be derogatory²⁴. Germanicus' forces consisted of "totidem legionum, duplicem sociorum numerum"²⁵, i.e., 4 legiones and 10,000 auxiliaries. The proportion of cavalry to infantry is not stated. But the total of the auxiliaries of Caecina and Germanicus, excluding the client German bands, was 15,000, compared with the less certain figure of 17,000 for the expedition of the previous year. During the battles of 15 A.D., Caecina's 4 legiones are referred to as "quadraginta cohortes Romanae", which is merely a stylistic variation²⁶. The Chaucans supplied "auxilia"²⁷. A reference to "subsidiarias cohortes" can only mean auxiliary cohorts, since the legiones are mentioned as supporting them in the next phrase²⁸.

The "classis, legiones ac socii" (under whom are subsumed the "eques" in the collective singular) appear in the expedition of 16 A.D. "equi well"²⁹. Wellcome detail occurs in Tacitus' description of the marching well²⁹. Wellcome detail occurs in Tacitus' description of the marching

/order

order of Germanicus before the battle of Idistavico. "Nostris exercitus
 sic incessit : auxiliares Galli Germanique in fronte, post quos pedites
 sagittarii; dein quattuor legiones et cum duabus praetoriis cohortibus
 ne delecto equite Germani; exis totidem aliae legiones et levis armatura
 cum equite sagittario ceterisque sociorum cohortes"³⁰. Other passages
 permit further discussion. The 8 legions and 2 praetorian cohorts need
 not detain. The "Galli Germanique auxiliares" or even the "ceterae ...
 sociorum cohortes" would have included the "maiores Vindellicorumque et
 Gallicae cohortes" mentioned in the next chapter³¹. The form of the word
 "Gallicae" gives pause, since normally the adjective indicates the area in
 which the regiment served, rather than its composition³². Here, however,
 it seems best to take it as an example of Tacitean "variation" for "Gallorum"
 and regard the cohorts as composed of Gauls rather than of other provin-
 cials stationed in Gaul before the expedition. One of the grounds Fieberius
 is said to have had for opposing further campaigns on the part of
 Germanicus was Gallic weariness with supplying horses : "fennes Gallias
 ministrandis equis"³³. It may be that riders were also sent, but these
 would probably not have received organization as formal cohorts yet. Of
 German auxiliaries, Batavians, Flavians and Chaucans are recorded. The skill
 of the Batavians in swimming is mentioned at the landing at the river
 Anisia (Rhine) before the major engagement at Idistavico. Their "dux"
 Chariovalda took them across the river Visurgis (the Moselle) prior to the
 crossing of the rest of the army. In this operation they formed part of
 the "equites", and Chariovalda had his horse killed under him. Hence the
 Batavians must be included among the cavalry auxiliaries³⁴. Reference

/con

was made in the last chapter to Arminius' famous interview with his pro-German brother, Flavius. Since German leaders were normally accompanied by a band of followers, the "comitatus" as Tacitus calls it, it is likely that Flavius had some of his fellow tribesmen (i.e. Cherusci) with him in Germanicus' auxiliary forces³⁵. When the interview had degenerated to insult, and the brothers were on the point of having recourse to arms, Flavius called for his weapons and horse, which makes it likely that he normally fought among the cavalry. The Chauci had joined the Roman army only the year before: it is hardly likely that they were among the German auxiliaries in the van, but were probably grouped in the rear³⁶.

The next element in the line consisted of archers on foot³⁷. "Sagittarii" are mentioned previously as stationed on the Roman side of the Visurgis at the interview of Arminius³⁸. Towards the rear were mounted archers, and associated with them the "levis armatura". Its separate mention from the "ancillorum cohortes" implies different organization, as if it were part of the "more professional" element in the army. It helped to crush the attack of the Angrivarii made when the Romans landed at the Arisia³⁹. In a further engagement with the army of Arminius after the battle of Idistaviso, Germanicus had to dislodge the Germans who had taken up a position on an earthwork that served as the boundary between the Angrivarii and the Cherusci. This was accomplished by the use of Roman artillery and the deployment of slingers, described as "funditores libritoresque"⁴⁰. Slingers in the republican period were auxiliaries, and there is no reason for regarding these in any other light. Presumably they can be classified

/with

with the "levis armatura".

In the middle of the line Germanicus was accompanied by "delecto equite". Neither Furneaux nor Roostermann comments on this phrase, which suggests the later "equites singulares". When Tiberius' son, the younger Drusus, was sent to deal with the mutiny in the Pannonian legions in 14, he was accompanied by 2 enlarged praetorian cohorts. "Adiuta magna pars praetoriani equitis et robora Germanorum, qui tunc custodes imperatori erant"⁴¹ - that is, he was also accompanied by cavalry of the praetorian guard and members of the "corporis custodes" or the emperor's bodyguard. The phrase here "cum duabus praetorianis cohortibus ac delecto equite Caesar" seems parallel. On the other hand, since Drusus was not in command of the Pannonian legions, his Roman force may have been made larger than that of Germanicus. A second possibility should be considered. As noted above, when the Angrivarians defected, light armed troops participated in avenging their treachery. The full phrase is "missus ilico Stertinius cum equite et armatura levi"⁴². In 15 Stertinius had been sent against the Bructerans "expedita cum manu"⁴³. In 16, "Stertinius et e numero principiarum semilius" commanded the cavalry at the crossing of the Vistula, and, when Chariovalda fell, "equites cum Stertiniio semilioque"⁴⁴ came to the rescue of his men. At the outset of the battle of Idistaviso, Germanicus gave orders for the swiftest cavalry to attack the Cheruscan flank, and for Stertinius to go round and attack their rear ("validissimos equitus incurrere latus, Stertinius cum ceteris turis circumgredi tergaque invadere"⁴⁵). If the identification of Semilius with the "Gullus Semilius

of I.L.S. 2686 can be accepted, he was in all probability a "praefectus equitus" at this stage. Stertinius must have been much superior : in fact Bitterling-Stein catalogues him among the "Unterlegaten", i.e., the "legati" and "comites" of Germanicus. The troops entrusted to him must have been of special quality, since he was used for special missions of great importance. Sometimes the "levis armatura" was included; but the cavalry must have been the best of the auxiliaries, the most "professional" among them. They could well be the "delectus eques" of Germanicus.

The auxiliaries of Germanicus in 16 fall into various categories. The professional element was represented by the "sagittarii" and some of the "levis armatura" and the cavalry entrusted to Stertinius, a Roman, not a native commander. It may have included elements from provinces other than Gaul or Germany. Whether the Raetian, Vindelician and Gallic cohorts were of long standing or not cannot be determined from this context, but it appears likely that they were. The Batavian contingents were still under a native leader, but were entirely reliable and must be considered as more permanent and professional than the Chaucan auxiliaries. The status of the "ceterae ... sociorum cohortes" cannot be definitely determined. Tacitus may be using the word "cohortes" here in a purely tactical sense. If so, it would refer to "ad hoc" levies⁴⁶. On the other hand it may be used in the technical auxiliary sense, in which case "socii" is merely an archaism.

The next event recorded by Tacitus in Germany was the Frisian revolt in 28 A.D. The Romans employed legionary detachments and select

/auxiliaries, ...

auxiliaries, described as "peditum et equitum auxiliarium delectos", against the rebels⁴⁷. A special function was assigned to an "ala Canninefatem et quod peditum inter nostros merebant"⁴⁸. The Canninefates were a neighbouring tribe, closely associated with the Batavians. The term "ala" suggests that their organization had been formalized: they are referred to in the next clause as "turmas sociales", where "turmas" is again a technical Roman term. It is difficult to know what weight should be given to the fact that the German infantry were "receiving pay": on the face of it it would appear that they too were organized, presumably in cohorts. As the battle proceeded "tres leues cohortes ac rursus duae, dein ... alarius equum" were sent into the attack. This force can only be regarded as 5 infantry cohorts and an unspecified number of cavalry also: the auxiliaries are later referred to simply as "cohortis alasque" and the deaths of many "praefecti" are noted. 1300 "Romans" perished in the uprising. Since the brunt of the fighting had been borne by the auxiliaries, it would be interesting to know whether their casualties are included in this figure or whether the term "Romans" refers only to legionaries. A disaster occurred in a farmhouse belonging to a certain Cruporix, described as a former soldier in Roman employ - "quondam stipendiarius"⁴⁹. He could hardly have been other than a Frisian. The term "stipendiarius" then implies the prior existence of a Frisian contingent in the Roman "auxilia". Tacitus' account of this engagement implies a well developed auxiliary force. It was obviously intended that they should be able to decide the issue⁵⁰: the legions were only brought in when things went wrong.

/auxiliaries

Auxiliaries on the Danubian front are mentioned only in connection with the Thracian troubles of 21 and 26 A.D. In the first disturbances, the governor of Moesia sent "alaris equites ad levis cohortium"⁵¹ against the dissidents. The rather unusual phrase for the infantry auxiliaries is contrasted with the "robur peditum", meaning the legionaries.

One of the reasons advanced for the troubles in 26 was a change in the conditions of service for Thracian "auxilia". The Thracians claimed that previously they chose their own commanders and were only employed against neighbouring tribes, but that now they were separated from each other and sent to various places far from home⁵². The claim sounds somewhat hollow in view of the fact that Thracian auxiliaries formed a regular element in Roman armies from comparatively early republican times. Presumably however this was voluntary or mercenary service, and the present grievance related to a long period of service away from home under direct Roman discipline. The passage is evidence, therefore, of a tendency to place even client kingdom auxiliaries on a regular or more professional basis at this time: Thrace only became a province in 46 A.D.

When the fighting spread, the Romans were assisted by loyal Thracians, by archers and by a Sarmatian cohort, to name those known to us. The first were under the command of their own king - "rex Rhodometalles cum auxiliis popularium"⁵³. The second group - "delectos

/sagittariorum" -

sagittariorum" - is mentioned because it was used against a rebel force entrenched in a hill-fort and hence initially secure against normal cavalry or infantry attack. However the rebels nearly succeeded in destroying them in a sudden sally, but they were saved by "auxilio Sugambrae cohortis", described as "promptam ad pericula nec mira cantuum et armorum tumultu truce"⁵⁴. It is clear that the Sugambrians, a German tribe, although retaining features of their native methods of fighting, had already come under the conditions of service feared by the Thracian rebels.

Various operations involving the army in Syria are recorded. One of the charges brought against Piso⁵⁵, after he had fallen out with Germanicus, was that his wife had been present at army manoeuvres: "sed exercitio equitum, decursibus cohortium interesse". When the matter came up in the senate, the words used were "praesidio super feminas exercitio cohortium, decursu legionum"⁵⁶. From this it is clear that, in the first passage, the cohorts were legionary, while in the second the cohorts, now corresponding to "equitus", must represent auxiliaries in general. These then were joint exercises of legions and "auxilia". When Venones, the exiled Parthian king, attempted to escape from the place of refuge assigned to him by the Romans, he was arrested by a cavalry commander ("praefecto equitum") - a natural use of a mounted auxiliary unit to capture someone trying to get away on horseback⁵⁷. After the death of Germanicus in 19 A.D., Piso attempted to regain control of the province, from which Germanicus had expelled him, by force. His supporters consisted of deserters from the legions, camp followers, slaves belonging to himself and his wife and

/"auxilia"

"auxilia" supplied by "reguli Cilicium"⁵⁸. These proved ineffective on account of their lack of training and their "rustic" weapons, as Tacitus calls them. They included a detachment of raw recruits for the Syrian legions. Also formed them "in numerus legionis", indicating that he had managed to muster some 5 or 6000 men.

L. Vitellius, governor of Syria at the end of Tiberius' principate, made a show of "robur legionum sociorumque" on the bank of the Euphrates in 33 A.D. during some Parthian difficulties⁵⁹. He sent one of his legates against the dissident Cilician tribe of the Tietae in the next year with "quattuor milibus legionariorum et delectis auxiliis"⁶⁰. In 37 he proceeded to make war on the Nabataean king Aretas. Josephus⁶¹ describes him as setting out with *καὶ ἡμεῖς συνέχουσιντες* *καὶ ἡμεῖς συνέχουσιντες*. The phrase 'such light-armed soldiers and cavalry as fought with the two legions' implies a definite and regular association of "auxilia" with legions.

Africa under Tiberius was noted for the revolt of Tacfarinas⁶². In the first clash in 17 A.D. the legion stationed in Africa (the III Augusta) and "quod sub signis sociorum"⁶³ were brought together against the rebels. "Socii" is the old term for auxiliaries, but is obviously just a variant for the contemporary terms which appear when the battle line is described: "legio medio, leues cohortes duaeque alae in cornibus locantur". The phrase 'sub signis' may then be understood in the sense of

/"in

"in regular formation". In 23 Tacfarinas attacked a "cohortem Romanam" that was holding a fort near a river⁶⁴. The precise import of this phrase is difficult to establish, but the soldiers in it are emphatically called "miles Romanus" and were punished for cowardice by the ancient method of decimation - surely an attempt to establish "Roman" discipline among legionaries. Their behaviour is strongly contrasted with that of a "vexillum veteranorum" that refused an attack by Tacfarinas and one of whose men, "Aulus Helvius Gregorius miles", received the "dona militaria" and the rare "civica corona"⁶⁵ - surely a Roman. Hence the phrase here must refer to a cohort of the legion. In a later engagement in the same year, the governor sent his men against Tacfarinas "cum equite et cohortibus auxiliariis, quia velocitatis legionum assiderat"⁶⁶, but no details can be recovered. In 24 A.D. certain "principes Masulianorum", whose loyalty was suspect, were executed by the Romans⁶⁷. From this it can be inferred that the Masulians had been rendering assistance to the Romans. Itolamy, the king of Mauretania, was pressed into service: he operated "cum popularibus"⁶⁸. This probably means that he put the royal army at the disposal of the Romans. We are further told that selected Mauretanians organized raiding parties: "praedatorias manus delecti Maurorum duxerunt"⁶⁹, no doubt using local methods to defeat a local enemy. The "expeditae cohortes alaeque" (the latter arranged in "turmae") that spear-headed the final attack on Tacfarinas were obviously regular "auxilia"⁷⁰. The troops employed in this long-drawn out war consisted of legionaries, regular auxiliaries and allied contingents with a flexible structure.

The supporters of Tacfarinas are instructive. Tacitus introduces him with the following sentence : "in natione Iudaea, in castris Romanis auxiliaria stipendia scriptus, mox desertor, uagos prius et introcinis agatos ad praedam et rapta congregeret, dein more militum per uexilla et turmas componere, postremo non Iudaeorum turbae sed Iudaeiorum dux haberi"⁷¹. It is clear that he had been a regular auxiliary, but whether he was a leader of a Jewish contingent as such cannot be firmly deduced from his nationality. He is not likely to have been the sole deserter : in any case he modelled his troops on the Roman pattern of "uexilla et turmas". Burneaux is inclined to regard "uexilla" as synonymous with "turmas", since the strength of the Iudaeians lay in their cavalry. But it is better with Koestermann to distinguish the terms, making the first refer to units of infantry⁷². Tacfarinas kept these "lectos viros et Romanum in modum arantos" close to himself, improving their discipline and leaving the tribesmen who flocked to his standard to their own commanders⁷³. Although admitting that he later licked them into shape, Tacitus stigmatizes his supporters as "vagantes, banditi and an untrained mob". These terms tend to recur in later parts of the narrative⁷⁴, and the word "auxilia" is also used for supplements to his forces⁷⁵. The general picture is one of a properly trained core supported by local material of varying degrees of skill. The strength of the resistance which the north africans provided is an indication of the degree to which the Roman "auxilia" in the province had been trained and disciplined.

Finally, general references may be noted. In book IV of the

/"Annals"

"Annals" Tacitus reviewed the armed forces of the Roman Empire as they were in 23 A.D. : "quae tunc Romanae copiae in armis, qui socii reges, quanto sit angustius imperitatus"⁷⁶. Naturally the emphasis falls on the legions which are listed province by province. The client kings⁷⁷ are Juba of Mauretania, the father of the Ptolemy who fought against Tacfarinas; the kings of the Iberians and the Albanians, in the area of the Caucasus, and "other kings", presumably of the East; Rhodmetalcus and the children of Cotys in Thrace. It is clear that Tacitus regarded the resources of the client kings as an integral part of imperial defence. Though he does not use the terms *ala* and *cohortes* of their contingents, he does classify them among the "auxilia". The regular "auxilia" are then listed : "at apud Ioniae provinciae socias triremes alaeque et auxilia cohortium, neque sulta socius in his uiribus : sed peraeque incertum fuit, cuius ex usu temporis huc illuc aderent, gliscerent numero et aliquando minuerentur"⁷⁸. The "triremes" are the provincial fleets or river flotillas as contrasted with the Italian fleet stationed at Misenum and Ravenna. The auxiliaries are compared for strength with the legions and said to be roughly equivalent. But Tacitus makes it clear that, in the early years of Tiberius' principate at any rate, they were not as stationary as the legions and that a fixed total of regiments had not yet been reached.

Justinus relates that Tiberius gave the senate a "species libertatis" in several respects. One was "de legionum et auxiliorum descriptione"⁷⁹ which is probably a generalization from the war against Tacfarinas, which took place in a senatorial province. The legio IX Hispana

/was

was temporarily transferred from Pannonia to Africa at that time⁸⁰. From this phrase it appears likely that the transfer of some of the "auxilia" serving with it in Pannonia was discussed. This statement of Suetonius confirms that of Tacitus, that the "auxilia" had become a fixed part of the army about which considerable information was available in Rome. Twice, too, Suetonius⁸¹ refers to "praefecti alae" under Tiberius as if they were a normal rank in the army. The auxiliary system must have taken shape by the time of Tiberius, even if it had not crystallized into that known from the diplomas by this date.

NOTES.

1. Suet. "Tib." 37, 3. For M. Julius Cottius and his kingdom, cf. Stein, "A.H." I, 112, 570 f. (no. 1777); cf. "P.L.R."² I, 274.
2. "Ann." II, 85.
3. "A.D." XVIII, 3, 5, 84.
4. "Tib." 30.
5. Josephus (l.c.n.3) says αὐτῶν τετρακισνέμετος
ἐκ τῶν αὐτῶν στρατολογήσαντες ἑκατὶν
ἐκ τῶν αὐτῶν. Since Cardania was an imperial province
at this stage, the ascription of the action to the consuls appears
strange, but Suetonius ("Tib." 31) refers to Tiberius' involving
of the consuls in military matters of this kind.
6. Tac. "Ann." III, 45. For Julius Florus and Julius Macrovir, cf.
"P.L.R."² I, 315; 339.
7. "Ann." III, 45.
8. III, 40.
9. Cf. Furneaux ad loc.; Forni, 1953, 53, n. 1. Roetermann's note
ad loc. suggests that the reference is to citizenship. But the
recruits would have considered Gauls and other western provincials
with citizenship serving in the legions as potential sympathizers.
10. Tac. "Ann." III, 41, - the "una ... cohortes" of 46. Cf. Fries,
1967, 28 f.
11. Tac. "Ann." III, 42; cf. Furneaux and Roetermann ad loc. For
the Treveri, cf. Rau, "A.H." VI A, 1937, 23-2 ff. (esp. 23) f.).
12. ibid.; 46. For Julius Indus, cf. "P.L.R."² I, 358.
13. Tac. "Ann." III, 45; 46 with Furneaux and Roetermann ad loc.
For L. Silius, cf. Stein, "A.H." III A, 1927, 74 ff. (no. 12);
Kitterling-Stein, 1935, 12. (Lynn, "A.H." 1966, 55 ff., has
shown that the element M. Caelius Largus did not form part of his
nomenclature.)
14. Tac. "Ann." I, 7.
15. I, 30.

16.

16. ad loc., a view accepted by Roestermann (ad loc.).
17. Tac. "Ann." I, 43, and Roestermann ad loc.
18. I, 34.
19. 45.
20. 49.
21. 51. Since the "auxiliariae cohortes" formed only part of the Roman marching column (other auxiliaries, called "ceteri sociorum", were in the rear) Burneaux ad loc. regards the suggestion that a number such as 10 has fallen out of the text before "auxiliariae" as probable. However the phrase can be taken in the sense of "auxiliary cohorts" rather than "the auxiliary cohorts"; in any case the number 10 has no secure basis, and cannot be used to calculate army sizes.
22. 50 - 1. The "expeditae cohortes" could refer to legionary cohorts, but the context makes it clear that auxiliaries are meant, for the legions are said to have followed after a short interval.
23. 60; cf. 45.
24. 56; 51; (II, 17 (Sueruscorum ceteris)). For A. Tacina Severus, cf. "A.I.R."² 6, 106; Witterlingstein, 1952, 45; for the Germani cisrhenani, cf. Lang, 1936, 4 ff.
25. Tac. "Ann." I, 56.
26. I, 60.
27. 60. For the Chauci, cf. Ihm, "A.I.R." III, 1819, 2201 ff.
28. Tac. "Ann." I, 63.
29. II, 8.
30. 16.
31. 17.
32. Cf. Uichorius, 253.
33. Tac. "Ann." II, 5. Cf. I, 71, where, however, "equos" is again the word.
34. II, 11. II, 9; 11. For the Batavi, cf. Ihm, "A.I.R." III, 1817, 113 ff.; for Chariovalda, "A.I.R."² 6, 716.

