

# ADALYA

(AYRIBASIM/OFFPRINT)



SUNA-İNAN KIRAÇ AKDENİZ MEDENİYETLERİ ARAŞTIRMA ENSTİTÜSÜ  
SUNA & İNAN KIRAÇ RESEARCH INSTITUTE ON MEDITERRANEAN CIVILIZATIONS

# ADALYA



SUNA-İNAN KIRAÇ AKDENİZ MEDENİYETLERİ ARAŞTIRMA ENSTİTÜSÜ YILLIĞI  
THE ANNUAL OF THE SUNA & İNAN KIRAÇ RESEARCH INSTITUTE ON MEDITERRANEAN CIVILIZATIONS

**ADALYA**  
Vehbi Koç Vakfı  
Suna - İnan KIRAÇ Akdeniz Medeniyetleri  
Araştırma Enstitüsü Yıllık Dergisi  
**Yönetim Yeri:** Barbaros Mh. Kocatepe Sk. No. 25  
Kaleiçi 07100 Antalya Tel: +90 242 243 42 74  
Faks: +90 242 243 80 13 E-posta: akmed@akmed.org.tr  
**Yayın Türü:** Yerel Süreli Yayın  
**Sayı:** XV - 2012

**Sabibi:** Vehbi Koç Vakfı Adına Erdal YILDIRIM  
**Sorumlu Müdür:** Kayhan DÖRTLÜK  
**Yapım:** Zero Prodüksiyon Ltd., İstanbul  
Abdullah Sokak No. 17  
Taksim 34433 İstanbul  
Tel: +90 212 244 75 21 Faks: +90 212 244 32 09  
**Baskı:** MAS Matbaacılık A.Ş.  
Hamidiye Mh. Soğuksu Cd. No: 3 Kağıthane - İstanbul  
Tel: +90 212 294 10 00 info@masmat.com.tr Sertifika No: 12055

## Bilim Danışma Kurulu / Editorial Advisory Board

Hâluk ABBASOĞLU	Max KUNZE
Ara ALTUN	Thomas MARKSTEINER (†)
Oluş ARIK	Wolfram MARTINI
Cevdet BAYBURTLUOĞLU	Gönül ÖNEY
Jürgen BORCHHARDT	Mehmet ÖZSAİT
Jacques Des COURTILS	Urs PESCHLOW
Vedat ÇELGİN	Scott REDFORD
Nevzat ÇEVİK	Denis ROUSSET
İnci DELEMEN	Martin Ferguson SMITH
Bekir DENİZ	Oğuz TEKİN
Refik DURU	Gülsün UMURTAK
Serra DURUGÖNÜL	Burhan VARKIVANÇ
Hansgerd HELLENKEMPER	Michael WÖRRLE
Frank KOLB	Martin ZIMMERMAN

Adalya, **A&HCI** (*Arts & Humanities Citation Index*) ve **CC/A&H** (*Current Contents / Art & Humanities*) tarafından taranmaktadır.

Adalya is indexed in the **A&HCI** (*Arts & Humanities Citation Index*) and **CC/A&H** (*Current Contents / Art & Humanities*).

Hakemli bir dergidir / *A peer reviewed Publication*

## Editörler / Editors

Kayhan DÖRTLÜK  
Tarkan KAHYA  
Remziye BOYRAZ SEYHAN  
Tuba ERTEKİN

## İngilizce Editörleri / English Editors

İnci TÜRKÖĞLU  
Mark WILSON

## Yazışma Adresi / Mailing Address

Barbaros Mah. Kocatepe Sk. No. 25  
Kaleiçi 07100 ANTALYA-TURKEY  
Tel: +90 242 243 42 74 • Fax: +90 242 243 80 13  
akmed@akmed.org.tr  
www.akmed.org.tr

ISSN 1301-2746

## İçindekiler

Işın Yalçinkaya – Kadriye Özçelik <i>Karain Mağarası'nın Kültürel ve Çevresel Verileri Işığında Anadolu Orta Paleolitik'inin Değerlendirilmesi</i> .....	1
Tarkan Kahya <i>The Rock-cut Tomb on the Düver Peninsula: An Early Example from Pisidia and Remarks on Cultural Interactions</i> .....	13
Hatice Pamir – İnanç Yamaç <i>Antiokbeia ad Orontes Suyolları</i> .....	33
Hamdi Şahin <i>Korykion Antron'daki Tapınak Zeus Tapınağı mıdır?</i> .....	65
Filiz Dönmez-Öztürk <i>Ordo Senatoriusa Mensup Lykialıların Prosopografyası</i> .....	81
Julian Bennett <i>The Garrison of Cilicia during the Principate</i> .....	115
Ümit Aydınoglu <i>Kanytella Nekropolisi: Yeni Buluntular Işığında Bir Değerlendirme</i> .....	129
Senem Özden-Gerçekler <i>Two Italian Sigillata Fragments from Perge</i> .....	159
Mehmet Özsait – Guy Labarre – Nesrin Özsait – İlhan Güceren <i>Sites et statuts des communautés en Pisidie: l'exemple des Hadrianoi et des Moulasseis</i> .....	171
Aliye Erol-Özdizbay <i>Perge Sikkelerinde Agonistik Ödül Taçları</i> .....	203
Özgür Turak <i>An Attic-Type Dionysiac Sarcophagus from Perge</i> .....	223
Ayşe Aydın <i>Dağlık Kilikia'da Yeni Keşfedilen Merkezi Planlı Yapılara İki Örnek: Küstüllü-Felicek ve Hisar'daki Tetrakonkhos Planlı Yapılar</i> .....	247
Georges Kiourtzian <i>Selçukluların Beklerken: 1199'un Küçük Asya'sında Alanya Surlarından Bir Yazıt</i> .....	265
Nida Naycı <i>Integrated Management Policies in Archaeological Sites and the Involvement of Local People: Proposals for the Ancient Olba Territorium, Mersin</i> .....	275