35. 9 - 10. Cf. above, p. 51 f. For the German "comitatus" cf. "G." 13, and note Arminius' "stipatoribus" here ("Ann." I, 9). If Boiocalus' services under Tiberius and Germanicus extended beyond the principate of Augustus (cf. above, p. 51 and below, p. 92), Ampsivariane may have to be included here.
36. I, 17 : "Chaucia inter auxilia agentibus", against Furneaux (note ad loc. s.v. "sagittarii") who would include the Chaucans among the "auxiliares ... Germanique".
37. The "sagittarii" of II, 17 are to be regarded as the "equites sagittarii" of 16 according to Furneaux ad loc.
38. II, 9.
39. 8.
40. 20. For the "libritores", cf. Brosse, "R.E." XIII, 1926, 139.
41. I, 24. For the German "corporis custodes", cf. above p. 52. It is true that Drusus' praetorian cohorts were "strengthened", but he still had the same number as Germanicus. Hence Levick's remark ("Lat." 1966, 240) that "Drusus seems to have had a special connection with the praetorian guard" is incorrect.
42. II, 8. For L. Stertinius, cf. Stein "R.E." III A, 1929, 2451 f. (no. 2); Witterlingstein, 1932, 123 (no. 6).
43. I, 60.
44. II, 11. For Aemilius and his identification with the Laullus Aemilius who was "primo pilo bis praefecto equit." (I.L.G. 2686) cf. Furneaux and Koesteremann ad loc.; "P.I.R."² A, 328.
45. Tac. "Ann." II, 17.
46. The possibility entertained by Koesteremann ad loc.
47. IV, 73. (The Frisian forces are referred to as a "ciuium sociorumque manus" in the previous chapter, a phrase recalling Roman republican terminology but here applied to the enemy.)
48. For the Canninefates, cf. Ihm, "R.E." III, 1899, 1484.
49. For "stipendiarius", cf. Furneaux ad loc., who compares "B.Afr." 43, 1 : "cohortes stipendiariae". Holder 1936, 1961, s.v. designates the name Cruptorix as Germanic.

50. The "ala Canninefas" and the German front were supported by "equites legionum", but this does not affect the general picture, as they were few in number (cf. above, p. 274) and assisting a special assignment.
51. Tac. "Ann." III, 3. In this chapter, Tacitus "auxilia" for the forces of the Thracian rebels, as in II, 65.
52. IV, 46: "Soliti ... si mitterent auxilia, suorum terrores praeficere nec nisi aduersum accolae belligerare. ac tum rursus incesserat fore ut dialecti aliisque nationibus permixti diuersas in terras traherentur."
53. 47. For Rhometalces, cf. Mahrschlag, "R.G." I 4, 1914, 1904 (no. 2).
54. Tac. "Ann." IV, 47. For the Sugabari, cf. Schön, "R.G." IV A, 1931, 657 ff.
55. For Cn. Calpurnius Piso, cf. "R.I.R."² C 787.
56. Tac. "Ann." II, 55; III, 33; Furneaux and Roestermann ad locc.
57. II, 68. For Vonones, cf. R. Hanslik, "R.G." Suppl. II, 1962, 1865 ff. (no. 2).
58. Tac. "Ann." II, 78; 80 and Roestermann ad loc. for the significance of "nuxerum". The legionary troops that opposed Piso are called "Romanae cohortes".
59. VI, 37. Tiberius invited Mithridates the Iberian (for whom cf. Geyer, "R.G." IV, 1932, 2214 f. (no. 33)) to invade Armenia according to Dio LVIII, 26, 3. For L. Vitellius, cf. R. Hanslik, "R.G." Suppl. Band I, 1962, 1733 ff. (no. 7c).
60. Tac. "Ann." VI, 41, and Furneaux ad loc. for the spelling Cietae.
61. "R.G." LVIII, 5, 3, 120. For Bretas, cf. above, p. 57.
62. Stein, "R.G." IV A, 1932, 1935 f.
63. Tac. "Ann." II, 52.
64. III, 20. Nothing can be deduced from the name of its commander, Decurius ("R.I.R."² D 32), who is otherwise unknown.
65. III, 21. For the "dona militaria", cf. above, p. 6/, n. 38.
66. Tac. "Ann." III, 21.

/67.

67. IV, 24. For the "maulani", cf. M. Mann "H.E." XVI, 1933, 126 ff.
68. Tac. "Ann." IV, 24. For Ptolemy, cf. M. Hofmann "H.E." XLIII, 1959, 1768 ff. (no. 62), who proposes the reading "regi" (instead of "rege Ptolemaeo") here, so that Ptolemy may appear as the nominal leader of the expedition, with the Roman commanding acting ostensibly only as adviser to him (Hofmann compares "consultor" to support his suggestion).
69. Tac. "Ann." IV, 24.
70. IV, 25.
71. II, 52; . It is not possible to say what rank Tacfarinas held in the Roman "auxilia". From the fact that a son of his fell fighting for him in 24 A.D. (IV, 25) it is possible to deduce that he was old enough to have had considerable experience in the "auxilia" before the revolt.
72. Furneaux and Koesterzahn ad loc. Romanelli, 1859, 238 supports the latter view in his phrase "organizzato ... in corpi di cavalleria e di fanteria".
73. Tac. "Ann." II, 52. His allies used "levis copia". Cf. IV, 25.
74. Cf. "inconditi" (III, 20); "desertor, praedo, latro" (73); "praedarum receptor et socius populandi rex Caraculani" (IV, 23). The dregs of the province joined him: "ipsaque e provincia, ut quis fortuna inops, aribus turbida promptius ruelant" (ibid).
75. III, 73; IV, 25.
76. IV, 4.
77. 5. For Juba, cf. "P.I.A." I 65; for the Iberians cf. below, p. 93; for Rhometalces and the children of Jutys, cf. above, p. 73 and Tac. "Ann." II, 67.
78. IV, 5.
79. "Tib." 30, and, for the import of the phrase, Vietra ad loc. Cf. note 5 above.
80. Tac. "Ann." III, 9; IV, 5; 23; Kitterling, "H.E." XII, 1924, 1243.
81. "Tib." 30; 41.

VI. FROM GRIBBS TO NINE.

The sources for the later Julio-Claudian period remain those parts of Tacitus' "Annals" that have survived, Suetonius and Dio or his epitomators. Josephus, and even the New Testament, illuminate Judaea. Epigraphical evidence becomes less scant, and will be discussed where it seems possible to date it with some security in this period.

Britain affords a special opportunity because of the definite starting-date of 43 A.D. which it provides. Unfortunately Tacitus' detailed account of the invasion forces has not survived. In the "Agricola"¹ it is simply stated that "the legions and auxiliaries" were transported to Britain. But in Dio's² account of the first pitched battle, on the Medway in Kent, ~~the~~ are mentioned. This is his term for Germans who forced a crossing by swimming across the river in full armour. This was known as a special skill of the Batavians³, so that it may be assumed that the invasion auxiliaries included Batavian detachments.

Detail next accrues in Tacitus' reports on the events leading up to the capture of Caratacus in 51 A.D. and the revolt of Boudicca in 61.⁴ When Gaius Suetonius Paulinus became governor of Britain in 47 he was obliged to restore order, making use of "citas cohortes"⁵. These can be regarded as auxiliaries, since "citas" would seem to be a variant for "leues" or "expeditae", and later in the same chapter Suetonius is described as leading "sine robore legionum socialis copias" against the dissident Iceni. Since they had chosen a place impervious to cavalry, he adopted the

/unusual

unusual tactic of making his cavalry dismount and fight on foot with the infantry auxiliaries : "distributis cohortibus turmas quoque peditum ad munia accingit". The cohorts in both engagements are auxiliary. In 51 the Romans crushed the Ordovices of Wales in Wales who were under the leadership of Caratacus. Before the decisive battle, prefects and tribunes exhorted the Roman troops : "praefectique et tribuni ... ardorem exercitus intendeant"⁵. The tribunes are the legionary tribunes - the prefects the commanders of auxiliary units. Accordingly the sentence must be taken as an indirect way of stating that the two arms of the legions and the "auxilia" were involved. The same distinction must underlie the contrast in "ec ... intrupere ferentarius grauisque miles, illi telis adsultantes, hi conferto gradu". "ferentarius" is an archaism, referring to a light-armed soldier⁷, and hence representing the auxiliaries as a whole, balanced by the legionaries ("gravis miles"). The third double phrase actually uses the normal terms in mentioning the different weapons of the two arms : "gladiis ac pilis legionariorum, ... spathis et hastis auxiliaribus" (where "spatha" is an unusual word for a heavy sword⁸). It would appear that Tacitus is deliberately experimenting with new expressions for what he now regarded as a regular feature of Roman fighting, the close employment together of two branches of a professional fighting force. Some minor reverses among the Silures of South Wales are next reported. The discomfiture of "legionarias cohortes" need not concern : the "turmas" that were defeated must, however, have been auxiliary⁹. Ostorius tried to restore the situation with "cohortis exeduntur" - by now a familiar phrase -

/who

who had to be saved by the "robber" of the "legiones"¹⁰. Fighting against the Silures continued often "in modum latrocinii" - we would call it guerrilla warfare rather than "brigandage". At one stage two cohorts were lost while foraging: "duas auxiliaris cohortis auaritia praefectorum incautius populantis intercepte". The pattern of auxiliaries later backed by legionaries was repeated when the Romans supported queen Cartimandua of the Brigantes under the next governor, Gaius Suetonius Paulinus (52 - 57 A.D.)¹¹.

There are the usual combinations of legionaries and auxiliaries in the section devoted to Boudicca¹². In the final battle with the rebels the governor, Suetonius Paulinus, had "quarta decima legio cum vexillariis uicesimae et e proximis auxiliares, decem fere milia armatorum"¹³.

Unfortunately the figure is too vague to be able to estimate the number of auxiliaries. The size of the detachment from the Twentieth Legion is not given, and the Fourteenth may not have been up to its full strength of 5 to 6000 men. One may hazard the guess that the auxiliaries formed roughly a third of the total. Next the battle-order is described:

"legionarius frequens ordinibus, leuis cinctura, conglobatus pro cornibus eques adstitit", where "leuis arma" is an old-fashioned term for auxiliary cohorts, "eques" a regular variant for "lae". In Dio's¹⁴ description of the battle, Roman archers contend with the chariots of the British. But the whole passage is highly rhetorical, and I am inclined to suspect that the archers, if not the British chariots, are anachronistic.

After the crushing of the revolt, Nero sent 2000 legionaries, 8 auxiliary

/cohorts

cohorts and 1000 cavalry¹⁵. It has been thought¹⁶ that the 8 cohorts were the 8 Batavian cohorts later found in Britain co-operating with the Fourteenth Legion. But it is most likely that Batavians formed part of the invading forces under Claudius, as stated above, so that the identification, although possible, is not obligatory. On the arrival of these reinforcements, the auxiliaries were assigned to small forts for the winter: "cohortes alaeque nouis hibernaculis locatae". This, and the phrase "e proximis auxiliaries" quoted above, are the first definite indications of auxiliary regiments being stationed in a network of forts in the literary record.

No regimental names appear in the passages discussed so far, except for the identification of Dio's *Batavi* as Batavians. References to auxiliaries in other parts of Tacitus might help. The Batavians appear in the "Histories"¹⁷ under the year 61 A.D., where they are said to have made a reputation for themselves in Britain. 8 cohorts accompanied the Fourteenth Legion when it was summoned from Britain by Nero. The Batavians next appear by name in 84, when 4 cohorts fought at the battle of Mons Graupius¹⁸. It is likely that the "lectissimos auxiliares, quibus nota uasa et patrius nandi usus quo simul seque et arma et equos regunt", who led Agricola's successful attack in 78 on Mona (Anglesey) were Batavians, if one may judge from the tactics described¹⁹. Two other names from the area of the lower Rhine are preserved. A cohort *Ualporum* mutinied while being trained in 85²⁰: the fact that they were being formed so late makes it unlikely that other cohorts of *Ualpiani* had preceded them. Then 2 cohorts of *Iungriani* are mentioned at the battle of Mons Graupius²¹.

/whether

whether Tungrians formed part of the Claudius-Neronian army cannot be deduced from this : but it is significant that the auxiliaries named in the literary record came from lower Germany²².

Information may also be gathered from inscriptions. A tombstone²³ from Colchester (Camulodunum) records an ala I Thracum :

Longinus Adaxematugi I, duplicarius ala prima Thracum (sic) anni. anno.
XL aetate. XXV. heredes ex testam. f.c. h.s.e.

In all likelihood this stone was set up before 49 A.D.²⁴, when Camulodunum was still garrisoned. The regiment must have formed part of the invasion force. A tombstone of the same early period records a Thracian cohort at Exeter (Ipsacum). Unfortunately the number of the cohort is no longer legible :

Tib. Claud. Viriatus (sic) eq. ann. f.c. Thracum annorum LVII stipendiorum
XX f.c. h.s.e.

Another Thracian cohort is recorded at Gloucester (Glevum) :

Rufus Bita eques. cho. VI Thracum (sic) ann. XL stip. XXXI. heredes ex
test. f. curae. h.s.e.

At Cirencester (Corinium) there were two alae, one Thracian, the other Gallic :

Cestus Valerius Genialis eq. (sic) ala Thrac. (sic) civis Frisiae tur.
Genialis an. XXXX st. XX. h.s.e. e. (sic) f.c.²⁵

/annicus

Curvius eque (sig) also Indian. tur. Albani stip. XVI class. cur. cur.
 Fulvius Aetilis et Cl. Aetilius Titus de testame. b.e.c.²⁸

These early inscriptions show that Thracian and Gallic²⁹ auxiliary regiments must be added to those known from the literary record.

This list may now be compared with that provided by Frere³⁰. He agrees to Aio's orders, but is doubtful about the Thracian units. Since Thrace did not become a province till 46, the units could hardly have arrived in Britain in 43. But, as has been shown in earlier chapters, Thracian auxiliaries had long served the Romans. Further Sextus Valerius Genialis of the ala Taurica above was a Thracian. He could not have been one of the original draft for this unit, which must have been in existence for quite some time before 46, for Genialis to have died after 20 years of service at about the middle of the first century A.D. Frere is not prepared to read back from the "Agricola". But basically the lists are the same.

We can now turn to the German area, beginning with Caligula's visit to the Rhine in 39 A.D.³¹. Suetonius³² gives as the reason for the expedition a reminder which Caligula had received that his German bodyguard needed recruits - "admonitus de supplendo numero Batavorum, quos circa se habebat". If this could serve as an ostensible motive for the expedition, it is clear that it was considered necessary to maintain the original character of the guard. The guard accompanied Caligula to Germany: at one point he sent "paucos de custodia Germanos" across the Rhine to

/hide

hide so that the praetorian cavalry could gain practice by tracking them down³⁵. Gaius collected a large army for his proposed invasion, but the figures that we have are exaggerated out of all proportion. Dio³⁴ says that there were either 200 or 250,000. This sounds like an estimate of the total strength of the Roman army, legions and auxiliaries together. Suetonius³⁵ gives no specific figures : "legionibus et auxiliis undique excitis, dilectibus ubique acerbissime actis" Some were slow in arriving; to gain a reputation for stern discipline, Gaius dismissed with ignominy "legatos qui auxilia serius ex diuersis locis adduxerant"³⁶. The "legati" must be the legionary legates : their lateness may have been due either to the fact that the auxiliaries under their responsibility were stationed in small forts over a wide area, and needed considerable time for mustering, or that they were occupied with the new levies already mentioned. No details survive, but it has been suggested that the chieftain of the Canninefates who got away with making fun of Gaius' expedition was supposed to provide "auxilia"³⁷.

In 47 A.D. Italicus, the son of Flavus and the nephew of Arminius, was sent out by Claudius to become king of the Cheruscans³⁸. Tacitus tells us that during his upbringing in Italy, he had been trained both in Roman and in German methods of fighting. It is obvious that such figures as Italicus would have made changes in tribal tactics, and that ultimately recruits for the Roman "auxilia" would have benefited from such contacts. Another avenue of Roman influence in the German area came from deserters who took control of invading armies. This appears from Tacitus³⁹.

/description

description of Cannascus who led the Chaucans in raids on the coast of Gaul in 47 - "qui natione Canninefas, auxiliare stipendium meritis, post transfuga, leuibus nauigiis praedabundus Gallorum maxime oram instabat". In 50 A.D. the Chattans made a raid on upper Germany. The forces employed against them were "auxiliaris Vangiones et Nemetes, addito equite alario"⁴⁰. Little difficulty attaches to the "eques alarius", obviously a Tacitean variant for an ala or a part of one. Pelham⁴¹ has described the Vangiones and Nemetes as "local levies", comparing the "tumultarias cateruas Germanorum cis Rhenum colentium" of Germanicus' expedition of 15. This would imply a hasty formation of a tribal contingent to deal with an emergency. But conditions were very different by this date, and, even if the Vangiones and Nemetes were drafted for the first time at this stage, the term "auxiliares" implies a professional organization. The distinction between "auxiliares" and "alarius" seems to be that between infantry and cavalry, rather than tribal contingent and professional regiment. The Romans had set certain areas on the right bank of the lower Rhine aside to be kept empty of inhabitants and free for military purposes. When the Frisians occupied these without permission and had to be ejected from them by force in 58, the soldiers employed were "auxiliaris eques"⁴². When, immediately thereafter, the Nepsivarions attempted the same thing under Chaucan pressure, their chief Roilocalus referred to his years as an auxiliary as part of his long service to Rome. The Romans acknowledged this, and admitted that it needed recompense, but used diplomatic means to prevent the occupation⁴³.

/hardly

hardly anything has survived concerning the Danubian area. When the governor of Dalmatia in 42 A.D., *Furius Camillus Scribonianus*, became involved in a conspiracy against Claudius, he was said to have had a large force of legionaries and auxiliaries at his disposal -

*legiones quatuordecim et auxilia*⁴⁴. When trouble broke out in the "regnum Vannianum" among the Suetans in 50 A.D., Claudius did not accede to Vannius' request for assistance. However he did order the governor of Pannonia to move troops up to the bank of the Danube to make a show of force to discourage any attempt to invade the province. These troops consisted of "*legiones ipsaque e provincia lecta auxilia*"⁴⁵. Since the garrison of Pannonia consisted of 3 legions at this date, it is clear that the whole army was not involved. Hence it seems best to regard "lecta" as "select" or "chosen from" the regular auxiliaries of the province, and not, as *Turneaux* and *Koestermann*, of "levies specially called out".

Interest in the East centres on fighting with the Parthians and the rebellion in Judaea. But minor incidents are also of value. In 47 A.D. Claudius sent *Mithridates* out to recover the kingdom of Armenia. In this he was aided by his brother *Pharasmanes*, the present king of Iberia⁴⁶. The "*miles romanus*" tackled the Armenian fortresses - presumably these were legionaries. At the same time the "*Hiberus exercitus*" scoured the plains. The Iberians were largely cavalry⁴⁷.

In 49 a different *Mithridates*, a descendant of the *Mithridates* the Great of Pontus who conducted the famous "Mithridatic" wars of the

/end

end of the Republic, tried to wrest the Bosporan Kingdom (in the Crimea) from his brother Cotys, who had become its ruler in his place. Cotys was supported by a few cohorts under a member of the equestrian order : "paucas cohortium cum Iulio Aquila equite Romano"⁴⁶. Cotys and Aquila then concluded an alliance with Cunobes, king of the Aorsians - a Sarmatian people. The arrangement was that Cunobes would fight the cavalry battles, the Romans handle the sieges. Their marching column is described as follows : "frontem et terga Aorsi, media cohortes et Bosporani tutabantur nostris in armis"⁴⁷. It seems best to refer "nostris in armis" to the Bosporans, meaning that they were armed like Roman infantry. Does this imply that the "cohorts" were legionary ? This would be the natural interpretation, but the derogatory tone of "paucas cohortium" above (coming immediately after the term "robur exercitus") and the fact that a minor skirmish occurred in which a "praefectus cohortis" and "plerique auxilium" were slain, must mean that the cohorts were auxiliary⁴⁸.

The next incident, in 51 A.D., comes from Armenia. Mithridates was attacked by the son of his brother Pharasmanes. He took refuge in a fort called Gorneae (Garnia) described as "tutus loco ac praesidio militum, quia Caelius Iulio praefectus, centurio Casperius praeserat"⁴⁹. These "milites" were obviously those designated as "miles Romanus" in 47. Tacitus remarks that their superior siege-craft frustrated the enemy's blockade until bribery was used. When the procurator of Cappadocia tried to intervene, he drew together the "auxilia" of his province = "auxiliis

/provincialium

"provincialis contractus"⁵² - but failed to accomplish anything. Later a legion was sent from the Syrian army to restore Roman ascendancy. The word "provinciales" suggests that the "auxilia" consisted of local Cappadocians, but they must have been formed into regular units already, otherwise they would not have been available for immediate use.

The Cilician Bistae again gave trouble in 52 A.D. They managed to overcome the "equites" sent against them from the Syrian army under the command of a "praefectus". But they were finally reduced by the intervention of Antiochus of Commagene⁵³. Here a client king appears to be performing the role of a legion.

Under Nero full-scale war broke out in the East. In 54 the famous Corbulo was appointed to oust the Parthian Tiridates who had seized control of Armenia⁵⁴. New recruits (called "fluentus" by Tacitus) were drafted for the Oriental legions, and the Jewish prince Herod Agrippa and king Antiochus of Commagene were ordered to supply forces. Lesser Armenia was assigned to Aristobulus, Sophene to Sohaemus⁵⁵. The Syrian army was split in two, "pars auxiliarium cum duabus legionibus" remaining in Syria under the legate, Ummidius Quadratus, while to Corbulo went "par civium sociorumque numerus ... additis cohortibus aliisque quae in Cappadocia hiemabant"⁵⁶. The local "ancilli reges" were ordered to obey the Roman commanders. Vologeses, the Parthian king (whose brother Tiridates was), was not prepared for war at this juncture, and surrendered hostages to Ummidius Quadratus, who sent a centurion to receive them. Corbulo, however, sent a "praefectus comitum" to take them over⁵⁷.

/Tacitus

Tacitus returns to the East under the year 58. Corbulo had found it necessary to restore discipline in his troops. A fresh levy was held, and soldiers transferred from another province. "Et habitus per Galatiam Cappadociamque dilectus, adiectaque ex Germania legio cum equitibus alariis et peditatu cohortium"³⁸. It would be interesting to know whether the levy included auxiliary as well as legionary recruits. The transfer of the legion is especially notable, since for the first time it is stated that a legion on transfer was accompanied by auxiliary *alae* and cohorts. During the winter Corbulo kept his legions in camp. He arranged his auxiliary cohorts in various forts, putting them under the command of a former leading centurion with strict orders that there was to be no fighting: "dispositisque per idoneos locos cohortibus auxiliariis ... : curas praesidiorum faccio Urfiti primi mili honore perfuncto mandat"³⁹. There must have been a separate officer in command of the cavalry, for we hear of "turmae" that came "e proximis castellis". When Faccius joined these in a sally and was defeated, Corbulo punished him and the "praefectos militesque" (i.e., the auxiliary soldiers and the unit commanders) with the old-fashioned penalty of having to encamp outside the fortified lines. Frontinus⁴⁰ also reports the incident, but with precise figures: he says that "duae *alae* et tres cohortes" were involved. When the actual invasion of Armenia began, Corbulo decided to divide his forces, so that "legati praefectique" might attack different places⁴¹. This variant for "legiones et auxilia" has been noted earlier in the chapter. He also employed the client kings, Antiochus of Commagene and Pharasmanes of Iberia, to attack

/outlying

outlying districts. The tribe of Osichans (or Heniochans) allied themselves to the Romans at this point, and performed useful services. During subsequent fighting there are two descriptions of Corbulo's troops drawn up in battle order, the first before a conference between the two armies, the second when Tiridates attempted to drive them off before the siege of Artaxata (Artashat) : "Corbulo sociis cohortis et auxilia regum pro cornibus, medio sextam legionem constituit, cui accita ex castris tria milia tertianorum parascuerat, una cum aquila, quasi eadem legio spectaretur"⁶² - here the royal "auxilia" must have formed the bulk of the cavalry; "latero dextra tertia legio, sinistro sexta incedebat, mediis decimanorum delectis; ... et tergo mille equites tuebantur; ... in cornibus pedes sagittarius et ceteri manus equitum ibat"⁶³. The "infantry archers" were probably professional, since the bow was one of the chief weapons of the Armenians and the Parthians, and practised skill would be needed to counter it. The death of a "decurio equitum" is noted : so far the prefect has been the most junior cavalry officer mentioned. At the outset of the siege of Artaxata, Corbulo used "leuis armatura"⁶⁴ to surround the walls and start the attack from a distance. This can only be a revival of an old term for some of the auxiliary cohorts.

In 60, on his way from Artaxata to Tigranocerta, the second capital of Armenia (? Teyshartin), Corbulo was attacked by some mountain tribesmen, but managed to crush them without shedding Roman blood by dispatching the Iberians against them : "Lusis Hiberis"⁶⁵. To keep Tiridates on the run, Corbulo sent ahead auxiliaries under separate command, following rapidly with the legions⁶⁶. Tiridates eventually withdrew

/completely, ...

completely, and was replaced on the Armenian throne by a Roman nominee, Tigranes. Corbulo left legionaries and auxiliaries behind to support the new king : "additum et praesidium mille legionarii, tres sociorum cohortes duaeque equitum alae"⁶⁷ - the auxiliaries obviously consisting of professional units.

When, in 62, Tiridates threatened to invade Armenia again with Parthian assistance, Corbulo sent 2 legions to the assistance of Tigranes. He warded off an advance of Vologeses towards Syria by moving the rest of his legions to the bank of the Euphrates and seizing Vologeses' routes of advance by means of hastily levied local troops : "turbulenti provinciales manu armati"⁶⁸. These were obviously not cohorts and alae, but may well later have been turned into such. Meanwhile Tigranes was holding out in Tigranocerta with the support of his Roman "auxilia". Corbulo protested to Vologeses about this, that "socium unicuique regem, cohortis Romanas obsideri"⁶⁹. The king was Tigranes, the Roman "cohorta" were the 1,000 legionaries and the 2 legions mentioned above. "Auxilia" are ignored. The situation was altered on the arrival of a new general, Caecernius Paetus⁷⁰, to direct Roman operations in Armenia. (This was done at Corbulo's suggestion, so that he could concentrate on the Syrian frontier.) Paetus describes the division of the military forces between Paetus and Corbulo as follows : "copiae ita divisis ut quarta et duodecimae legiones addita quinta, quae recens e Moesia exorta erant, simul Pontica et Galatarum Cappadocumque auxilia Paeto obociderunt, tertia et sexta

sexta et decima legiones priorque Syriac miles apud Corbulonem manerent; cetera ex rerum usu sociarent partirentur"⁷¹. The use of the name of the people, "Boesi", for the more usual provincial name of "Boemia", signals caution in interpreting. It is not stated that the Fifth was accompanied by auxiliaries when it was transferred to Cappadocia from Boesia, but the Pannonian ala or alae recorded below⁷² most probably came with it. The phrase "Pontica ... auxilia" would normally mean "auxilia" stationed in Pontus. But as Pontus was still a client kingdom, the phrase must mean "auxiliaries supplied by the king of Pontus (Mithridates⁷³)". The words "Galatarum Cappadociaeque auxilia" suggest auxiliaries who were Galatians and Cappadocians. Some of them may well have been of local origin, but, as these two areas were provinces, the words must mean "auxiliaries stationed in Galatia and Cappadocia"⁷⁴. Since the "legiones" of Syria are mentioned separately, the "prior ... miles Syriac" must refer to auxiliaries stationed in Syria. The forces labelled "cetera" presumably refer to "ad hoc" contingents provided by allied kings. Operations late in 62 are reported both on the Syrian and on the Armenian front. Corbulo tightened his grip on the approaches to the Euphrates crossings by occupying hills on the opposite bank "per totius cohortis, non legionum castris"⁷⁵. The cohorts involved sound as though they had a permanent form, and presumably replaced the "tributaria circumdatus agros" first recorded in the area. Caetani tried to block the advance of Volagases by stationing "tria milia delecti peditis" (i.e., presumably legionaries, the Twelfth having just been added) on an elevated position and "alaris iudque Pannonios, robur equitatus" on the plain. Since his position was the more defensible,

Corbulo

Corbulo prepared a standby force to assist him should the need arise. This consisted of 1000 men from each of 3 legions, 800 auxiliary cavalry ("alarici") and an equal number from the infantry cohorts⁷⁶.

By 63, Aetius had been recalled and replaced by Corbulo with wide powers. Syria was now given to Cestius Gallus⁷⁷. Tacitus concentrates on the legions in this section (Corbulo received the Fifteenth from Pannonia on transfer), but we hear of an instruction given to "tetrarchis ac regibus praefectisque"⁷⁸ to observe Corbulo's commands. These would presumably include orders to supply troops. The tetrarchs and kings offer no difficulties, but who were the "praefecti"? They cannot be the commanders of cohorts and also, as Turnebus quibz, Sigurdus, nor Roman prefects of special districts (Turnebus' second suggestion). They are not Roman officials at all - the procurators and pro-praetors in the neighboring provinces are mentioned separately. The enclitic "-que" joins them to the tetrarchs and kings. They must be the rulers of the "praefecturae" or petty chiefdoms who were helping Rome as allies. Corbulo selected 4 legions (VI, III, V, XV) for his march into Armenia together with "uexilla delectorum ex Illyrico et Aegypto, quodque alarum cohortisque, et auxilia regum"⁷⁹. The last two phrases will be readily understood. The detachments from Illyricum and Egypt must be legionaries, since all the types of auxiliary are encompassed by what follows. There was however no province of "Illyricum" at this date: Tacitus must be using it anachronistically for Dalmatia, Pannonia and Moesia⁸⁰.

Regular auxiliary regiments are much in evidence in the fighting

for

of the central and northern sections of the eastern frontier during this period. But the forces of client kings, and of allied tribes such as the Iberians, are as prominent. Their importance lay in the field of cavalry and in the use of the bow. The Romans are still shown supporting weak client kings with heavy and auxiliary troops.

In considering the southern part of the eastern frontier, Judaea, three stages may be distinguished. First there was what was probably considered the "normal" period after the death of Herod Agrippa⁶¹ when Judaea was under Roman governors, then there was the fighting that culminated in the intervention of Cestius Gallus from Syria, and finally the Great Rebellion which Vespasian attempted to crush.

The New Testament evidence can be added to that of Josephus. For this reason it is necessary to go back to the principate of Tiberius. The chronology of the New Testament is notoriously difficult: only approximate dates can be given. The soldiers that guarded Christ at his trial and crucifixion under Pontius Pilate, governor from 26 - 36 A.D., are described as *cohortes*, the Greek for "cohorts"⁶². Hence they were an auxiliary unit. One of their officers is called a *centurio* or *κατασκευαστής*, which, as the Greek itself shows, meant a centurion⁶³. When Caligula became emperor, he sent Marullus, who is otherwise unknown, to be commander of the cavalry in Judaea: *ἐπὶ τῆς ἵππου* *ἐκτακτικῆς* *ἀρχῆς*⁶⁴. Salomon⁶⁵ understood this in the sense that Marullus became governor of Judaea, but this depends upon the emendation *ἐκτακτικῆς* for *ἐκτακτικῆς*. But for this /there

there is no manuscript authority, and the puzzling office must be allowed to stand. When the then governor of Syria, Petronius, was sent to compel the Jews to erect a statue of Gaius in the Temple at Jerusalem in 40 A.D., he set out, according to the "bellus ludaeus"⁸⁶, with a force of 4 legions. Since there were only 4 legions in all in Syria, the number which Josephus gives in the "Antiquities"⁸⁷, namely 2, is to be preferred. ⁸⁸ Then, then, is Josephus' word for legion, but there is no detail on the many auxiliaries that came from Syria.

The conversion to Christianity of the centurion, Cornelius of Caesarea (Kaisariya), is featured early in "Acts", where he is referred to as ⁸⁸ *centurio de civitate caesariensis*. In other words he was a centurion in the cohort called Italica. ⁸⁹ Cornelius' conversion is to be dated to 41 - 42 A.D., a difficulty is seen in that Herod Agrippa was king of Judaea then, having replaced the Roman procurator as a favour from the emperor Claudius. The implication is that there would have been no Roman troops in Judaea at the time. But the Herodian kings needed strong military support no less than the Romans, and Claudius must have left the Roman troops previously in Judaea there under the new king. This is confirmed by the fact that when Judaea reverted once more to provincial status on the death of Agrippa in 44, Claudius threatened to transfer regiments of Caesariensis and Sebasteniensis (i.e. Samaritana) from their local stations to Pontus and to replace them with troops from Syria: ⁹⁰ *et cum esset in Syria, et cum esset in Syria, et cum esset in Syria*.

μεταφυγεῖν, ἐν δὲ ἐκείνῳ χρόνῳ, τὴν δὲ ἐν Ἰουδαίᾳ, ὡς ἀποκαταστήσει τὰς ἐκείνῃς ἐπαρχίας, καὶ ὡς ἀποκαταστήσει τὴν ἐκείνῃς ἐπαρχίας, ὡς ἀποκαταστήσει τὴν ἐκείνῃς ἐπαρχίας. 90.

It is obvious that these troops had been in Judaea during the royal interlude: in fact the reason for the transfer was their insulting behaviour to the royal family during Agrippa's funeral. Other conclusions follow from this statement by Josephus. Momigliano⁹¹ has shown that, although here and in "Antiquities" XX, 8, 7, 176, the Tassareans are mentioned, Josephus normally refers to Sebastenians alone as the troops stationed in Caesarea. Further the troops numbered 300, which is precisely the number of Sebastenians that fought for the Romans under Augustus on the death of Herod the Great. At some time, therefore, between the death of Herod and of Agrippa in 44 A.D., 300 royal troops, obviously with successive replacements of those discharged, had become 1 unit and 2 cohorts, each quingenary. Claudius felt that they should be transferred from their home situation to a distant province, but allowed himself to be dissuaded. Professional organization was not the death of local ties. The threatened replacements were to have come from Roman legions in Syria. As noted above, Josephus normally uses *στρατήριον* for "legio", but it is unthinkable that legionaries should be drafted into auxiliary units. Hence, as Momigliano remarks, *στρατήριον* must here mean auxiliary unit.

Judaea under Claudius suffered from a series of comparatively serious incidents needing the use of force. When the prophet Theudas had collected a large following, an *ἐκδοχή* of cavalry was dispatched against him⁹². During the Passover celebrations, a unit of soldiers was normally stationed

stationed near the temple. This Josephus called *ἡ ὁπλίτης σὺνταγμα*. This can only mean an auxiliary cohort, called Roman because it was part of the occupation army as far as the Jews were concerned. On one occasion when one of the soldiers insulted the crowd, the resulting riot necessitated the bringing in of reinforcements. These are called *ὁπλίται*, normally the term used for legionary soldiers. "Hoplite" here may just be a variant for "soldier", but possibly indicates that the auxiliaries on duty in Jerusalem were heavily armed⁹³. Some Jewish-Samaritan clashes led to serious complications. Flavius, in a brief notice, merely says that "milites" were involved⁹⁴. Josephus, however, in the "Bellum" relates that *ἡ δὲ τῶν Ἰουδαίων σὺνταγμα* was summoned from Caesarea by the procurator⁹⁵. In the "Antiquities" the forces appear as "the Roman cohort" *ἡ ῥωμαίων σὺνταγμα* ...⁹⁶. In Latin terms, an *ala Sebastenerum*, 4 cohorts of infantry and local Samaritan levies are meant, (*ἡ ὁπλίτης σὺνταγμα* again meaning an auxiliary cohort, not a legion). A judicial enquiry into the fighting was held, and the emperor sentenced a Roman, Celer, to death. That his offence was, is not stated, but he is described as a *tribunus militum*, i.e., "tribunus militum". Normally cohorts were commanded by prefects. Since Celer was a tribune, one of the auxiliary regiments at least must have been military, not quingenary⁹⁷. Suetonius reports the appointment of Felix as procurator in the following terms: *Felix, quem cohortibus et aliis provinciisque Iudaee praeposuit* (sc. Claudius)⁹⁸. The specific reference to the command of the cohorts and also may be due to the fact that the military situation

/ in

in Judaea was uppermost in man's mind at the time. More likely it is the fact that a man who had been a freedman was placed in command of troops that caused the choice of the words used.

The governorship of Felix lasted into the principate of Nero. The security situation did not improve. Josephus notes the emergence of a sinister new group of freedom fighters or terrorists, the 'sicarii'⁹⁹, so named from the curved knife they used. False prophets were another source of trouble. Felix used cavalry and ¹⁰⁰ against these. This can only mean "heavy-armed auxiliary infantry". One, an Egyptian, threatened to seize Jerusalem, overwhelming ¹⁰¹ ¹⁰² : "the Roman garrison" must mean an auxiliary regiment or regiments in the city. A serious disturbance occurred at Caesarea. The non-Jewish element in the population, called indiscriminately Syrians or Greeks by Josephus, felt that they could rely on the support of the auxiliaries there, as being Syrians and relatives as it were :

[illegible]

102.

The parallel version of the "Antiquities" is more precise : most of the troops originated from Caesarea and Sebaste (Samaria) :

Syrian troops are in fact Caesareans and Sebastenians. They were in the majority, but nothing is said of the "origines" of the others.

The

The arrest and trial of the apostle Paul in Jerusalem spanned the last years of Felix and the first months of his successor Porcius Festus¹⁰⁴. The commander of the unit that kept Paul prisoner, Claudius Lysias, is called *στρατηγός*¹⁰⁵; in Latin terms, he must have been military tribune of a military cohort. Claudius Lysias provided a military escort under centurions *καταστάσεις* to take Paul to Caesarea. The escort consisted of *ἀρματωροὶ* ... *ὅσοι ἐκείνῳ ἐπέταξαν*¹⁰⁶. 470 soldiers are a large number, especially if they all came from the same unit. If they do, and if the terminology can be pressed, the cohort contained cavalry, hence it was a "cohorta milliaria equitata". What the *καταστάσεις* were is not clear. The word is very rare, but the variant reading *ἀρματωροὶ* is an hapax legomenon. It would appear to mean "throwing with the hand" and could refer to spearmen or javelin throwers or even bowmen. In later writers *καταστάς* is given the meanings "a light soldier, perhaps a Bowman or slinger", "a bodyguard". If the *καταστάσεις* were *εὐχάριστοι* or heavy-armed, to use Josephus' word, light-armed would be the natural meaning for *καταστάσεις* in this context. Given the prevalence of bowmen in the past, "archer" is a suitable rendering. When Paul was sent to Rome in view of his appeal to the emperor, he was handed over to *ἐκτονωμένης ὑπόστατος ἰσχυρῆς ἐκείνης*¹⁰⁷. The Latin translation would be "cohorta augusta", presumably a cohort at one stage honoured with the name of Augustus or one of his successors. But,

/as

as noted above, Samaria was called Sebaste or Augusta, and there was a cohort of Sebastenians. So that the phrase may represent "cohors Sebaste".

When trouble broke out at Caesarea under the procurator Cestius Florus (64 - 66 A.D.), a cavalry commander Jucundus was detailed to intervene¹⁰⁸. The trouble spread and Florus marched with what Josephus calls an "army" of cavalry and infantry on Jerusalem, but later it appears that only a cohort was involved¹⁰⁹. Meanwhile he had sent for 2 further cohorts from Caesarea. The situation was now so serious that Cestius Gallus¹¹⁰ in Syria was asked to deal with it.

This survey of the first period of Judaea in the Claudio-Herodian period has shown various types of officer - tribunes, prefects of cavalry and centurions - in some prominence. The greatest number of regiments stationed in the province amounted to 1 ala and 5 cohorts, all of Sebastenians (including Caesareans). In addition there was a cohors Italica. Whether the ~~unit~~ was one of the Sebastenian cohorts or an additional unit cannot be decided. Whether Celer and Claudius Lysias commanded the same regiment, and which regiment (or regiments) it was, is not known. But at least one of the regiments was a "cohors milliaria equitata", and if ~~archers~~ means archers, "auxillaria" as well. Finally, in an emergency, extra Samaritan troops were enlisted.

Before the arrival of Cestius Gallus, the Roman garrison at Masada (Sebbeh near the Dead Sea) fell - but no details about its composition survive¹¹¹. Agrippa sent 2000 horse to the aid of the Jews who were still

/loyal

loyal to the Romans¹¹². When Cestius set out from Syria in 66, he took the Twelfth Legion, and 2,000 picked men from each of the other legions. Since there were 3 legions in Syria, this gives him 6,000 legionaries in the detachments, i.e., a second legion as far as numbers go. His non-legionary troops comprised *καὶ τὰς ἐκ τῶν βασιλέων* *ἐκ τῶν βασιλέων* *ἐκ τῶν βασιλέων*. The royal forces were supplied by Antiochus of Commagene (2,000 horse and 3,000 foot, all archers), Agrippa (3,000 foot and just under 2,000 horse), and Sohaemus (4,000 men, a third of whom were cavalry and the majority archers)¹¹³. This gives a total of just under 14,000 royal soldiers, of whom some 3,000 at least were cavalry, the majority armed with the bow (unfortunately it is not stated whether Agrippa's forces were bowmen or not). If the professional auxiliaries were quingenary, they would have amounted to 2,000 horse and 3,000 foot. This seems a low total to accompany 12,000 legionaries. But, if Josephus' figures can be accepted, Cestius' strategy seems to have been to allow the client kings to supply the special arm of "sagittarii", both mounted and on foot. He also collected a large number of other auxiliaries (*καὶ τὰς ἐκ τῶν βασιλέων*) from the towns of Syria. These were completely untrained¹¹⁴. Cestius was unsuccessful in his assault on Jerusalem, and eventually withdrew, his flight turning to a rout. Josephus gives the losses of the Romans and their auxiliaries together: 5,500 infantry and 480 cavalry¹¹⁵. The death of a "praefectus alae" (*πραιφεκτος αλῆς*), Aemilius Jucundus is mentioned¹¹⁶.

/Vespasian

Vespasian took over in 67 and mustered his forces in Ptolemais (Acre or 'Akka).¹¹⁷ His legions were the Fifth and the Tenth and the Fifteenth¹¹⁸. 18 cohorts accompanied the legions. These were supplemented by 5 others from Caesarea. Josephus says that 10 of these 23 were military, while the other 13 contain 600 infantry and 120 cavalry each. As far as alae were concerned, 1 came from Caesarea¹¹⁹ and 5 others from Syria. Antiochus, Agrippa¹²⁰ and Sohaemus had provided ...
¹²¹, that is, 2000 infantry archers and 1000 cavalry each. Further the Nabataean Arab Malchus¹²² sent 1000 cavalry and 5000 infantry, the majority being archers. The total of all these forces was 60,000, according to Josephus, who then adds the very interesting remark that the very large numbers of "servants"¹²³ following the army must be included, since they had shared in their owners' training.

The information supplied by Josephus can be set out as follows :

Legions :	3 x 6000		18,000
Cohorts :	10 x 1000	10,000	
	13 x 720	<u>9,360</u>	
		<u>19,360</u>	c. 20,000
Alae :	Caesarea : 1 x 500 or 1000	500 or 1000	
	Syria : 5 x 500 or 1000	<u>2500</u> or <u>5000</u>	
		<u>3000</u> or <u>6000</u>	3 - 6,000
Kings :	Bowmen : 5 x 2000	6000	
	Cavalry : 3 x 1000	<u>3000</u>	
		<u>9000</u>	
			<u>9,000</u>
			c. 30,000 - 53,000

		c. 50,000 - 53,000
Malchus :	Infantry :	5000
	Cavalry :	<u>1000</u>
		<u>6000</u>
		6,000
TOTAL :		c. <u>56,000 - 59,000</u>

The relation of this total to two other small forces that Josephus had mentioned earlier is not clear. Vespasian left a garrison of 6000 foot and 1000 horse (i.e. 7000) at Nepphoris (Nefuriye) under a tribune, Flacidus¹²⁴, and a cohort and ala had been holding out at Ascalon (Ashkelon near 'Asakalan) under the command of a prefect, Antonius¹²⁵. The numbers involved are too large for inclusion in Josephus' 60,000. The proportion of cavalry to infantry in the 60,000 is difficult to work out exactly. The ala and the allied cavalry would amount to 7 - 10,000. Legions contained 120 cavalry¹²⁶, and the "cohortes equitatae" the same number. This produces a total of 1920 (3 x 120 + 13 x 120), with a grand total of some 9 - 12,000, a rough sixth or quarter of the whole. Vespasian's marching order in his invasion of Galilee is described in detail¹²⁷. Light-armed auxiliaries (*agelai*) and archers formed the van so that they could repel surprise attacks and spy out dangerous areas. Next came various specialized detachments, which do not concern us here. Then followed the main body of the legions, and their servants. The next in order appear as *mercenarii* *stipendiarii* here cannot mean "mercenarii", but "stipendiarii", for so far the main auxiliaries have not been mentioned. A special force of infantry and *agelai* and cavalry brought up the rear.

/The

The course of Vespasian's fighting in Galilee¹²⁸ and advance to Jerusalem cannot be studied in detail, but certain "notabilia" may be singled out. At the siege of Jotapata (Khirbet Jofat) Vespasian used his archers, slingers and all his marksmen¹²⁹: the first were certainly auxiliaries, but the status of the second two groups is not clear. Later Arab archers, javelin-men and slingers are mentioned together, and then Arab archers and slingers and stone-throwers: the latter appear as ¹³⁰. From this it is clear that the slingers and probably the stone-throwers and marksmen were auxiliaries. As far as the officers of the auxiliaries are concerned, two decurions are named, Valerius and Aebutius, and a centurion Gallus, who is specifically stated to have been a Syrian¹³¹. 2000 archers were under the command of a certain Aeternus Silo¹³²: since the archers were almost entirely provided by the kings, this looks like the placing of a Roman officer in charge of allied royal troops. Vespasian seems to have used certain of his subordinate commanders on special missions with joint legionary - auxiliary forces of differing sizes. Thus Trajanus, legate of the Tenth (the father of the future emperor)¹³³, was sent against Japha (Yafa) with 2000 foot and 1000 horse. Titus, as legate of the Fifteenth, relieved him with 1000 foot and 500 horse, and is later shown operating with 600 chosen cavalry¹³⁴. Cerealis, the legate of the Fifth, was sent to quell a Samaritan disturbance with 3000 infantry and 600 cavalry, and, in 68 A.D., ravaged part of Idumea with a detachment of infantry and cavalry¹³⁵. After the fall of Jotapata, Agrippa invited Vespasian to his kingdom. One of his objects was to secure the assistance of the Roman

/general

general in putting down disorders in his own kingdom. This Vespasian did, but we do not hear of a garrison left behind by the Romans¹³⁶. When Vespasian made arrangements for the winter of 67 - 8, he stationed decurions in the villages and centurions in the towns¹³⁷ - these clearly commanded auxiliary detachments. All this shows how fully integrated the auxiliaries were with the legionaries : they played a vital role in the overall strategy.

Little can be recovered concerning Egypt and Africa. Dio¹³⁸ ascribes Galus' decision to remove the troops in Africa proconsularis from the control of the proconsular governor and to place them under the command of an imperial legate in 39 A.D. to his fear of Lucius Piso (son of the Piso condemned for the death of Germanicus). Piso is alleged to have had a large force of auxiliaries with his legionaries (*legionem cum auxilio*), and might be encouraged to revolt. Tacitus, however, ascribes the transfer to the governorship of A. Silanus, describing the troops in the following way : "legio in Africa auxiliisque tutandis imperii finibus sub diuo Augusto Tiberioque principibus proconsuli parebant ..." ¹³⁹. The name of the governor concerned need not be discussed here : the two passages together, however, imply that not only the legion but also the auxiliaries that had been in Africa were now in the new province of Numidia.

Galus' execution of Ptolemy¹⁴⁰, the king of Mauretania, led to fighting there which lasted into the principate of Claudius. The Moorish resistance was led by a freedman of the king, Kedemon by name. In an

/inscription¹⁴¹

inscription¹⁴¹ from Volubilis (Near Faraoun) we hear of auxiliaries used against Aedemon :

M. Val. Bontaris f. Gal. Seneca Aed. sufeti Iluir. flammii primo in municipio suo praef. auxilior. adversus Aedemon oppressum bello huic ordo municipi Volub. ob merita erga repub. et legationem bene gestam qua ab diuo Claudio ciuitates Romanas et conubium cum peregrinis mulieribus immunitatem annor. et incolae bonae ciuium bello interfectorum quorum heredes non extabant suis inpetrauit. ...

The "auxilia" of whom M. Valerius Severus was prefect were presumably a local force whom he got together for the war. The rewards which he received from Claudius included citizenship, and the right of legally valid marriage with non-Roman women. Since his father's name (Bontar) is not Roman, presumably his citizenship dates to this incident. (Similarly his wife was the daughter of a non-Roman.)

In 66 there was a Jewish pogrom in Alexandria in Egypt. Besides the 2 Roman legions, 2000 soldiers who had just arrived from Africa participated (...) : these were regarded as auxiliaries intended for Nero's projected Ethiopian expedition¹⁴². The ala Siliana was also involved : "pro consule Vitellius Siliani in Africa habuerant, mox a Nerone, ut in Aegyptum praemitterentur, excitati ..." ¹⁴³. Vitellius' governorship of Africa belongs to the principate of Nero : the statement reveals that, in spite of the creation of the legateship of Numidia, /senatorial

senatorial Africa had some auxiliary troops stationed in it. The Ethiopian expedition was planned for 68, but some years earlier, possibly in 61, a detachment from the Praetorian Guard had been sent into Ethiopia to investigate the sources of the Nile¹⁴⁴. A tantalizing papyrus from Egypt has been connected with these events by Turner¹⁴⁵:

καρπυῶντο καὶ τοῖς ἐκείνου
ἐκ τῆς αἰῶνος καὶ οὐκ ἐκ τῆς
ἐκ τῆς αἰῶνος καὶ οὐκ ἐκ τῆς

The first lacuna has been filled to read *καρπυῶντο καὶ τοῖς ἐκείνου* and *ἐκ τῆς αἰῶνος*, although *ἐκ τῆς αἰῶνος* or *ἐκ τῆς αἰῶνος* are equally possible, according to Turner. The second lacuna presumably ended with *ἐκ τῆς αἰῶνος*. Accordingly there is no secure basis for cohorts and light-armed troops (*ἀσπίδι καὶ ῥομφαίᾳ*), since this is a pure emendation. But there appear to be cavalry, possibly under a "praefectus" (*πραιφεκτός*). Who Rufus was is not clear. Not even the link with Nero's plans is secure: Altheim and Stiehl¹⁴⁶ date the papyrus to the early 2nd century A.D.

Certain general features remain to be discussed. Reference has already been made to the German "corporis custodes" under Caligula: in spite of his intention to keep the guard German, he placed Thracians in command of it¹⁴⁷. The guard showed its loyalty to him at his assassination by attempting a massacre of the senators, whom they regarded as responsible¹⁴⁸. They are heard of again when Nero's relations with his mother became

/strained:

strained : he decided to withdraw the detachment of them that he had assigned to her as a mark of respect¹⁴⁹

A chance occurrence on Nero's journey from Naples to Rome after the outbreak of the revolt of Vindex is of incidental interest. The emperor regarded seeing a representation in sculpture of a Roman cavalryman riding down a Gaul as a happy omen¹⁵⁰. Such a motif was very popular on the tombstones of the auxiliary cavalry.

Suetonius reports that Claudius regularized the order in which commands of cohorts, of alae and military tribunates were to be held : "equestris militibus ita ordinavit, ut post cohortes alae, post alae tribunatum legionis daret"¹⁵¹. However this arrangement did not long remain in force, since the command of an alae soon ranked higher than a military tribunate in a legion¹⁵².

The first diplomas¹⁵³ issued to auxiliaries appear in the Claudio-Heronian period. The earliest is dated to before 34 A.D. It is very fragmentary, but the relevant portions can be restored as follows :

[... cuorum nomina subscripta sunt ipsius liberis posterisque eorum civitatem dedit et coniugibus cum uxoribus quae tunc habuissent cum est civitas data aut si cui⁷ qualibet essent cum iis quae postea duxissent duntaxat singuli singulas ...

cohort. II Hispanorum qui praestant C. Saurina Triacus

equiti Bassenti Basseni f. Cornu(ati) et Lorna Procosii filiae uxori eius

/et

et emerito f. eius et Iuranae filiae et Emeritae filiae eius¹⁵⁴.

Several comments are called for. The concern for the citizenship status of the wife and children has appeared on the Volubilis inscription, as noted above. The recipient was an "eques", hence the cohort must have been "equitata", but this element does not appear in its title. His tribe, and his name and the names of his relations, except for his son and one of his daughters, show that he was a Pannonian. Yet his regiment was a Spanish cohort. This means that it must have come to Pannonia (then still part of Illyricum) at least 25 years before Iulius Iulianus to have been drafted into it. So the cohort II Hispanorum must have reached Illyricum at some date before 29. The names Emeritus/s for his son and one of his daughters strike one as humorous; but they were probably given in honour of his discharge from service and reflect a desire to provide a Roman-sounding name.

Other regiments attested by the diplomas may be noted :

ala veterana Gallorum et Thraecum

ala Gallorum et Thraecum Antiana

ala Gallorum et Thraecum [...]¹⁵⁵, possibly in Moesia, in 54.

coh. I Aetorum et Callaecorum

coh. I Hispanorum

coh. I Alpinorum

coh. II Alpinorum

coh. II Hispanorum

coh. V Lucensium et Callaecorum¹⁵⁶, in Illyricum, in 60.

ala Gemelliana¹⁵⁷, in Paetia (?). In 64.

/The

The list of regiments is very small, and possibly unrepresentative. But it is clear that Alpine, Gallic, Spanish and Thracian elements predominate. The aiae already show composite titles, but they do not have numbers like the cohorts. Two composite cohorts appear, but these are not of widely separated peoples, as in the aiae, but of tribes close to each other in a single province, Hispania Tarraconensis. A further point regarding nomenclature emerges. It will be seen that the coh. II Hispanorum features in both the Illyrian diplomas (the first and the third above). In the second of these the recipient is once again an "eques" and aannonian :

coh. II Hispan. cui praest C. Caesius Afer equiti Iantimaro Andedunis f. Varciano.

This is further confirmation that the cohort was "equitata", and the "cursum" of the prefect establishes this beyond doubt. It begins as follows :

C. Caesio T. f. Cl. Apru praef. coh. Hispanorum equitatae ...¹⁵⁶.

Here however the cohort has no number. One cannot then expect uniformity and rigidity of titulature at this stage.

NOTES.

1. Tac. "Agr." 13, 5.
2. LX, 20, 2 : διατρέχει χελτοῦς , εἰς πλοῦς ἔν
 αὐτῷ τῶν ποταμῶν ἵππας αὐτοῖς οὐλοῖς
 ... Cf. ibid. 6, where the ... cross the
 Thames in the same way. For Dio's ... cf. above, p. 61/36
 If Dio's elephant in Britain (21, 2) can be accepted, a circus animal
 rather than an African auxiliary corps must be intended.
3. For the skill of Batavians in swimming in full armour, cf. above,
 p. 68 and below, p. 154.
4. "Ann." XII, 51 - 42; XII, 29 - 39. For Caratacus, cf. "P.L.A."²
 C 424; Boudicca, p. 146.
5. Tac. "Ann." XII, 31. For ... scapula, cf. ... Hoffman,
 "A.E." XVIII, 1942, 1571 (no. 4).
6. Tac. "Agr." XII, 32.
7. Burneaux and Koestermann ad loc.
8. ibid. At this point Tacitus comments on the lack of protective armour
 of the Britons. Their troops are referred to as "ceterum armatorum"
 (33) and "valida et lacta armia iuventus" (40) in this section.
9. 38.
10. 39.
11. 40. For ... cf. "P.L.A." 2453; for ... Julius Gallus, p. 70.
 Didius had accompanied Claudius to Britain during the invasion in
 43 A.D. : cf. I.L.S. 974, 11. 6 - 7, as amended by Oliver, "A.J.S."
 1940, 219 : "comen et le atin imperatoris in ... Britannia".
 A difficulty arises over the point recorded in I. 5 : "ir/sefectu
 equitat." Group ("P.L.A." loc. cit.) says that von Domaszewski's
 proposal that Didius was in charge of all the cavalry during the
 invasion cannot be proved, but Oliver (221) accepts the suggestion.
12. "pedes ... equites" at ... (Tac. "Ann." XII, 27)
 /"legiones

- "legiones et quod peditum ... cum equitibus" of the forces of A. Petilius Cerealis Coeninus Rufus (Z. Swoboda, "R.E." XIX, 1937, 1138 ff., (no. 8)) then legate of legio IX at Lindum (Lincoln) (32).
13. 34. "Auxiliarium impetus" and "eques" are later used (37). The British forces are described in the words "ceterum et turmas" (presumably to cover both infantry and cavalry) (34) and "iuventus" (36). For G. Suetonius Paulinus, cf. Miltner, "R.E." IV A, 1931, 591 ff. (no. 5).
14. LIII, 12, 3 - 4, where Dio refers to the Britons' lack of protective armour (cf. S. 2, and above, n. 8 for Tacitus).
15. Tac. "Ann." XIV, 38.
16. Cf. Furneaux ad loc., quoting Hipperdey, who refers to "H." I, 59 : "et erant in ciuitate Lingonum octo Batavorum cohortes, quartae decimae legionis auxilia" (69 A.D.), on which cf. Heubner, who accepts the identification. The Batavians are said to have won glory in Britain in "H." IV, 12, but the passage is too general to be of use here.
17. Cf. n. 16
18. "Agr." 36, 1.
19. 18, 5 and Ugilvie and Richmond ad loc. This leads one to suspect that the auxiliaries used for the attack on Mona by Suetonius Paulinus included Batavians.
20. 28, and Ugilvie and Richmond ad loc. and appendix 2. For the Usipi, or, as they are more commonly called, the Usipetes, cf. E. Guttenbrunner "R.E." IX A, 1961, 1987 ff.
21. Tac. "Agr." 36, 1. For the Tungri, cf. K. Scherling, "R.E." VII A, 1948, 1345 ff.
22. van de Waerd, "R.E." 1936, 369, suggests that Claudius called upon the Belgians especially for troops to garrison Britain.
23. R.I.B. 201; Kraft, 611.
24. Frere, 1967, 71; Webster, "Limes" VI, 1967, 44; Hull "Germ." 1929, 188 ff.
25. Frere, 1967, 79; Webster, "Limes" VI, 1967, 45; R.I.B. 291.
26. R.I.B. 122.

27. R.I.B. 109; Kraft, 612.
28. R.I.B. 108; Kraft, 413.
29. One may note that the *ualla* are included among the auxiliaries in Calgacus' ("V.L.R." II 3 224) address to the British army before the battle of Mons Graupius (Tac. "Agr." 32, 1).
30. 1967, 61, n. 1. The diplomas are not of much help, since the first British diploma ("C.I.L." XVI, 43) falls in 98 A.D. An *ala* I *Tungrorum* is listed, but the *Tungrici* named are definitely from cohorts. However, as Nesselhauf remarks *ad loc.*, there is room for a coh. *Tungrorum* among the lacunae in the list of cohorts: they appear in the second century diplomas (conveniently listed in Simpson, 1964, 184 f.). The *ala* I *Thracum*, coh. I *Mataurorum*, and Thracian cohorts are also attested.
31. Caladon, 1934, 58 ff., makes a reasonable attempt at a reconstruction of *Julius'* German and British plans, explaining the literary tradition as a misunderstanding of measures taken to restore discipline and provide troop manoeuvres before action could be started. Davies, "Hist." 1966, 124 ff., and Hickenell, *ibid.* 1968, 496 ff. (who would place *Julius'* military activities in 40, i.e., those directed towards Britain, in Lower Germany - 500 ff.) have recently continued the debate.
32. "Cal." 43.
33. 45, 1.
34. LIX, 22, 2. On the exaggeration in this figure, cf. Townsend, "Hermes" 1964, 48.
35. "Cal." 43.
36. 44.
37. Tac. "H." IV, 15; Caladon, 1934, 76, n. 2. For the *Canninefates*, cf. above, p. 82, n. 48.
38. For *Flavius* and the *Cherusci*, cf. above, p. 69. Cf. Tac. "Ann." XI, 16: "armis equisque in patrium nostrumque morem exercitus".
39. XI, 18. There was probably too long an interval for *Cannascus* (Stein "H.G." VII, 1910, 207 f.) to have had any connection with the "*ala Canninefatus*" that operated in the Frisian revolt of 28 A.D., for which cf. above, p. 72.

40. All, 27. The Chatti are described as "latrocinia agentes" and "populatores".
41. apud Furness ad loc. for the cisterne "cateruae", cf. above, p. 67. Lang, 1944, 43 and Gallies, 1964, 145, regard the units as regular. For the Nemetes, cf. A. Franke, "Herm." XVI, 1935, 2362 ff.
42. Tac. "Ann." XIII, 24. For these areas reserved for military use, cf. Ahrstedt, "Limes" 1949, 47 ff.; "B.J." 1950, 75 ff.
43. Tac. "Ann." XIII, 55: "Boiocalus, uinctus se rebellione Cherusci iussu Arminii referens, mox Iulio, Germanico ducibus stipendia meruisse, et quinquaginta annorum obsequio id quoque adiungere quod gentem suam ditioni nostrae subiceret". For the Ampsivarii and Boiocalus, cf. above, p. 51, and "P.L.R."² B 140.
44. Dio LX, 15, 2. For L. Arruntius Camillus Scribonianus, cf. "P.L.R."² A 114, Jagenteufel, 1954, 21 (no. 5).
45. Tac. "Ann." XII, 29, with Furness ad loc. (and Pelham, l.c. n. 41) and Koestermann. For the "Vannianum regnum", cf. B. Caria, "P.L.R."² XIII A, 1955, 338 ff.; for Vannius, R. Manslik, ibid., 346 f.
46. Tac. "Ann." XI, 8. For Althricates, cf. above, p. 83; for Charasmenes and the Iberi, cf. Schur, 1923,² 1963, index, s.v. Iberien; Nagle, 1951, s.vv.
47. Tac. "Ann." XI, 9.
48. All, 15. The Bosphoran forces are called "nationes", "perfugas", "antresco exercitu". For Bosphorus, cf. Brandis, "K.G." III, 757 ff. (no. 3 - esp. 782); for Althricates, Geyer, "K.G." XV, 1932, 226 (no. 16); for Antys, "P.L.R."² C 1556; for G. Julius Aquila, 1 166; Tflaum, 1960, 51 ff. (no. 51).
49. Tac. "Ann." XII, 15 - 16. Cunobelinus ("P.L.R."² A 113) was at pains to establish that he had not acted as a subordinate, but had shared "communiones victoriarum" with the Romans (17). For the Norzi, cf. Tomaschek, "K.G." I, 1914, 265 f.
50. Tac. "Ann." XII, 17; Furness ad loc.; Koestermann ad 15.
51. All, 45. For Caesius Gallio, cf. "P.L.R."² C 140, and for Casparius, 461.

52. Tac. "Ann." XII, 45, contra the interpretation of Furneaux and Koestermann. Contrast the phrase "tumultuariam" of a new levy by Corbulo in Syria, below, p. 98. For Cappadocian auxiliaries, cf. below, p. 98f.
53. XII, 55. For the *civitas*, cf. above, p. 75; for C. Julius Antiochus Epiphanes, cf. "H.I.R."² I 149.
54. For Cn. Domitius Corbulo, cf. "H.I.R."² D 142; for Tiridates, F. Geyer, "H.I.R." VI A, 1937, 1441 f. (no. 6).
55. Tac. "Ann." XIII, 7. For M. Julius Arippa, cf. "H.I.R."² I 132; for Aristobulus, A 1052; for C. Julius Sohaemus, I 582, where he is identified with the king of Bessa (Bosra) known from Josephus.
56. Tac. "Ann." XIII, 5. For C. Umidius Durzius quadratus, cf. R. Hanslik, "H.I.R." Suppl. IX, 1962, 1827 ff. (no. 4). Frontinus ("Strat." IV, 2, 3: "duabus legionibus et paucissimis auxiliis") plays down the "auxilia".
57. Tac. "Ann." XIII, 7. For Vologeses, cf. R. Hanslik, "H.I.R." Suppl. IX, 1962, 1831 ff. (no. 1).
58. Tac. "Ann." XIV, 53, and Koestermann ad loc. for the legion concerned.
59. XIII, 36. For Paccius Orfitus, cf. Stein, "H.I.R." XVIII, 1942, 2065 (no. 14).
60. "Strat." IV, 1, 21. Frontinus (ibid., 28) relates the punishment of another prefect of an ala: "Aemilio Rufo praefecto equitum, quia hostibus cesserat et parum instructam armis alam habebat ...".
61. Tac. "Ann." XIII, 37. Raschi is an emendation, accepted by Furneaux and Koestermann ad loc. Others have proposed "Heniochi" (cf. Guilleumier ad loc. and Pagnie, 1958, 1413). Neither A. Herrmann "H.I.R." XVI, 1933, 351 f. nor Kieselring, ibid. VIII, 1912, 251 ff. (no. 2) refers to the passage.
62. Tac. "Ann." XIII, 38. In a subsequent attack on an Armenian stronghold, "funditores libritoresque" are mentioned (39; cf. above, p. 49).
63. XIII, 40.
64. 41.
65. XIV, 23. The tribesmen were "latrocinia exerciti".

/66.

66. XIV, 26 : "praemissis cum auxiliis Verulano legato atque ipse legionibus citis ...".
67. *ibid.* Cf. Dio LIII, 20, 2. For Tigranes, cf. F. Geyer, "R.L." VI A, 1936, 980 f. (no. 6).
68. Tac. "Ann." XV, 3.
69. XV, 4 - 5. Cf. Dio LIII, 20, 3.
70. For L. Caesennius Paetus cf. "R.L." C 173.
71. Tac. "Ann." XV, 6, with Furneaux and Pelham *ad loc.*
72. Cf. Cichorius, 1255.
73. E. Hoffmann, "R.L." XXI, 1952, 1205 ff. (no. 3).
74. Cf. above, p. 94.
75. Tac. "Ann." XV, 8. The Parthian attackers at this point are referred to as "hostiles turmae".
76. XV, 1. "alaris", "equite" are used for cavalry in 11.
77. For C. Cestius Gallus, cf. "R.L." C 691.
78. "Ann." XV, 25, and Furneaux and Roestermann *ad loc.* For "praefectura" in the sense discussed below, cf. e.g. XV, 28.
79. 26.
80. Cf. Furneaux *ad loc.* and Waser, 1967, 12.
81. For (M.) Julius Agrippa, cf. "R.L." I 131. As Jones, 1934, 211, n.l., points out, the "Herod" of "Acts" 12 was not part of his official nomenclature.
82. Mt. 27, 27; Mk. 15, 16; Jn. 18, 3; 12. The centurions in the earlier parts of the gospels belonged to the armed forces of the tetrarchs, and were not auxiliaries (cf. Sherwin-white, 1963, 124). For Pontius Pilatus, cf. E. Pascher "R.L." XI, 1920, 1322 f.
83. Mt. 27, 54; Mk. 15, 19; Lk. 23, 47.
84. Jos. "A.J." XVIII, 6, 12, 237 and Feldman *ad loc.*
85. 1934, 115; cf. Stein "R.L." XIV, 1950, 2053 (no. 1). It may be noted that under Herod there was a separate commander for the cavalry of the royal army (Jos. "A.J." II, 3, 4, 52).
86. II, 10, 1, 106.

/87.

87. AvIII, 5, 2, 262. This is the figure accepted by Jones, 1935, 197.
For Petronius, cf. R. Hamelink, "A.J." XIX, 1937, 1199 ff. (no. 24).
88. 10, 1; "P.I.R."² C 1308. For *Caenopus Stratonis*, cf. Benzinger,
"A.J." III, 1847, 1291 ff. (no. 10).
89. Thus Gabba, 1953, 89. "P.I.R." says "circa a. 40"; Bruce ad loc.
"before 41".
90. Jos. AvI, 9, 2, 365.
91. 1934, 1967, 89 ff. Monigiano refers to "B.J." II, 3, 4, 52;
12, 5, 236; "A.J." ix, 6, 1, 122 - passages discussed either above
or below. For *Lebanus (Lamaria)*, cf. above, p. 62 n 48.
92. Jos. "A.J." xi, 5, 1, 8. For Theudas, cf. Feldman ad loc.
93. Jos. "A.J." II, 12, 1, 224; 226; "A.J." xi, 3, 3, 106, where *Lebanus*
not *Theudas*, is used.
94. "Ann." xii, 54, where the Jewish leaders are called "latrones globoi".
95. II, 12, 5, 236.
96. xi, 6, 1, 122.
97. 6, 2, 132; 3, 13; "A.J." II, 12, 1, 244; "P.I.R."² C 617. Cf.
Cheesman, 36.
98. "A.J." 28. For (A.) Antonius Felix, cf. "P.I.R."² A 329. Whether
Felix' was a sole or a joint governorship at the outset cannot be
discussed here. Cf. "P.I.R."²; Farnoux and Roederbaum on Tac. "Ann."
xii, 54; and most fully, Monigiano, 1934, 1967, 81 ff.; Smallwood,
"Lat." 1957, 56 ff.
99. "B.J." II, 13, 3, 254. For the *Lebanus* cf. Monigiano, "A.J."
II A, 1923, 2461.
100. Jos. "B.J." II, 13, 4, 260.
101. 5, 262. Cf. "Ac." 21, 38.
102. Jos. "B.J." II, 13, 7, 265. As Sherwin-WHITE (1953, 136) notes,
Cornelius, the centurion of the cohort Italica, appears to have been
a provincial, surrounded by relatives and friends ("Ac." 10, 24).
103. Jos. "A.J." xx, 8, 7, 176.
104. For *Porcius Festus*, cf. Lamberts, "A.J." xxi, 1953, 220 ff. (no. 36).

/105.

105. "Ac." 21, 31; 23, 25; 24, 22; "I.L.R."² c 917.
106. "Ac." 23, 23, and the lexicon of Bader-Arndt-Gingrich.
107. "Ac." 27, 1.
108. Jos. "B.J." 11, 14, 5, 291; "I.L.R."² I 72 : Jucundus is called an *ἐπίτροπος*. For this term applied to Romans cf. 19, 4, 551. For Sossius Florus, cf. Stein, "H.L." VII, 1910, 1325 ff. (no. 5).
109. Jos. "B.J." 11, 14, 6, 296; 332.
110. Cf. above, p. 100.
111. Jos. "B.J." 11, 17, 2, 408.
112. 17, 4, 421. We hear of *ἐπίτροπος* in the army of Agrippa operating at home (18, 6, 483).
113. 9, 500 f. For Atticchus and Bohannus, cf. above, p. 95.
114. 9, 52.
115. 19, 9, 555.
116. 7, 544. "I.L.R."² 351 identifies him with the Jucundus mentioned above, p. 107.
117. Jos. "B.J." III, 4, 1, 64 ff.; cf. IV, 10, 3, 598. Suetonius, however, ("Vesp." 4, 6) gives the number of alae as 8, and of cohorts as 10.
118. Titus had brought the Fifteenth from Alexandria : whether any auxiliaries accompanied it is not stated (cf. III, 1, 3, 5).
119. Momigliano's calculations (1934, I⁷, 71) make it likely that the ala Sebastenorum at least was quingenary.
120. Earlier Agrippa is said to have attended on Vespasian "with his whole army" (Jos. "B.J." III, 2, 4, 29).
121. For the phrase, cf. *ἐπὶ τῇ συντάξει* (1, 3, 8).
122. Flues, "H.L." XIV, 1, 28, 857 f. (no. 2). Forní, "Athen." 1958, 27, refers to a passage in the Talmud where it is said that 8000 Palmyrene archers were in the service of Rome during the wars of Vespasian. He identifies these with the force of Malchus.
123. *ἐπεὶ οὖν οἱ παλαιὸι ἐν τῇ πόλει ἔμενον ... οἱ δὲ οὐκ ἔμενον ἐν τῇ πόλει, ἀλλ' ἐν ταῖς μετέτοις τῶν δεσποτῶν ἀεὶ στρεφόμενοι, συγκινδυνεύοντες ἢ ἐν πολέμοις ὥς μὲν εἰπεῖν.*

ἀπὸ τινος ἀπὸ τῶν δεσποτῶν ἐκτιθεσθαι.

- For such soldiers' servants ("calones"), cf. v. Domaszewski, "R.E." III, 1897, 1362.
124. Jos. "B.J." III, 4, 1, 59. For Placidus, cf. Lambert, "R.E." XI, 1930, 1934 ff. (no. 1).
125. Jos. "B.J." III, 7, 1, 12. For Antinius, cf. "P.I.R."² n 796.
126. as Josephus himself says ("B.J." III, 8, 2, 120). Cf. above, p. 27 n 6.
127. 6, 2, 115 ff., and Thien on 120.
128. Josephus himself had been quite responsible for the Jewish defence of Galilee, and claims to have collected an army of over 100,000 men (II, 2, 6, 576).
129. III, 7, 5, 151 - the marksmen called *scytharii*.
130. 9, 168; 18, 211; cf. 30, 285.
131. 7, 3, 144; 9, 7, 443; IV, 1, 5, 36 ff. For Nebutius, cf. "P.I.R."² A 110.
132. Jos. "B.J." III, 10, 3, 431; "P.I.R."² A 877.
133. Jos. "B.J." III, 7, 31, 289. Cf. 7, 8, 458; 10, 3, 485 for Trajanus operating with smaller bodies of cavalry; R. Canalik, "R.E." Suppl. A, 1965, 1032 ff. (no. 1).
134. Jos. "B.J." III, 7, 31, 289; 10, 1, 470.
135. 7, 32, 310; IV, 9, 1, 405. A similar force of 3000 foot and 500 horse is found under the command of Placidus. When first mentioned, however (cf. n. 124 above), he was a *tribunus*, not a legionary legate. In IV, 1, 3, 57, he commands 600 horse.
136. III, 9, 7, 443 ff.
137. IV, 8, 1, 442. On a larger scale, Vespasian left garrisons *ἐν τῇ πόλει* in Jericho and Adida (Maditah) prior to his planned assault on Jerusalem in 68 (9, 1, 486).
138. LXX, 20, 7. For C. Calpurnius Piso, cf. "P.I.R."² C 293; Thomassen, 1960, II 29 f. (and I, 10 ff.).

139. "A." IV, 48. For P. Junius Silanus (Torquatus), cf. "P.I.L."² I 839, who, contra Romaneli, 1959, 247 ff., and Thomassen, 1962, II 28 f. (cf. I, 10 ff.), argue that Dio, and not Tacitus, is correct on the name of the governor.
140. For Ptolemy, cf. above, p. 16.
141. "P.I.L." 634. For Hedman, cf. "P.I.L."² A 112.
142. Jos. "B.J." II, 17, 7, 494; Schur, 1923, 1963, 100.
143. Tac. "A." I, 70; Thomassen, 1962, II, 39 f.
144. Cf. Schur, 1923, 1963, 40 ff.
145. "J.R.S." 1959, 36 ff., referring to Aug. Milan 40.
146. 1964 - , vol. II, 53.
147. Suet. "Cal." 55, 3. Cf. above, p. 90. Suetonius uses the plural. Dio (LX, 23, 2) speaks of ~~the tribune who was~~ ^{the tribune} ~~the tribune~~ ^{the tribune} Josephus ("A.J." XIX, 1, 15, 122) names this Gabinus, who had been a gladiator, ~~the tribune~~ ^{the tribune} over the guard at the death of Calpurnius. Feldman ad loc. regards him as a Thracian, but says that ~~the tribune~~ ^{the tribune} cannot be a technical term equivalent to "tribunus militum".
148. Suet. "Cal." 55, 3; Jos. "A.J." XIX, 1, 15, 119 ff.; cf. Dio LX, 30, 16.
149. Tac. "Ann." XIII, 18; Suet. "Cal." 34, 1.
150. 41, 2: "Insculptus senescens milites Gallus ab equite R. oppressum trahi crinibus". The revolt of Vindex will be discussed in the next chapter.
151. "Cl." 25, 1; Smilde ad loc.
152. Cf. Bosigliano, 1931, 1964, 47 f.; Cheesman, 90; von Domaszewski, 1906, 1967, 122; 129; xxxv.
153. On these, cf. ^{above} below, p. 6.
154. C.I.L. XVI, 2, with Henzen ad loc. for the date; Kraft, 1911. For the Carnacates, cf. Vatsch, "P.I.L." IV, 198, 145.
155. C.I.L. XVI, 3. 5 also are mentioned, but only these 3 names have survived.

/156.

196. C.I.L. XVI, 4, supplying a consular date, the province and the governor under whom the regiments served. For the Astures, cf. Rübner, "Z.S." 12, 1896, 1895 ff.; Callaeci, III, 1897, 1896 ff.; Lucenses, Schulten, XIII, 1927, 170 (no. 1).
197. C.I.L. XVI, 5. XVI, 6, of 54 - 55 A.D., is very fragmentary and supplies no regimental names.
198. I.L.S. 781; for the *Legio IV*, cf. "I.L.S." C 191; for *lustuarius*, Kraft, 191; for the *Varciani*, E. *seria*, "Z.S." VIII A, 1903, 303 ff.

VII. FROM GALBA TO VESPASIAN.

The revolt of Vindex¹, which led to the fall of Nero, broke out early in 68. Vindex, himself of Gallic descent, was governor of Gallia Lugdunensis. His forces are said to have numbered 150,000 men². The tribes who supported him were the Aedui, Arverni and Sequani³. Vienna (Vienne) was accused by Lugdunum (Lyons) - both Roman colonies, but of differing origins - of having supported Vindex⁴. There may have been other support for the revolt, but it is not recorded. The figure of 150,000 seems excessive, and Hainsworth⁵ would explain it as a somewhat exaggerated estimate of the strength of the legions and auxiliaries of the army of upper and lower Germany. In the event, according to Plutarch⁶, 20,000 Gauls fell.

Verginius Rufus, legate of the forces of Upper Germany that crushed Vindex, had Batavian cavalry and Belgians among his auxiliaries⁷. Two Gallic peoples, the Treveri and the Lingones⁸, supported him, but whether this means that they supplied extra "auxilia" is not known.

Galba, then governor of Hispania Tarraconensis, accepted leadership of the revolt and was proclaimed emperor in April, 68, before the defeat of Vindex. Verginius Rufus' troops then called the rebels "Galbiciani"⁹, thereby implying that they had more respectable opponents to deal with than the followers of a rebel Gaul. In Tarraconensis Galba had 1 legion, 2 alae and 3 cohorts, according to Suetonius¹⁰, and he then set about conscripting further legions and auxiliaries. In fact only one legion was formed, which

/Tacitus

Tacitus calls the "septima Calbiana"¹¹, normally in contexts where it could be confused with the "septima Claudiana". Among the auxiliaries we hear of "vasconum lectae a Galba cohortes"¹² when they were sent to Upper Germany. Otho, then governor of Lusitania, joined Galba at the outset¹³, but nothing is stated about the troop movements involved.

On his arrival in Rome in the autumn of 68, Galba found the city full of troops being levied or transferred for the expeditions or crises of Nero's last months. Tacitus describes the non-praetorian and non-urban forces as follows: "inducta legione hispana, remanente ea quam e classe Nero conscripserat, plena urbs exercitu insolito; multi ad hoc numeri e Germania ac Britannia et Illyrico, quos idem Nero electos ... reuocauerat"¹⁴. The "Spanish legion", as noted above, was the legion that accompanied Galba from Spain. It would have been either the new Seventh or the old Sixth. The "legion which Nero had conscripted from the fleet" later appears as "legio classica" and "prima adiutrix"¹⁵. The "numeri" were detachments drawn from the armies stationed in the areas named. Saxon¹⁶ is of the opinion that they consisted mainly of legionaries. But when Galba was threatened by Otho and appealed to them for support, they are referred to as "legiones ... et auxilia"¹⁷. Further, Otho sent "Sulpicius Florus e Britannicis cohortibus, nuper a Galba ciuitate donatus" to murder the man whom Galba had adopted as his heir¹⁸. "Cohortes" on occasion can mean legionary cohorts, but Sulpicius Florus (Galba belonged to the gens Sulpicia) could not have been a legionary, otherwise he would already have possessed citizenship. The "Britannicæ cohortes", therefore, must mean auxiliary cohorts previously stationed in Britain and forming part of the "numeri e ... Britannia". The

/German

German detachment is later described as "Germanici exercitus milites", "Germanici milites" and "Germanica vexilla"¹⁹. "Vexillum"²⁰ has three senses that could be appropriate here: auxiliary cavalry, veterans in reserve, and detachment. It is obvious from the equation just quoted that the last sense is the correct one, and that "Germanici exercitus milites" is being used anachronistically or broadly; for "Pannonici ... legio exercitus milites" are equated with "electos Illyrici exercitus"²¹. Saxer's view cannot stand, and the "numeri" must be regarded as part legionary. "Germanici exercitus milites" are equated with "electos Illyrici exercitus"²¹. Saxer's view cannot stand, and the "numeri" must be regarded as part legionary, part auxiliary. That they were so argues for a close link between the two arms, and a high degree of professional organization on the part of the auxiliaries concerned. An action of Calba's after his entry into Rome should be noted: he decided to disband the German "corpora custodes" of Nero, sending the men back home without a bounty: Suetonius²² refers to the corps as "Germanorum cohortes".

After staging his proclamation as emperor on the Rhine on January 1st, 69 A.D., Vitellius' supporters mobilized their forces for an invasion of Italy. Key communities in the area - the "Agrippinenses, Treviri, Lingones" - offered enthusiastic support in the form of "auxilia equorum arma pecuniae"²³. It is hard to know whether tribal auxiliaries can be understood or not. The Agrippinenses were the inhabitants of a Roman colony (now Cologne) and hence entitled to serve in the legions, but they may represent the surrounding Ubians, still auxiliary material. The Treverans could serve as auxiliaries, although their chief town was also a colony (now Trier).

/The

The Lingones were still partly peregrine : Otho granted the whole "ciuitas" citizenship. In any case, it is not clear whether this offer was accepted, and, if so, whether contingents of these peoples were included in the large number of Gallic auxiliaries that supported Vitellius in Italy. Governors of neighbouring provinces threw their weight in with Vitellius. Of the governor of Gallia Lugdunensis we are told that he had the "ala Iaurana" and the "Italica legio" at Lugdunum : these were both shortly withdrawn²⁴. It is possible that the ala formed part of the invasion force. Tacitus' description of this is as follows : "valenti interioris exercitus electi cum aquila quintae legionis et cohortibus aliis, ad quadraginta milia armatarum data; triginta milia caecina e superiore Germania ducunt, quorum robur legio anetuiensis fuit. addita Germanorum auxilia, a quibus Vitellius suis quoque copiis suppluit ..." ²⁵. Unfortunately the total of 70,000 ²⁶ cannot be broken down into specific legionary and auxiliary proportions on the evidence of this statement. But there is a contrast implied between the regular cohorts and alae and the "Germanorum auxilia". Later there is a reference to "transrhenanos" ²⁷, mentioned at the crossing of the Rh. These German "auxilia" or "transrhenani" must have been allied contingents supplied by free Germans. Heubner ²⁸ would place the "Batavi" mentioned at the Rh in the same category. But the "octo Batavorum cohortes, quartae decimae legionis auxilia" ²⁹ on their way from Italy to Britain who joined Vitellius when his revolt was known - , probably the Batavians referred to. They would have been more professional than allied German contingents

/at

at this stage. It is not clear whether they are to be regarded as part of, or in addition to, the 72,000 named above.

Some details on the composition of the "auxilia" assigned to Valens and Decina can be recovered as the narrative proceeds. Thus "Gallorum Lusitanorumque et Britannorum cohortes et Germanorum uexilla cum ala Petriana"³⁰ were sent into Italy ahead of the main forces. The cohorts require no comment, except to note that this is the first reference to British ones. The sense of "uexilla" has caused disagreement. Since "alae" (in the plural) is used in reference to these forces in the next sentence, and only one ala, the Petriana, is named, it has been thought³¹ that "uexillum" here means "ala". But this cannot be pressed: other unnamed alae such as the ala Siliana may have been meant. However, it is best to interpret the phrase in the light of what has gone before rather than in the light of what follows. As we have seen, "Germanorum auxilia" were included in the invasion force. The "Germanorum uexilla" here must mean detachments of these. They were probably cavalry, since they are closely associated with the Petriana, but certainly not properly organized Roman alae, as argued above. On the march to Italy Valens had to divert part of his forces to protect Gallia Narbonensis from an attack by Otho's fleet. The auxiliaries involved comprised "duas Iungorum cohortis, quattuor equitum turmas, uniuersam Ircuorum alam cum Iulio Classico praefecto"³². A quingenary ala appears to have been divided into 16 "turmae"; hence the 4 "turmae" of cavalry represented a quarter of a regiment. In describing the fighting between the Vitellians and the Othonians at Placentia

/(Placenza), ...

(Piacenza), Tacitus singles out the "cohortis Germanorum, cantu truci et more patrio nudis corporibus super umeros scuta quantientium"³³. The question arises, whether these German "cohorts" can be regarded as regular regiments like the Tungrian cohorts just mentioned. The strong emphasis placed on their "ancestral" mode of entering into battle makes this unlikely. They are rather to be classified among the "Germanorum auxilia" referred to in the original description of the invading force³⁴. "Cohort" must be used here in a tactical, not a professional sense. It is likely that at least 2 of the cohorts accompanying Valens were Gallic, to judge from a fight between a Gallic auxiliary and a legionary that Tacitus describes in connection with a feast which Vitellius gave for Verginius Rufus in North Italy after the battle of Bedriacum. It is true that the Gallic auxiliary may have accompanied Vitellius rather than the original invasion force to Italy. But the dispute arose with a soldier of the Fifth legion, which was part of Valens' force. Accordingly it seems preferable to consider the Gaul as one of Valens' auxiliaries. To avenge the defeat of their comrade by the Gaul, the legionaries then cut 2 cohorts to pieces. Probably both were Gallic³⁵. We are told that, after the defeat of Otho, Vitellius decided to send the Gallic auxiliaries home: "reddita ciuitatibus Gallorum auxilia, ingens numerus et prima statim defectione inter inania belli adsumptus"³⁶. From this it would appear that he had enlisted a very large number of Gauls at the very outset of his revolt. (The phrase "inter inania belli" implies that they were of little value.) whether the men included those offered by the

/Agrippinenses, ...

Agrippinenses, Treverans and Lingones in the incident discussed above, cannot be decided. It is interesting that they were returned to their home tribes ("ciuitatibus"). This implies discharge, rather than continuance as professional auxiliaries. Here it is instructive to compare the German "auxilia" of the invasion force. They were of far greater military value, although technically called "socii", than hastily drafted provincials. For these to become professional "auxilia" a long training was necessary.

The "auxilia" of the invasion force may now be said to include, from the army of Lower Germany

1 Treveran ala,

2 Tungrian cohorts,

3 Gallic cohorts³⁷ (in all likelihood),

6 Batavian cohorts, all of which appear to have followed Valens to Italy³⁸;

and from the army of Upper Germany

an ala Petriana,

British,

Gallic, and

Lusitanian cohorts,

1 Thracian cohort (in all probability)³⁹.

The allied German contingents and the "raw" Gauls (7).

The allied German contingents are mentioned with the latter branch of the

/Vitellian

Vitellian forces, but were probably to be found in the other half as well. If the "raw" Gauls did not accompany Vitellius on his march into Italy, they were probably found in both halves of the invasion force.

Before proceeding to the major fighting in North Italy, it will be of use to consider some of the incidents en route in more detail. Caecina's passage to Italy was blocked by the Helvetians, still unaware of Calpa's death. The cause of their resistance was the seizure of money intended for local defence by some nearby legionaries: "rapuerant pecunias quas in stipendium castelli quod olim Helvetii suis militibus ac stipendiis tuebantur"⁴⁶. The Helvetian "milites" must have been entirely under local control. They are commonly regarded as a local militia. The Helvetians mobilized rapidly, but were caught between Caecina and the auxiliaries in Raetia whom he had ordered to attack the Helvetians in the rear. These appear as "Raetiae alae cohortesque et ipsorum Raetorum iuventus, sueta arsis et more militum exercita". The defeat of the Helvetians is then described in the words "ac statim innixa cohorte Thraecum depulsi et consecantibus Germanis Raetisque ... trucidati"⁴⁷. "Raetiae" here must mean "stationed in Raetia", whether consisting of Raetians or not. The "cohors Thraecum" may have been part of the German or the Raetian army. The Raetian "youth" who were militarily prepared co-operated with the Germans ("consecantibus Germanis Raetisque" - presumably from the "Germanorum auxilia" of Caecina) in slaughtering the fleeing Helvetians. It would be interesting to know whether these Raetians were a standing local militia, operating with

/Roman

Roman permission, as in the case of the Helvetian garrison under discussion, or whether they were a purely tribal organization. The first alternative appears the more likely⁴². Cassius was threatened by the procurator of Noricum who drew his auxiliaries together to oppose his coming into his province. These troops Tacitus loosely calls "Noricum"⁴³, but must be thinking of "auxilia Norica", i.e., auxiliaries stationed in Noricum, whether of Norican origin or not. As noted above, Cassius sent various auxiliary formations ahead into Italy to strengthen the ala Miliana, whose accession to the Vitellian cause he had heard of while among the Helvetians. Their connection with Vitellius in Africa has already been noted: at present they were still in north Italy, where they had been marooned on their way to join the expedition against Vindex. It was particularly their desertions who instigated their change of sides. Tacitus further tells us that they won over 4 important Transpadane "municipia" (including Mediolanum, now Milan) for Vitellius. It is true that their influence was heightened because they happened to be the only military force in a "latissima Italiae pars", but even so, the incident is a striking comment on the increasing importance of the professional auxiliaries⁴⁴.

Meanwhile the procurator of the Maritime Alps was trying to hold his province against an attack by the Attonians. He had to use local material only, called "montani" by Tacitus. The "iuventus" of the tribe, however, proved unequal to warfare against the soldiers of Vindex⁴⁵. The

/2 Hungarian

- 100 -

2 auxiliary cohorts, the Treveran ala and the 4 squadrons of cavalry which Valens sent to Carboneae could have already been mentioned. Tacitus later refers to the 2 cohorts in the phrase "Tungrarum cohortium", using the adjectival form, and "Tungrorum"⁴⁶. This detachment from Valens' army was supported by local "auxilia" - "adiuncta Ligurum cohors, uetus loci auxilium, et quingenti Pannonii, nondum sub signis"⁴⁷. From the run of the sentence, it would seem natural to take the 500 Pannonians as part of the local "auxilia", like the Ligurian cohort. But there seems little reason for stationing Pannonians in this area under normal circumstances, and it is more probable to regard the Pannonians as recruits for a quingenary cohort, presumably en route to a frontier army. This would be an early instance of auxiliaries being sent from their home area before their period of training. In the actual battle which follows, the Vitellians were able to use "alpinos", presumably local levies from the Maritime Alps smarting under their earlier defeat by the Othonians. On their side on this occasion the praetorians were supported by "pars classicorum mixtis paganis" : cf. "ante ad faciendum ... paganorum manus" who hurled rocks down on the Vitellian "circumscripturae turmae"⁴⁸. In other words marines from the fleet were assisted by the local population using a natural technique in a hilly area. The forces of Otho proved to be the victors. As a result of this Corsica remained true to Otho, but its governor tried to win it over for Vitellius. He called the "principes insulae" together, and, after cowering opposition, proceeded to hold a levy. But the "inconditi homines" so enlisted rebelled against the discipline of military training, and argued that even where

/Corsica

Corsica had been protected by cohorts and also it had been ravaged by the fleet. They succeeded in assassinating the governor⁴⁹. Once again, a picture emerges of a professional core supplemented by local levies in an emergency.

Reference has already been made to the auxiliaries sent on ahead to Italy to join the ala Siliana. These forces captured a "Pannoniorum cohors" and cut off "centum equites ac mille classicai"⁵⁰. Neubner⁵¹ regards the Pannonian cohort as part of the detachment of the German army that Nero had planned to send to Alexandria but had later recalled to Italy for the uprising of Vindex, like the ala Siliana. The marines from the fleet are self-explanatory: it is however not clear whether the 100 cavalry were auxiliary or not. When Decimus attacked Placentia (Piacenza), his legionaries were accompanied by a "parsa auxiliorum manus". Arrows are named among the weapons used in the assault, but there is no indication that there was a "cohors sagittaria" involved. German cohorts receive special mention: as noted above, "cohorts" here should be taken in a tactical sense. Although Vindex's Decimus was joined by several "classici" and "Julius Brigranticus cum paucis equitum ... praefectus alae in Batavis genitus"⁵². Julius Brigranticus was a Batavian, but it is not stated that the troops whom he commanded at this juncture were Batavians. As Neubner remarks, the "few cavalry" with whom he defected were part of the (Rhodian) garrison of 5 praetorian cohorts, 1000 legionaries and cavalry mentioned in an earlier chapter⁵³. What their

/nationality

nationality was cannot be decided. After being worsted at Placentia, Caecina withdrew to Cremona. In the vicinity his auxiliaries were defeated by gladiators whom an Othonian commander had transported across the Po in boats⁵⁴. In the same area (at a place called ad Ostores) Caecina placed his "ferocissimos auxiliarios" in ambush: the 2 Othonian commanders divided the infantry and the cavalry between themselves. Behind these came, on the left, a detachment of the Thirteenth Legion, 4 auxiliary cohorts and 500 cavalry; in the centre 3 praetorian cohorts; on the right the First Legion with 2 auxiliary cohorts and 500 horse. In the reserve were "ex praetorio auxiliisque milibus equites"⁵⁵. The emphasis on the cavalry is notable. There is the initial group, under one of the commanders, 1000 on the left and the right of the main body, and 1000 in reserve. The fact that the reserve group consisted of cavalry from the praetorian guard and from the auxiliaries is also notable: the incident shows how intimate a part of the army the auxiliary cavalry was. One may also observe that where the number of legionaries differed on the two wings, auxiliary troops (4 cohorts to 2) were used to balance the two sections. So in the case of the cavalry, so the infantry auxiliaries are increasingly being used on the same terms as the legionaries. In passing Tacitus records the sounding of "rex Epiphanes, insignis pro Othone pugnam clens"⁵⁶. Epiphanes' father was the last king of Commagene: we do not know whether he was commanding a contingent of Commagenians or, which appears more likely, fighting in the Othonian forces in an individual capacity.

Attention now turns to Valens, worried about the position of

/verbonese

Marbonense Gaul and the growing moralliness of the Batavian cohorts (associated with the Fourteenth Legion) that were now with him in North Italy, as we have seen. Valens decided to send "partem Batavorum" to assist the troops he had left behind in Narbonensis. When this was announced "maerere socii, fremere legiones". The reason for the legionaries' discontent was: "horbari ac fortissimorum virorum auxilio": "ueteros illos et tot bellorum victores" were being removed: it was like cutting the strongest limbs off a body! In the ensuing riot Valens was forced to disguise himself as a slave and take refuge with a "securione equitum"⁵⁷. The strength and importance of the auxiliaries are apparent not only to the commanders, but also to the common legionary.

Tacitus described in some detail a clash around an island in the Rhine between Otho's gladiators and the Vitellians⁵⁸. The Vitellian troops involved are called "Germani" and their effective swimming is noted. They showed more firmness than the gladiators and are then honoured with the appellation "milites". When describing the battle of Bedriacum itself, Tacitus reports the opportune arrival of "recenti auxilio" for the Vitellians in these words: "Varus affertur cum Batavis, fusa gladiatorum manu, quam navibus transvectas oppositas cohortes in ipso flumine trucidaverant"⁵⁹. These three elements - "Germani, Batavi, cohortes" - appear in Plutarch's biography of Otho as Γερμανοὶ⁶⁰ and τοὶ δὲ ποταμιοὶ ... ἀνέβησαν πλοῖον ... most of the gladiators fell into the river, into the hands of cohorts stationed there:

auxilium, duo milia gladiatorum". Whether the "classicorum ingens numerus"⁶⁴ which he had in his own entourage is to be distinguished from the "legion" just mentioned is not clear. The loss of 10 cavalry and 1000 "classici" near Placentia has already been noted, as well as the fate of the 2000 gladiators. The numbers of auxiliary regiments involved at the battle of "ad Castores" have also been seen : they do not form a basis for calculating the whole auxiliary force. As far as the actual names of regiments are concerned, there is nothing except for two of very doubtful value. "rex Epiphanes" has been discussed already, and we also have a mention of Otho's use of a "citus equo Numida"⁶⁵, but this Numidian is more likely to have been a private courier than an auxiliary. Then two also from the Danubian armies were credited with a significant role in the battle, but their names are not known⁶⁶. Before leaving the conflict between Otho and Vitellius, it will be interesting to note various rhetorical references to the "auxilia" involved. These occur mainly in the speeches which Tacitus put in the mouths of the protagonists. Vitellius is assured that "Germanorum auxilia"⁶⁷ will follow him to Italy : no others are mentioned in the passage concerned. Otho is made to stigmatize his troops as "Germani" in a sentence that implies that he had unlimited "Germani" at his disposal. This is immediately qualified, or contradicted, by "nationes aliquas" - a few tribes ! It is clear that the legionaries themselves are to be tarred with the German brush : for Otho opposes the "Italiae alumni et Romana ... iuventus"⁶⁸, the "true sons of Italy and Rome" to Vitellius' men. Otho's troops are made to call Vitellius' army

/"peregrinum

"peregrinus et externus"⁶⁹. When disparaged, the Germans, admitted to be the strongest element in Vitellius' forces ("quod genus militum apud hostis atrocissimum sit"), are said not to have been able to withstand the relaxing climate of Italy⁷⁰. Neutral terms, however, appear in a favourable passage. Vitellius is invited to admire the part played by his soldiers at the battle of Bedriacum in the phrase: "hinc inrupisse legionum agmen, hinc equites coortes, inde circumfusas auxiliorum manus"⁷¹. It is clear that, when the foreignness or "Germaneness" of troops is being stressed, allowance must be made for prejudice and rhetoric.

The preparations of the Flavians may be considered next. Tacitus states that Mucianus and Vespasian had 7 legions between them in the East and "auxilia utrique cohortium alarumque et classes regesque"⁷². The accession of Egypt increased the legions to 9: the auxiliary strength remained unspecified: "classium alarum cohortium robora et fidissimi reges"⁷³. Certain of the kings are then named: Sohaemus of Sophene with "haud spernenda uiribus", Antiochus of Commagene and Agrippa with his sister Berenice⁷⁴. Levies were held: since Vespasian is said to have bestowed "praefecturae" or commands in auxiliary regiments on many, it can be supposed that auxiliaries as well as legionaries were enlisted⁷⁵. Diplomatic arrangements were concluded with Armenia and Parthia to secure peace on the Eastern Frontier. After he had heard of the successful outcome of the battle of Cremona, Vespasian received an offer of assistance from Vologeses of Parthia. This was now no longer necessary: it would be interesting to know what Vespasian's reaction would have been if the offer

/had

had come earlier. Tacitus reports the incident as follows: "aderant legati regis Vologuesi quadraginta milia Parthorum equitum offerentes. magnificum laetuzque tantis sociorum auxiliis ambiri neque indigere"⁷⁶. In Suetonius, however, the 4,000 Parthians appear as "quadraginta milia sagittariorum"⁷⁷. They were, therefore, mounted archers of the usual Parthian type, but Tacitus and Suetonius refer to only one of their military characteristics. In the event the forces of the East were hardly involved in the civil war, apart from the comparatively small portion that accompanied Lucianus to Italy. Both Tacitus and Josephus merely mention infantry and cavalry⁷⁸. In general however it may be remarked that, as in the West, so in the East, the auxiliaries are associated with the legionaries on a completely professional basis. The crisis brought a search for extra forces: where Vitellius turned to the free German tribes, Vespasian approached the "servientes reges"⁷⁹ and even Parthia, if his embassy to them was instructed to make a request for the troops which they appear to have offered of their own accord in the accounts of the Roman authors.

The Flavian attack on Italy was spearheaded by Antonius Priscus⁸⁰. The force by which he was accompanied consisted of "vexillaria e cohortibus et partes equitum"⁸¹; in a speech urging the invasion he had referred especially to the cavalry at the disposal of the Flavians: "duae tunc" (at the battle of Bedriacum) "annonicae ac Moesicae alae percurrere hostes: nunc oedecim alarum coniuncta signa ... superfundent oblitos proeliorum equites equosque"⁸². The emphasis on cavalry is evident: the Flavian strength is said to lie in it⁸³. Further, as Vitellius had turned

/to

to the free Germans and Vespasian to the client kings of the East, the Flavian leaders in Pannonia turned to the peoples across the Danube. The chiefs of the Sarmatian Iazyges were "in commilitium adacti"⁸⁴. Since their offer of "plebem ... et uia equitum, qua sola ualent" was rejected for security reasons, the implication of the phrase is not clear. The chiefs could hardly have been expected to fight without their followers, so that they must be regarded as non-participating allies. However Sido and Italicus, "reges Sueborum" who were also induced to support the Flavian faction, later appear fighting in Italy "cum delectis popularium"⁸⁵. The governor of Raetia remained true to Vitellius, "auxilia" were detached to oppose him. These "auxilia" are defined as "ala Aurianna et octo cohortes ex Noricorum iuuentus"⁸⁶, presumably a local militia supporting a professional auxiliary force. What part of these forces accompanied Antonius cannot be determined.

When detailing the troops that came to the support of Antonius from the commands of Pannonia and Moesia, Tacitus concentrates on the legions⁸⁷. At the battle of Cremona itself, the position of the auxiliaries is given after that of the legions: "cohortes auxiliorum in cornibus, latera ac terga equite circumdata; Sido atque Italicus Suebi cum delectis popularium primori in acie uersabantur"⁸⁸. Before passing to the Vitellian troops, some individual incidents should be noted. Before the battle of Cremona, Antonius gave his auxiliaries a foretaste of plundering: "auxiliares cohortes in Cremona: ex agris missae ut specie

/parandarum

parandurus copiarum ciuili praeda miles imbueretur: ipse cum quattuor
milibus equitum ad octauum a Bedriaco progressus quo licentius popularentur.
exploratores, ut mos est, longius curabant"⁸⁹. Once again, the
association with cavalry should be noted: the numbers involved are large.
But on the human side, Tacitus' use of the "ciuili praeda miles imbueretur"
is striking. There is not here the obvious contrast between Roman citizens
and auxiliary troops of non-Roman origin, otherwise "barbarum" or "externus"
might have been used. "Miles" in its place seems to imply that Tacitus is
avoiding the obvious comment to assimilate the auxiliary and the legionary
soldier. It was military indiscipline in the last resort that had led to
the deplorable incident: hence "miles" for auxiliary. The foray was
interrupted by the unexpected appearance of the enemy. This led to a number
of cavalry skirmishes⁹⁰. Two of the Vitellian legions "laeto inter initia
equitum suorum proelio"⁹¹: the adjective "suorum" implies that the cavalry
involved was associated with the legions, but cannot be generalized to mean
that legions always had cavalry attached to them. The Vitellian legions
failed to take the initiative, and the Flavians attacked: "nutantes scien-
(of the Vitellians) uictor equitatus (of the Flavians) incurrens: et
Vipstanus Messala tribunus cum Messala auxiliaribus asequitur, quos multi
e legionariis quamquam raptim ductos nequabant: ita mixtus pedes equesque
rupere legionum agmen". The initiatory and decisive role of the cavalry,
referred to in the stylistic variant "uictor equitatus", is again apparent.
Vipstanus Messala's auxiliaries are referred to by the army from which they
came rather than by their regimental names. In the attack on the Vitellian

camp after the actual battle of Cremona, Antonius is found acting "cum delectis auxiliariis" which in Josephus are called cavalry⁹². Antonius presents the interesting spectacle of a Roman legionary commander consistently choosing to lead the auxiliary cavalry in battle.

While Caecina and Valens were engaged in Italy, Vitellius was levying troops in Gaul and receiving reinforcements from Britain⁹³. Only legionaries are mentioned. When Vitellius reached Italy and joined up with Caecina and Valens, he sent various troops back. These included Gauls and the 8 cohorts of Batavians already mentioned⁹⁴. Now that his position was secure, he attempted to reduce the size of his forces: "amputari legionum auxiliorumque numeros iubet utitis supplementis; et praescae missiones offerebantur"⁹⁵. Whole regiments were not cashiered: it was their effective strength only that was affected. We are next informed that 60,000 "armati" followed Vitellius into Rome: the division between legionary and auxiliary is not given. An even larger number of "calones" and "lixae" followed the army itself⁹⁶. The formal entry into Rome is described as follows: "quattuor legionum aquilae per frontem totidemque circa e legionibus aliae vexilla, mox duodecim alarum signa et post peditum ordines eque; dein quattuor et triginta cohortes, ut nomina gentium aut species armorum forent, discretae"⁹⁷. This passage affords indications regarding army strength. Unfortunately the "vexilla" provide an element of uncertainty. They are usually regarded as detachments of the 4 legions that had remained in Germany⁹⁸. Since it is known that the strength of these legions was greatly depleted, it may safely

the

be assumed that the detachments that had been drawn from them were of the larger kind, i.e., 2000 rather than 1000 strong in each case. Hence a total of 8000 is arrived at. But there still remains the problem of the 8000 men whom Vitellius had brought from Britain: these are listed among the forces whom Cassius took to Cremona⁹⁹, but appear to be ignored here. The total, 8000, causes difficulty in itself. Sauer¹⁰⁰ explains the figure as 6000 legionaries and 2000 auxiliaries, since there were 3 legions in Britain at this stage. But Vitellius sent the Fourteenth back to Britain. This inclines one to suggest that he may have regarded the paper strength of the British army as 4 legions, and so arranged the 8000 men under 4 "uexilla". This is not to deny that there may have been detachments of auxiliaries from the British army, but Tacitus is probably ignoring them in these two contexts. Taking the 4 "uexilla" as legionary, the following break-down of the army at the Milvian Bridge can be given:

4 legions	up to 24,000
4 legionary "uexilla"	up to 8,000
Total legionaries	<u>32,000</u>
12 alae (if quingenary)	6,000
36 cohorts (if quingenary)	<u>17,000</u>
	<u>23,000</u>

These figures must be treated with caution: as already noted, regiments were below strength. The auxiliaries however form less than three quarters of the total. The grand total falls short of the 60,000 "armati" noted

/above

above by 500¹⁰⁰⁴. Finally it is interesting to note that the auxiliaries are classified under two heads: tribal affiliation or weapons borne. Once they were in Rome, the troops deteriorated rapidly. Tacitus singles out the decline in health of the "Germanorum Gallorumque"¹⁰¹: these are probably blanket terms referring to several of the professional auxiliary regiments. There was also a wholesale interchange between newly created urban troops, legions and auxiliaries¹⁰².

On the announcement of the defection of Vespasian, Vitellius ordered fresh reinforcements from Germany, Britain and Spain¹⁰³. In a speech referring to this Antonius Primus is made to say (after mentioning Germany and Britain) that Gaul and Spain would provide "men horses and tribute"¹⁰⁴ to the Vitellian cause. These provinces provided recruits for the legions, but it is fair to surmise that, since horses are mentioned, auxiliaries were also in question, especially for the cavalry. Unfortunately in describing the army that set out under Caecina from Rome to oppose the Flavians, Tacitus concentrates on the legions involved, just mentioning the cavalry and "electa auxilia"¹⁰⁵. At the battle of Cremona they are referred to merely in the words "equum auxiliaque"¹⁰⁶. Prior to the battle "tria Vitellianae cohortes et ala, cui Sabaziana nomen"¹⁰⁷ were worsted by the Flavians at Forum Alerii (Legnano?). When Lucilius Bassus, prefect of the fleet at Ravenna (a post to which he was promoted after holding the prefecture of an ala) defected to Vespasian, he was taken to Atria (Adria) for detention by a prefect of an ala who was garrisoning

/the

the town¹⁰⁸. Presumably other auxiliary regiments were performing similar functions elsewhere in the war zone of north Italy. After Cremona, the Flavians decided to send two defeated Vitellian supporters to announce their victory in Gaul. One was Alpinus Montanus, a Treveran who was a prefect of a cohort¹⁰⁹. Unfortunately the nationality of his cohort is not stated.

In the period between the battle of Cremona and the occupation of Rome by the Flavians, a succession of troop movements and minor engagements occurred which merit some attention. Fabius Valens, who was not present at the battle of Cremona, requested assistance from Rome on hearing of the defeat of the Vitellians. Vitellius sent him "tres cohortes cum ala Britannica"¹¹⁰, a force exactly parallel in size to that worsted at Forum Alerii. To judge by its name, the ala Britannica must have been stationed in Britain at some stage, but whether it came directly from there or from a period of service on the Rhine cannot be established. The next report concerns the arrival of a legion from Dalmatia with new recruits: "sex milia Dalmatarum, recens dilectus"¹¹¹. It is probable that these were intended for auxiliary service, since they accepted enrolment into the Ravennate fleet, whose men were clamouring for service in the legions, many successfully. When discussing Lucilius Bassus, Tacitus¹¹² had stated that a great number of its sailors consisted of Dalmatians and Caemonians in the first instance. Antonius Primus eventually decided to leave the bulk of the legions in North Italy, while he advanced southwards with auxiliary infantry and cavalry and detached legionaries¹¹³. The force which Vitellius

/sent

sent from Rome to hold the Apennines against the Flavian approach consisted of 14 cohorts of the praetorian guard, "omnes equitum alae" and "6 classicis legio"¹¹⁴. But Vitellius' resources appear to have been drying up: when the defection of the fleet at Misenum to Vespasian was announced, the forces which he despatched against it consisted of an urban cohort and gladiators¹¹⁵, a favourite recruiting ground for the urban based. When this force defected as well, Vitellius sent his brother, L. Vitellius, to Campania with "6 cohorts and 500 cavalry"¹¹⁶. These were probably praetorian, since Vitellius had recalled part of his forces from the Apennines¹¹⁷, and is more likely to have assigned these to his brother than "cohortes vigilum" or urban cohorts. The cavalry may have been either praetorian or auxiliary. Vitellius then proceeded to enlist men from the Roman "plebs" and from slaves¹¹⁸: he was faced with fighting on two fronts simultaneously, against the rebel fleet which had established itself at Tarracina (Terracina), and against the Flavian force advancing across the Apennines towards Rome. The success of L. Vitellius at Tarracina, and his surrender after the death of his brother in Rome, need not detain us, except to note that the Flavians sent cavalry ahead of the legions along the route which he would take to Rome as a precaution. Later they sent Lucilius Bassus with some light armed cavalry to restore order in Campania¹¹⁹. Antonius Irius had little difficulty in his advance on Rome. However Petilius Cerialis, who had been sent on ahead with a force of 1000 cavalry to make a diversionary attack on Rome, suffered a surprise defeat in which the prefect of an ala was captured¹²⁰. A final incident involving what was possibly an auxiliary soldier is that in which "obuius e germanicis militibus"¹²¹ appeared to aim a blow at Vitellius

/just

just before he was killed. As the phrase stands, the soldier could have been a legionary or an auxiliary from the German army units that had accompanied Vitellius to Rome. Dio however calls him *ἐκ τῆς γερμανικῆς*, definitely suggesting an auxiliary (or a member of the German bodyguard). When Nicianus arrived in Rome, he attempted to curb the power of Antonius Prianus. One of his measures was the generous granting of military tribunates and auxiliary prefectures to his close supporters, another was to despatch the Seventh Legion, that worshipped Antonius, away from Rome. Other legionary movements are reported, but in no instance do the "auxilia" receive mention¹²².

Local incidents and provincial matters may now be considered. While Vitellius was in Lugdunum on his way to Italy, a revolt broke out among a small section of the *Usule*, the *Boisae*¹²³. Their prophet-leader, Mariccus, succeeded in obtaining assistance from Vitellius in crushing the uprising: "*grauissima ciuitas the electa iuuentute, adiectis a Vitellio cohortibus, fanaticum multitudinem assistit disiecit*". The cohorts of Vitellius were presumably auxiliary. Of interest is the ease with which Mariccus could gather an armed force in the proximity of a strong Roman army, and the apparently independent action of the *Usule*. Their "iuuentus" must have been under training to have been so readily available.

The Batavian Revolt was on a completely different scale. In his

/introduction . . .

introduction to this subject, Tacitus gives a brief account of the Batavians and their relation to Rome. They did not pay taxes, being required only to supply men and arms. Experts at swimming, they could even cross rivers under arms and keep hold of their horses. "uiros tantum araque imperio ministrant, illi Germanicis bellis exerciti, non aucta per Britanniam gloria, transmissis illius comitibus, quas uetere instituto nobilissimam populi regebant. erat et domi delectus eques, praecipuo nandi studio, arma equosque retinens integris turmis amenam percurrere ..."¹²⁴. Their service in Germany and Britain has been noted in earlier chapters. It would appear that they kept a force of cavalry at home, presumably for border defence. Their troops abroad, and therefore obviously those at home, were under native commanders.

Several of the causes alleged for the revolt throw light on the auxiliary system. Civilis, the leader of the revolt, had twice been in difficulties with the Roman authorities: it has been plausibly suggested that the first occasion was due to intriguing with Vindex¹²⁵. In the event however, the Batavians fought alongside the Romans against Vindex¹²⁶. A second cause was a levy of Batavians instituted by Vitellius as part of his preparations for his attempt on the purple - "iussu vitellii Batavorum iuventus ad dilectum vocabatur, quae suapte natura graues onerabant ministri"¹²⁷. The abuses arose from the avarice and lust of the recruiting agents, whom Civilis called "praefecti centurionesque": presumably auxiliary commanders as well as legionary centurions were responsible. Civilis then exacerbated the feelings of the Batavians by proclaiming that

/the

the separation of the recruits from their families would be for ever ("uelut euepremus"). The implication was that they would not be serving at home, but abroad. Thirdly, Antonius Priscus had got into contact with Civilis, instructing him to stage an uprising so as to prevent forces leaving Germany to assist Vitellius in Italy: "missis sane ad eum Primi Antonii litteris, quibus auertere accita vitellio auxilia et tumultus Germanici specie retentare legiones iubebatur"¹²⁶. This was clearly an attempt on the part of the Flavians to detach Civilis from the "clientela" of Vitellius.

The strength of the legions in lower Germany was seriously depleted. What indications survive concerning the auxiliaries available to the Romans? An attack was made on 2 cohorts in winterquarters close to the coast near the mouth of the Rhine. Unable to sustain the attack, the prefects of the cohorts burnt the "castella" concerned, and joined the other troops in the vicinity. The strategy is described as follows: "signa vexillaque et quod militum in superiorum insulae partes congregantur, duce Aquilio principilari, nomen saepe exercitus quam robur: quippe uiribus cohortium abductis Vitellius a proximis Germanorum pagis segnem numerum armis cernuerat"¹²⁷. The phrase "signa vexillaque" appears to be a periphrasis for auxiliary detachments - no legionaries were involved¹²⁸. Vitellius had withdrawn the normal auxiliary cohorts ("uires cohortium") and substituted what Tacitus depreciates as an armed force of local villagers. The *uiores* are well enough known: Nervian cohorts are found on the Roman side later. But who are the "Germani" here? The names of various local peoples have been suggested as emendations, especially as

/the

the defection of a "Tungroorum cohort" ¹³¹ to Civilis is mentioned in the account of the ensuing battle. "German" here, however, may be a generic for a specific name, or a re-appearance of the old cisrhene Germani : most of the peoples in this region claimed a Germanic origin ¹³². The phrase "Tungrian cohort" should make us wary of interpreting "seignis numerus" above as a reference to a different category of soldier. The derogatory tone is intended to reflect on Vitellius, and at most means that the Nervians and Germans were recently recruited and badly trained. But they were formed in cohorts : before Civilis joined in battle with them he offered them all safe conduct to return to their "hiberna" ¹³³. The name of the original 2 cohorts has not survived. Civilis allowed prefects whom he had captured to return to their communities in Gaul : Like Alpinus Montanus, they must have been Gallic ¹³⁴. The cohorts were allowed to return home or to join the rebellion. They too may have been Gallic, although any people in the vicinity would serve. We have at this juncture an auxiliary force normally stationed in small forts of their own for the winter. They are drawn together in an emergency, and placed under the command of a comparatively high-ranking legionary officer. The names involved are Nervian and Tungrian, German in all probability, and possibly Gallic.

Information next appears when the commander of the army of Upper Germany, Nordeonius Flaccus, ordered a legionary legate, Sabinus Lupercus, to proceed against Civilis. He took the following forces : "legionarios et praesentibus, tribus e praesentibus, Iradurum equites huius longe agentis ...

/addita

addita Batavorum ala"¹³⁵. They are referred to again as "legiones
cohortesque ... ala", and the centre element in the phrase "Vbiorum
Trevirorumque alia". Ubian cohorts are next heard of during Civilis'
siege of Vetera (Xanten)¹³⁶: they fell prey to Civilis' German allies who
surprised them "in uico Harceduro" (Düren). In spite of this, however,
"Vbi" continued to plunder the Germans across the Rhine, until completely
crushed by the rebels. The use of the term "cohorts" in two different
references, and the word "auxilia" creates the impression that the Ubians
accompanying Manius Lupercus formed regular auxiliary units. The Ubians,
however, who raided across the Rhine sound like a local force acting on its
own initiative. The Treverans were also attacked by Civilis' forces.
"Treviri"¹³⁷ are said to have erected defence works against the attack, but
to have suffered heavy losses. More must have been involved than a profes-
sional auxiliary unit. Such a unit - an ala - appears when "Clasticus
praefectus alae Trevirorum" decided to change sides and join Civilis after
the death of Nordeonius Flaccus¹³⁸. Clasticus and the Treveran ala are last
recorded in the Vitellian forces that repulsed the Othonians in their attempt
on Gallie Narbonensis. The most likely explanation is that Clasticus and
his regiment had since returned to the Rhineland and that the "equites"
accompanying Manius Lupercus were in fact this ala. There can be no doubt
about the professional character of the Batavian ala referred to in the
passage under discussion. We are informed that its commander was a Batavian,
Claudius Labeo, who was captured by the rebels and sent to the Frisians for
custody¹³⁹. We have, then, a Ubian cohort (or cohorts), a Treveran and a
Batavian ala.

/At

At the same time as Nordeonius Flaccus detached Munius Iupercus against Civilis, orders came from Vitellius that "Batavorum et Cann¹⁴⁰ fatium cohortis" were to proceed to Rome. These Batavian cohorts were not officially part of the Roman army: earlier they are described as "Britannica auxilia, Batavorum cohortis missas in Germaniam ... ac tum Moguntiaci agentis"¹⁴¹. They were the famous 8 cohorts on their way back to Britain, temporarily camping at Moguntiacum (Mainz), but then recalled to Italy by Vitellius. This is the only reference to a cohort (or cohorts) of Canninefates associated with them. At what stage they had joined them is not clear. These cohorts had already been tampered with by Civilis: their reaction on receiving their orders to proceed to Rome are instructive. "Tretius itineris donativum, duplex stipendium, augeri equitum numerus. promissa sane a Vitellio, postulabant, non ^{ut} adsequerentur, sed causam seditioni"¹⁴². Their demands were not intended to be taken seriously, as they were already determined to revolt. The donative for the journey and the doubling of their pay are easily understandable. The "increase in the number of cavalry" is less clear. The motive is clear: cavalry received higher pay than infantry¹⁴³. The cohorts must have been "equitatae" for an increase in cavalry (rather than for the creation of cavalry) to have been demanded. But whether the mutinous troops intended the normal proportion of cavalry to infantry in "cohortes equitatae" to be altered, or whether they were pressing for elevation to the status of alae is not apparent. The cohorts then proceeded northwards to join Civilis. At Bonna (Bonn) the legionary legate, Aereannus Gallus, opposed them with 3000 legionaries, "tumultuariae Belgarum cohortes, aliae paganorum

/lixarumque

lixarumque ignava sed proci ante periculum manus"¹⁴⁴. The countrymen and the camp-followers ("pagani lixaeque") were obviously pressed into service for the emergency. Godley compares the "belgarum cohortes" to the Nervians and Tungrians (discussed above) of the first clash with Civilis: they were part of the province of Belgica at this date. This would incline me to understand "cohortes" here in its professional sense; and, in fact, "tumultuarie"¹⁴⁵ does not prevent. By the time of Tacitus "tumultus" had long lost its early sense of a sudden incursion in Italy, especially in Cisalpine Gaul. Here "tumultuariae" must mean hastily or recently levied. In effect the Belgian cohorts were untrained and useless, but in intention they were regular cohorts, not a local militia. Herennius Gallus' force, therefore, consisted of legionaries, improperly trained or embryonic cohorts, and an armed mob.

Gerdeonius Flaccus had meanwhile sent agents to collect "auxilia" from the provinces of Gaul¹⁴⁶: he moved up himself and established his headquarters north of Bonna in Colonia Agrippinensis (Cologne): there considerable numbers of Gallic auxiliaries reached him¹⁴⁷. These "auxilia Gallorum" must have been intended for regular auxiliary service, but were obviously unable to be trained before being put to use.

The next large-scale engagement between the Romans and Civilis took place at Uelduba (Krefeld-Gellep), north of Colonia Agrippinensis. On the way the rebels overwhelmed the winterquarters of an ala at Mosiburgium (Moers-Asberg, north of Uelduba)¹⁴⁸. The ala concerned was in

all probability the ala *Frontoniana*¹⁴⁹. After their victory at *Asciburgium*, the Batavians bore down upon *Melduba* with such speed that *Dillius Vocula*, a legionary legate to whom *Hordeonius Flaccus* had surrendered the effective command of the troops, was unable to draw up his forces in time. The auxiliaries involved comprised unnamed cavalry and "*Nerviorum cohortes*" and "*Vasconum ... cohortes*" (the latter being summoned after the start of the battle)¹⁵⁰.

The Roman fortunes reached their lowest ebb after the surrender of the legions and the destruction of *Vetera* by the Batavians. Further outposts were destroyed: "*cohortium alarum legionum hiberna subversa cremataque, his tantum relictis, quae Moguntiacy ac Vindoniense sita sunt*"¹⁵¹. *Moguntiacum* and *Vindonissa* (*Windisch*) were legionary headquarters: the passage however is of interest for showing that there was a clearly integrated system of legionary and auxiliary forts at this date. When the surrender at *Novesium* (*Neuss*) occurred, the forces involved are described as "*legio sexta decima cum auxiliis simul deditis*"¹⁵² - auxiliaries clearly being associated with the legion. One of the units involved was the ala *Picentina*, which, however, returned to its Roman allegiance almost immediately. After the surrender of the legions, the Romans profited by divisions among the rebels. *Claudius Labeo*, the pro-Roman Batavian, collected a small force, described as "*Paetianorum Tungrorumque et Nerviorum tumultuaria manus*"¹⁵³, and attempted to withstand *Civilis*. The *Tungri* and *Nervi* had joined *Civilis* by this date: the fact that some of them supported *Labeo* shows that these tribes too were not united against Rome.

/un

On the Gallic side, the Sequanians opposed the pro-Batavian Lingones¹⁵⁴. The rebels failed to take advantage of their success, which enabled the Romans to send forces from the South up to the scene of the rebellion: "unaeticensis legio vindonissa, Sextilius Felix cum auxiliaribus cohortibus per Raetiam intrare; accessit ala singularium excitum olim a Vitellio deinde in partis Vespasiani transgressa. praecrat Iulius Briganticus sorore Ciuilis genitus ... inuisus auunculo"¹⁵⁵. The ala singularium is of interest here. Fiebiger has defined "singulares" as "militarische Einzelpersonen, die höheren Offizieren angeteilt waren und von ihnen als Ordennanzen verwendet wurden". This definition does not fit this particular case, except for the element of individual selection or choice. Stein's suggestion "dass ihren Kern die 'equites singulares' eines Heerescommandanten, vermutlich von Untergermanien, gebildet hatten" may be true. But probably Vitellius selected sufficient cavalrymen from existing alae or from alae that had been reduced in number in the fighting of the civil wars and formed a new regiment from them. It is noteworthy that he assigned the command to a Batavian, even if he had Roman citizenship. This appears to be the first definite instance of a prefect of 'native' origin commanding an ala of a different tribal or national origin to himself.

The auxiliaries on the Rhine of which we have record before the arrival of the reinforcements from Raetia and the army of Germania superior may now be listed.

/als

ala Batavorum.

cohors Batavorum, under the command of Civilis himself¹⁵⁶.

(The 8 Batavian cohorts at Moguntiacum, specifically called "Britannica auxilia", can obviously not be included).

cohortes Belgarum.

cohors Canninefatum, although some doubt attaches here.

auxilia Gallorum.

Germani, though difficult to define.

cohortes Nerviorum.

ala Treverorum.

cohors Fungorum.

cohortes Ubiorum.

cohortes Vasconum.

ala Picentina.

unnamed regiments include

an ala (presumably the Frantoniensis).

alae.

II cohortes (possibly Gallie).

cohortes¹⁵⁷.

Among the irregular forces were

lixae.

the bastasians, Fungriani and Nerviani of Labeo.

Sequani (?)

Ubi (?)

/at

At this juncture Petilius Cerialis arrived with further forces to put down the rebellion. He sent troops that had recently been levied in Gaul back home, with the boast that the legions would be sufficient¹⁵⁸. But this claim must not be allowed to mislead: from references to "equites", "praefecti", "cohortes" and "alae"¹⁵⁹ it is perfectly clear that Cerialis' legions were supported by auxiliaries in the normal fashion. His attitude to the recent Gallic levies did not extend to what were proved and tried auxiliary regiments, none of which is named by Tacitus. From the account of one of Civilis' last offensives we learn that Cerialis had been able to restore the previous system of posting regiments in permanent quarters: Civilis attacked "praesidia cohortium alarum legionum", special mention being made of "Grinnes Vadumque, cohortium alarumque castra"¹⁶⁰. The plural probably indicates that there was more than one auxiliary regiment in each of these forts.

The way in which Civilis' forces grew may now be set beside the Roman soldiers for comparison. As noted above, Civilis started out with a single cohort of Batavians. He won the support of the majority of his own tribe, and then of the neighbouring Canninefates and Frisians¹⁶¹. The Canninefates were currently supplying auxiliaries to Rome: the Frisians had done so under Augustus, but no Frisian regiment is recorded as such¹⁶². These three peoples formed the core of Civilis' resistance movement. In the first engagement after the attack on the 2 cohorts stationed near the coast, Civilis was strengthened by the defection from the Romans of a cohort of *Langrorum*. In the clash with Iulius Lupercus an *ala Batavorum* deserted to *Langrorum*.

/the

the rebels. Next the Batavian and the Canninefatan cohorts left Moguntiacum to join them. These were a great asset and, as Tacitus says, turned Civilis into a general in command of a proper army - "Civilis aduentu veteranorum cohortibus iuncti iam exercitus ductor"¹⁶³. After the victory of the Batavians at Bonn over Herennius Gallus and the refusal of the legionaries at Vetera to swear allegiance to Vespasian, the whole Batavian tribe is said to have rushed to arms, the Bructerans and Tencterans, who lived without the Roman Empire across the Rhine, joined Civilis and "Germania" - presumably other tribes in free Germany - was contacted¹⁶⁴. In other words Civilis has active and prospective free German allies from this point onwards. From Tacitus' account of the fighting at Gelduba we learn that the Eboracians, a German people on the left bank of the Rhine north of the Ubians, had joined Civilis¹⁶⁵. The Ubians themselves were crushed, and had to become unwilling allies of the rebels¹⁶⁶. At the battle of Gelduba itself the Nervian cohorts deserted to the insurgents¹⁶⁷. Further south, Chattans, Teupians and Mattiacans attacked Moguntiacum¹⁶⁸; these were 'free' Germans from across the Rhine. It is not stated whether they were acting in concert with Civilis or using the confused situation to their own advantage.

The next stage was more dangerous - certain Gallic tribes joined Civilis. But, as Brunt¹⁶⁹ has shown, they only came in after the death of Vitellius. Before this, as noted above, they had been fighting for the Romans. No open move was made until after the murder of Hordeonius Flaccus: the people who acted first were the Treverans and Lingones, who

/had

had supported Verginius Rufus against Vindex early in 68 A.D. and who had been punished by Galba for so doing¹⁷⁰. Their sympathies would naturally lie with troops loyal to Vitellius, the "German" emperor. The instigators were "Claseicum ... praefectum alae Treuirorum", who obviously felt that his position in his tribe should resemble that of Civilis among the Batavians, and "Julius Tutor et Julius Sabinus, hic Treuir, hic Lingonus, Tutor ripae wheni a Vitellio praefectus"¹⁷¹. After the destruction of Vetera, the surrender of the Roman legions and the occupation of Colonia Agrippinensis, Civilis won over the Sunucans - "occupatis Sunucis et iuventute eorum per cohortes composita"¹⁷². The Sunucans lived between the Ubians and the Tungrians: they were Germanic or semi-Germanic and must not be reckoned with Civilis' Gallic supporters. They were drafted by him into cohorts. The word here must refer to tactical units, and the phrase creates the impression of Civilis using Roman methods of organization. The Bastians, Tungrians and Nervians of the pro-Roman Claudius Labeo have already been noted: Civilis succeeded in winning these peoples over, and in particular gained control of the whole tribe of the Tungrians¹⁷³. The next development occurred after the Romans started their offensive against the rebels when the legion from Vindonissa and the auxiliary forces of Sextilius Felix advanced towards the scene of the fighting. The Treveran, Julius Tutor, opposed Felix with a force described as follows: "Treuirorum copias, recenti Vangionum, Coeracatum, Tribocorum dilectu auctas, ueterano pedite atque equite armavit, corruptis spe aut metu subactis legionariis"¹⁷⁴. Two comments are called for. The Vangiones and Tribocans, and presumably

/the

Caninefates, two peoples connected to
rule. The Frisians belong here too

- 106 -

by the Agrippinenses. His loss on this occasion involved "flagrantissima
the otherwi cohortium suarum integra, quae e Chaucis Frisisque composita Tolbiaci in
cannot be c finibus Agrippinensium agebat"¹⁷⁷. Like the Frisians, the Chaucans had once
Tutor's force had a "Roman" pattern. It comprised actual Roman legionaries,
professional Treveran "auxilia" and newly drafted troops of less value.
Tutor was defeated, lost his legionaries, and the Vangiones, Caeracates and
Tribocans returned to their Roman allegiance. One of the first engagements
in which Petilius Cerialis was involved was against the Treverans under
Valentinus at Rigodulum (169). Cerialis captured "nobilissimos Belgas,
in quis duces Valentini"¹⁷⁵. Here it is clear that by "Belgians" Treverans
must be mainly meant: Tacitus is using a larger for a more specific term.
In a speech delivered soon after this, Civilis referred to Belgians on his
side, calling them "quod reboris sit" of the Gallic forces¹⁷⁶. Here too
tunity to rejoin the Romans. Civilis advanced into their territory and
encamped at Tolbiacum (Zülpich): he lost a cohort as a result of a stratagem
encamped at Tolbiacum (Zülpich): he lost a cohort as a result of a stratagem
by the Agrippinenses. His loss on this occasion involved "flagrantissima
cohortium suarum integra, quae e Chaucis Frisisque composita Tolbiaci in
finibus Agrippinensium agebat"¹⁷⁷. Like the Frisians, the Chaucans had once
supported the Romans. They were now however not under Roman control.
The Chaucans appear once again, as "auxilia" coming to aid Civilis in the
final stages of the revolt just before the attack on Bonna and Vada¹⁷⁸.

Civilis' forces fell into several distinct groups. His main
supporters were the Batavians and Caninefates, two peoples connected to
none, but not under direct provincial rule. The Frisians belong here too,

/aven

even if such a relationship had not been restored after their revolt under Tiberius. The next group consisted of comparatively unimportant people of Germanic origin on the left bank of the Rhine - the Cugernians, Conucans, Buctasians, Ubians. The Tungrians and even the Nervians may be included here, although they were much more powerful. Such peoples could be described as "Germani cisrhenani"¹⁷⁹. Also of Germanic origin, but further south, were the Vangiones, Caraceni and Tribocans. The Gallic element was represented by the Lingones and Treverans, at times classified as Belgians. The peoples on the right bank of the Rhine, the "free Germans", were the Bructerans, the Tencterans and the Chaucans. Further south the Chattans, Usipetes and Mattiacans fell into this group. This distinction between the different groups of Civilis' supporters is reflected in Tacitus' use of generic terms as well as in the actual tribal names discussed above. On occasion the three main elements are juxtaposed as Gaul, Batavian and German¹⁸⁰. The distinction between the "Germanic" peoples supporting Civilis and his "free German" allies is more interesting. In one of the first attacks on Vindex Civilis supplemented his "rotar batavorum" with "Germanorum satraparum"¹⁸¹, where "satraparum", apart from being derogatory, probably also refers to the native formations. A second way of distinguishing these two groups was the use of "transrhenani" for the free Germans, as in the phrase "latens transrhenanisque"¹⁸². But when viewed from another angle, especially when contrasted with the Romans, both groups are subsumed under the name "Germani", especially in the final phases of the conflict after the arrival of Caracalla¹⁸³. But at times the

/Batavians

and Frisians) appear simply as "Germani"¹⁸⁴. Sometimes the name is used in a neutral ethnographical sense¹⁸⁵, but at others it is distinctly pejorative¹⁸⁶, and approximates to "barbari"¹⁸⁷. Tacitus uses "Germanus", especially in a derogatory sense, to discredit Civilis. A Roman auxiliary who does not remain loyal takes on the worst characteristics of one of Rome's greatest enemies, the barbaric Germans.

Certain military aspects of the Batavian Revolt should be noticed. The Batavians and their close allies fought in "cunei", that is, in native-style formations¹⁸⁸. The fighting methods of the Germans proved unequal to an assault on the walls of the Roman fortress of Vetera. But "perfugas captivique" from the Roman side instructed them so that they were able to build rudimentary war machines¹⁸⁹. Such contacts would have led to the adoption of Roman methods and eventually to the improvement of native methods and a raising of the standard of auxiliary recruits.

The manuscript of the "Historiae" unfortunately breaks off before the description of the final surrender of the Batavians and Vespasian's operations in Germany later in his principate. For references to auxiliaries during this period we are reduced to two Diplomas and two inscriptions. The first diploma, dated to 76 A.D., names the soldiers of 6 alae and 12 cohorts who were "in Germania sub On. Minerio Cornelio Ulpiano"¹⁹⁰. The alae were the

I Flavia Gemina

I Cannenefatium (sic)

/II Flavia

II Flavia Gemina

Vicentiana (sic)

Scubulorum

Claudia nova,

the cohorts were the

I Thracum

I Asturum

I Aquitanorum veterana

I Aquitanorum biturigum

II Augusta Cyrenaica

III Gallorum

III Aquitanorum

III Aquitanorum

III Vindellicorum

V Hispanorum

V Dalmatarum

VII Raetorum.

Publius Aemilius Clemens had conducted campaigns which led to the annexation of the salient between the Rhine and the Danube comprising the district called the "Agri Decumates" (in the Black Forest) by the Romans. Almost nothing is known of the scale of the operations: they were however of sufficient compass for Clemens to have been awarded the "ornamenta triumphalia" "ob res in Germania prospere gestas". Some, if not all, of the auxiliary

/units

units of the diploma must have been involved in the fighting. 2 alae bear the title "Flavia Gemina". "Gemina" means formed from the remains of earlier alae¹⁹¹. Presumably the earlier alae had been decimated in the Batavian Uprising. The addition of Vespasian's "gentilicium" to their title may imply that the men had distinguished themselves earlier, or that a sense of pride was to be fostered in the unit. The 1 Canninefates recalls the ala Canninefata mentioned in the Frisian revolt of 28 A.D. and the Canninefates associated with the Batavian cohorts stationed at Moguntiacum at the outset of the Batavian Uprising¹⁹². The Canninefates played a prominent role in the Uprising, as detailed above. It is not possible to speculate whether the soldiers discharged from it in 74 A.D. with at least 25 years service included men who had participated in the rebellion and been pardoned. It is at any rate clear that the regimental name did not suffer because of the revolt. The next 3 alae are unnumbered. The Vicentiana received honourable mention for retracting its surrender to Civilis at Novaesium¹⁹³. The cohort 1 Thracum recalls the "cohors Thracum" used by Caecina against the Helvetians on his march to Italy¹⁹⁴. The III Gallorum suggests the "Gallicae cohortes" of Germanicus at the battle of Idistaviso in 16 A.D., the "cohortes Gallorum" that Caecina sent ahead to Italy against Otho and the "Gallorum auxilia" and "auxilia e Gallia" recorded during the Batavian Uprising¹⁹⁵. The IIII Vindelicorum and the VII Raetorum suggest the "Raetorum Vindellicorumque ... cohortes" under Germanicus at the battle of Idistaviso: the "Raetorum iuventus" that assisted Caecina against the Helvetians were probably not

/in

in regular cohorts¹⁹⁶. It is clear that in several cases links can be established between regiments listed in this German diploma and those operating earlier in the area. The clearest case is that of the ala Picentiana.

The next diploma names 6 alae and a cohort "in Germania sub Q. Iulio Cordino Rutilio Gallico"¹⁹⁷ in 78 A.D. Rutilius Gallicus was celebrated for the capture of Teleda, the Bructeran prophetess who had served as a figurehead in the Batavian Uprising almost a decade before. The regiments from which the soldiers were discharged were the alae

Noricorum

singularium

Moesica

Afrorum veterana

Siliana

Sulpicia¹⁹⁸

and the cohort

I Flavia Hispanorum.

"Noricorum iuventus" has been recorded, but cannot be equated with a professional ala Noricorum¹⁹⁹. The circumstances surrounding the formation of the ala singularium in 69 have already been discussed²⁰⁰. Whether the ala Moesica was one of the alae at the battle of Bedriacum, or formed part of the "Moesici auxiliares" sent by the Flavians to Italy is not clear, but

but an ala Moesica is recorded at Asciburgium, most probably replacing the ala Frontoniana there. The ala Silliana has appeared on several previous occasions²⁰¹. The alae are all without a number, but the cohort in the diploma has one. Whether its title "Flavia" points to a new formation by Vespasian or honours an act of bravery cannot be established. The recipient of the diploma, a Treveran, belonged to the ala Moesica "cui praest T. Staberius T. f. qui. Secundus". This commander of the ala is known from an inscription discovered in Rome, where his career is given as praef. coh. Chalcid. in Africa tribuno militum leg. VII Geminae felix in Germania praef. equit. alae Moesicae felix torquatus²⁰².

This is the sole place where the ala has the title "felix torquatus". The fact that the inscription was erected by T. Staberius Secundus' mother at her own expense (no further posts are named) may indicate that she took a special interest in a decoration awarded to the ala during her son's command. His previous post, the tribunate in the Seventh Legion, can most probably be dated to 70 - 74, when that legion was in Germany. It was during this period that it acquired the title "Felix"²⁰³. This leads one to speculate that the ala Moesica may have been decorated with its similar title for an operation in conjunction with the legion.

The two inscriptions referring to the "auxilia" of Germany are those recording the careers of the brothers Domitius Lucanus and Domitius Tullus²⁰⁴. They both filled the post of "praef. auxiliorum omnium adversus Germanos", but the question is when. Dessau rejects the early

/view

view that this occurred during the Batavian revolt, and accepts the suggestion that it was during the expedition of Aemilius Clemens. Croag prefers the expedition of Atilius Ballicus, and has the support of Thomasson. von Domaszewski does not discuss the matter, but remarks that such posts were held after a legionary legateship. Alföldy, however, has announced that in an as yet unpublished work he will argue for the older view of the Batavian revolt. The brothers served as military tribunes in the legio V Alaudae which was stationed at Vetera until 69 A.D. This would have been during the latter part of Nero's principate. The special auxiliary command may have followed soon afterwards. On the other hand, the command is associated with various special legateships and honours accorded to the brothers, and is in a section at the head of the inscription in each case before the praetorship and junior posts prior to that are mentioned in descending order. The honours consisted of decorations normally given to those of praetorian rank and adlection into the patriciate. The latter item is usually dated to the censorship of Vespasian and Titus in 73 - 4 A.D. It seems to reward special services in Africa as well as the auxiliary prefecture against the Germans. But as this part of the inscriptions is not in chronological order and the brothers did not hold the same special legateships or receive identical honours, it is not possible to date any single item. Nor is it possible to associate the special legateships or the honours with the regular stages of the "cursus honorum" that come in the second part of the inscription in each case. The question of the date must therefore remain open. It is

/difficult, ...

difficult, too, to categorize the post of "praefectus omnium auxiliorum adversus Germanos" itself. Casselin has compared the command of Vidius Gallus of the cavalry in the British expedition of Claudius. But this in itself raises difficulties. At first sight it would appear that the brothers, either jointly or in succession to each other, were placed in command of all the auxiliaries, presumably of the Lower or Upper German army, in an emergency caused by a German war. Whether this implies the temporary separation of the "auxilia" from their legions for a joint auxiliary offensive is not clear. This question must also remain open.

Turning from Germany to Britain, we have a few brief general notices concerning "auxilia". As noted above, British auxiliary cohorts were among the forces which Galba found in Rome on his arrival there late in 68 A.D.²⁰⁵ On the proclamation of Vitellius as emperor by the Rhine armies, trouble broke out in the British army before it joined the side of Vitellius. A dispute arose between the governor, Trebellius Maximus, and Roscius Coelius, legate of the Twentieth Legion. The situation degenerated: "*modestia exercitus corrupta eoque discordiae ventum ut auxilium quoque militum conviciis proturbatus et adgregantibus ne Coelio cohortibus alisque desertus Trebellius ad Vitellium perfugerit*"²⁰⁶. Tacitus regards the involvement of the auxiliaries as a sign of even greater disgrace. Another interpretation that may be placed upon it, however, is the evidence it affords of the ever-increasing "professionalism" of the "auxilia". The governor had obviously turned to them for support, but they had aligned themselves with the legionary legate. They felt themselves as much

/part

part of the quarrel as the legions. It is probable that by the auxiliaries Tacitus means all the auxiliaries of Britain. It would be interesting to know how their support was organized by one of the legionary commanders. A linguistic point should be noted : the technical phrase "cohortes alaeque" is used as the equivalent of the more literary "auxiliares milites". The auxiliaries in Britain are mentioned for the third time²⁵⁷ in the year of the Four Emperors in connection with troubles in the Brigantian area. The queen of the Brigantes, Cartimandua, who had long been supported by the Romans, was attacked by her ex-husband and rival for the throne, Venutius. She sought "praesidium" from Rome. "Cohortes alaeque nostrae" saved her, but the kingdom fell to her husband. As Frere suggests, the legions were probably not involved because they were below strength as a result of having supplied detachments to Vitellius. The next item of information²⁵⁸ comes from Agricola's campaigns in Wales in 78 A.D. Not long before his arrival, the Ordovices (in Welsh) had all but destroyed a cavalry regiment : "alae in finibus suis agentes". The phrase implies that the ala was operating apart from the legions and other "auxilia" : whether its stay in Ordovician territory was temporary or permanent cannot be determined from the phrase quoted. But the fact that, on his arrival, Agricola found military detachments, i.e., auxiliary units, scattered throughout the province ("sparsi per provinciam numeri") implies that the stationing of units in their own forts was the normal practice at this stage. In spite of the lateness of the season, Agricola decided to attack the Ordovices. His gathering together of his forces is described in the

Words :

The successor of Fonteius Agrippa restored the situation with more and stronger "garrisons". These ~~must~~ must have been mainly auxiliary forta. Another Transdanubian people, the Dacians²¹⁴, also crossed the Roman frontier in this area. They chose the time when the "Moesian army" had been removed to fight the Vitellians in Italy and stormed "cohortium alarumque hiberna" before proceeding against the "castra legionum". However Mucianus was able to check them on his journey from the East to Italy. This was at the end of 69, before Fonteius Agrippa was appointed governor of Moesia. As on the Rhine and, though less clearly, in Britain, a picture emerges of auxiliary units stationed on the Danube in permanent headquarters of their own. A military diploma²¹⁵ of 78 A.D. records discharges from cohorts stationed in Moesia under Sex. Vettulenus Cerialis. The regiments concerned were the

I Cantabrorum

I Thracum Syriace

I Sugamborum tironum

II Lucensium

III Gallorum

VIII Gallorum

Silicum

Mattiacorum.

The Cantabrians were last mentioned when Strabo recorded that they were fighting for Rome after Augustus' Spanish wars²¹⁶. A "Sugambra cohors" was

/recorded

recorded fighting in Thrace under Tiberius²¹⁷. A cohort III Gallorum is attested in Germany in 74 A.D., which was later itself transferred to Moesia. But this is probably not the same regiment²¹⁸. Cilices supported Piso against Germanicus under Tiberius²¹⁹.

From the Danube, attention goes to the East where, as under Nero, Judaea proved to be the focal point in the initial period of Vespasian's principate. There are, however, some minor incidents outside Judaea that call for comment. Under Otto a false Nero²²⁰ appeared in Greece. He won over destitute deserters and even soldiers who were returning from their leave. His next accession of strength consisted of strong slaves whom he had stolen from their owners. It is interesting to note that he was unable to gain the support of the local population in this part of the Empire. Vespasian was faced with trouble in Pontus after Nicianus had gone to Italy. The leader of the insurrection there was Anicetus, a former slave of king Polemo and commander of the royal navy before Pontus became a province in 63 or 64 A.D. Like Livilla in Germany, he claimed to be acting on behalf of a Roman emperor, Vitellius. Winning the support of the tribes adjacent to Pontus, he attacked Trapezus (Trebizond or Trabzon), allying the troops there. Tacitus describes them as follows: "causa ibi cohortis, legibus auxilium olim; mox donati ciuitate Romana signa armaque in nostrum modum, desidia licentiamque Graecorum retinebant"²²¹. "Auxilia" next appear in the East in the expedition of Gaius Iulius Iudaeus, then governor of Syria, in 72 against Commagene. His forces consisted of the Sixth Legion

222. He was assisted by king Arietobulus of Chalcidice and king Sohemus of Armenia. In other words, 'Pactus' force consisted of the usual elements: a legion, professional cohorts and alae, and royal assistance. Shortly after this the Parthians were troubled by an invasion of the Alanians. Vologases appealed to Rome for help. Domitian is said²²³ to have been keen to lead Roman forces to the assistance of the Parthians, but Vespasian refused. The incident recalls Vologases' earlier offer of assistance to Vespasian during the Year of the Four Emperors, and is in the tradition of Roman support for friendly powers.

On hearing of the death of Nero Vespasian suspended active operations in Judaea. They were not resumed until he set out for Rome to become emperor himself. He left his son Titus to conclude the war. Generally speaking, Josephus merely refers to auxiliaries or cavalry without giving details. Some excerpts of his account of the closing campaigns, however, repay study. He describes Titus' army as he set out for Jerusalem. He had 4 legions,

Tacitus lists the legions and then says "comitabantur viginti milia cohortes, octo equitum alas, simul Agrippa Bohaerumque regis et auxilia regis Antiochi validaque et molito inter accolam odio infensa Iudaeis Arabum manus ..." ²²⁹ Josephus then describes Titus' order of march.

The ²²⁶ van consisted of ^{of} ^{particular} ^{and}

after various specialized detachments, such as the
surveyors, came Titus and his special troops and the legionary cavalry

(αὐτὸ τὸ ἄρματὸς τῶν ἰσχυρῶν). After the engines were
 μετ' ἐκείνων ἡλίκωνται αὐτὸν τῶν ἰσχυρῶν. The
 legions followed, then the baggage-train, then τὸ πλῆθος
 ἰσχυρῶν τῶν ἰσχυρῶν. Last of all were οἱ μὲντοι καὶ τοὺς
 φρουρὰς οὐρετοί. Josephus' first statement is too brief to
 be of much assistance. The fact that the auxiliaries were "from Syria"
 probably means that they were part of the Syrian army rather than that
 they were all Syrians. Tacitus names the kings, known in any case from
 the campaigns of Vespasian under Nero. But he adds the fact that there
 was a "band of Arabs", useful because of their neighbourly hatred for the
 Jews. They must have formed a different category to the professional
 "auxilia" and the royal armies to be mentioned separately under the name
 of "army". One wonders whether they were what Josephus in the second
 passage calls οἱ ἰσχυροὶ who brought up the rear of the marching
 column. The order of the army on the march is similar to that of Vespasian
 described in Book III.²²⁷ Auxiliaries form the van in both cases. The
 prefects of the cohorts are together in the centre in both cases. The
 servants of the legions or "quintarii" are noted on each occasion. The rear
 is formed by οἱ μὲντοι, regarded as paid auxiliaries in
 Vespasian's army and here possibly to be equated with the Arab force
 mentioned by Tacitus. Tacitus supplies certain figures for the "auxilia".
 If it can be assumed that he is describing the same army as that in
 Josephus, and if the figures for various units that are not specified in him,
 but are detailed in Josephus' enumeration of Vespasian's forces can be used,
 it is possible to suggest figures for Titus' army :

/Legions :

Legions :	4 x 6,000	24,000
Cohorts :	20 x 500 (or 1,000)	10 or 20,000
Alae :	8 x 500 (or 1,000)	4 or 8,000
Kings :		? 9,000
Arab Force :		? 6,000
TOTAL :		<u>53 or 67,000</u>

The force of the kings has been put at 9,000 : it should be noted that they had earlier supplied Cestius Gallus with 14,000. This may imply that the number was lower by the time of Titus. Further, Tacitus' "Arab force" may not have been the same as Malchus' Arabs under Vespasian. The different totals are of course to be explained by the difficulty of deciding whether the professional auxiliary regiments were all of the same size, and whether they were quingenary or milliary. Presumably the lower figure (53,000) is to be preferred, given the military situation at the end of 69 A.D. If the legions were at full strength, and the lower figures be favoured, the professional "auxilia" formed less than two of the legionary total. But when the royal and "Arab" contingents are added, the auxiliaries (in the broader sense) must at least have equalled, if not considerably exceeded, the number of legionaries. But even so, it should be noted that Titus had 1 legion more than his father. (Cestius Gallus had set out with the equivalent of 2 legions.)

Such was the composition of Titus' army in so far as it can be recovered. The few occasions on which ethnical names appear may now be /listed.

listed. An Idumean leader fell when struck by an arrow shot by an Arab²²⁸. Jewish deserters and refugees were cut open by "the Arab mob and the Syrians"²²⁹ on the Roman side when it was discovered that some had concealed gold coins by swallowing them before fleeing from Jerusalem.

An act of courage was performed by a Syrian - τῶν δὲ ἐκ Συρίας

καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀσσυρίας

γένοιο²³⁰; in spite of his being a Syrian, his name

was a common Latin one. Another such act was performed by τὸν

Ῥωμαῖον τῆς ἀποστολῆς Παύλου γένοιο Ἀλβῆριον²³¹;

the Egyptian mufus is not specifically called an auxiliary, but was in all probability one. The description of the arrival of Antiochus Epiphanes before Jerusalem is interesting, because it shows an ethnic title being applied to a force because of its fighting methods, not because of its race.

He brought numerous ὀπλίτας and ὑπὸ μάχῃ οὐλοῦνται μαχητάς

μαχομένους. This consisted of tall young troops armed and trained in the Macedonian fashion. ὅταν τῶν ἐπὶ μαχῇ εἴχον

ἀντιποδῶντες ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ γένους²³². Some personal names are also on record. A spectacular feat was performed by a cavalryman

Longinus²³³, another by Fedanius, described as τῶν δὲ οὐλοῦντων

τῆς ἰσχυρῆς²³⁴. If this description is correct, Fedanius was a cavalry-

man from a cohort. This implies a "cohort equitata". A certain Iudens,

however, is described as τῆς ... τῶν ἐκ τῆς ἰσχυρῆς

hence a cavalryman from an ala. When Iudens fell, he was avenged by a

centurion called Iriacus, who despatched his slayer with an arrow. One

wonders whether Iriacus was not a centurion of an auxiliary regiment of

archers²³⁵.

Author Saddington D

Name of thesis Problems in the development of the auxiliary system in the Roman Army of the late Republican and early Imperial period 1970

PUBLISHER:

University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg

©2013

LEGAL NOTICES:

Copyright Notice: All materials on the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg Library website are protected by South African copyright law and may not be distributed, transmitted, displayed, or otherwise published in any format, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

Disclaimer and Terms of Use: Provided that you maintain all copyright and other notices contained therein, you may download material (one machine readable copy and one print copy per page) for your personal and/or educational non-commercial use only.

The University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, is not responsible for any errors or omissions and excludes any and all liability for any errors in or omissions from the information on the Library website.