## The Garrison of Cilicia during the Principate

Julian BENNETT\*

### Introduction

It has long been accepted that each and every Roman province, whether it was an imperial province, and so constitutionally the responsibility of the emperor, or a senatorial one, and thus (nominally, at least) under the control of the senate, had a garrison of some kind. However, firm evidence that this was the case with the imperial province of Cilicia, as reconstituted by Vespasian, only emerged in 2004, with the publication of a *diploma* for the year 121 reporting the *cobors IIII Gallorum equitata* as the provincial garrison at that time<sup>1</sup>. Unfortunately, the existence of this document is not as widely known as one might hope for. Thus while the valuable information it contains is well known amongst students of the Roman army, this seems to have escaped a wider audience. This paper is intended to rectify that fact but will also attempt to establish, as far as the evidence permits, the nature of the garrison of Cilicia province during the early and high principate. But first it is necessary to briefly summarise the official standing of Cilicia in the provincial hierarchy at that time, as this has a fundamental bearing on the nature and size of its garrison.

### The Province of Cilicia

The original Republican province of Cilicia, in existence from 80 B.C.<sup>2</sup>, was dissolved sometime between c. 49-38 B.C., Cilicia Campestris (Pedia) then being attached to Syria, apparently under its own *legatus*, while Cilicia Tracheia (Aspera) was assigned to the first of a series of 'native' rulers<sup>3</sup>. The last of these was Antiochos IV of Commagene, deposed for alleged treachery by the emperor Vespasian (69-79) in 72, after which event Commagene was attached to Syria and the two Cilicias were reconstituted as a single

---

\* Dr. J. Bennett, Bilkent Üniversitesi, İnsani Bilimler ve Edebiyat Fakültesi, Arkeoloji Bölümü, 06800 Bilkent, Ankara. E-mail [bennett@bilkent.edu.tr](mailto:bennett@bilkent.edu.tr)

I gratefully acknowledge the use of the library facilities of the British Institute in Ankara during the preparation of this paper, and also the comments of an anonymous referee. Note that all dates are A.D. unless otherwise indicated.

<sup>1</sup> The term *diploma* is a modern one used for those individual bronze copies of official constitutions or statutes originally 'published' at Rome which detailed those auxiliary regiments with men eligible for discharge, and the rights they thus acquired: cf. Bennett 2011, 253-255, for a conveniently accessible summary account. The *diploma* reviewed here was originally reported in Pferdehirt 2004, 54-56 no. 19.

<sup>2</sup> Oktan 2011. Cf. also Freeman 1986.

<sup>3</sup> For the dismembering of the Republican province, see Magie 1950, 418, 433-434, and 1271-72 n. 44; and for the senatorial *legatus* of Cilicia Pedia, cf. Tac. Ann. 13.33 and 16.21, with Magie 1950, 563, and 1419-1420 n. 68.

province<sup>4</sup>. Vespasian's motive(s) in re-establishing the province of Cilicia is nowhere stated in any of the available sources. But we can be sure that his act was part of a deliberate policy intended to remove the various 'independent' statelets that were scattered throughout the eastern part of the Roman Empire, many of them hardly urbanised, and so bring these areas within direct Roman rule<sup>5</sup>.

In its revived form Cilicia province became one of those Roman territories that are often referred to as the junior imperial provinces. That is to say, unlike the senior imperial provinces (such as Syria), it did not have any legion(s) permanently stationed within its boundaries. As such then throughout the early and high principate, Cilicia province was also one of those territories generally classed as the *inermes provinciae*, the 'unarmed' or 'undefended provinces'<sup>6</sup>. The phrase does not literally mean that these provinces lacked any form of garrison. It simply refers to the fact that instead of being provided with a legionary garrison on a permanent basis, these provinces were garrisoned by one or more units of *auxilia*, the auxiliary or 'support' units of the Roman army<sup>7</sup>.

As with the senior imperial provinces, the administration of the junior imperial provinces was delegated to an imperial agent, a man the emperor personally chose for the task in hand, and who would normally hold the position for three or so years. In the case of the junior imperial provinces these agents might be members of the equestrian order, as was the case with the governors of Cappadocia between c. 18/20-55. However, the majority of the junior imperial provinces were administered on the emperor's behalf by a member of the senatorial order after he had served a one-year term as a praetor, one of the 16 or so junior magistrates of Rome: hence their official title as provincial governor was *legatus Augusti pro praetore* - 'delegate of the emperor with praetorian status'. With regard to the reconstituted province of Cilicia, the epigraphic evidence is quite clear that this was the title of those men who governed the territory from its formation until the early or mid 3<sup>rd</sup> century, when an administrative reorganisation saw the province 'relegated' to the oversight of a governor appointed from among the equestrian order<sup>8</sup>.

---

<sup>4</sup> Magie 1950, 576, and Rémy 1986, 61-62.

<sup>5</sup> It seems likely that Cilicia Tracheia at this time and even later was a patchwork of small, semi-autonomous, non-civic settlements and sub-tribal federations, along with temple-states, making it difficult for the Roman authorities to deal with, and probably nigh impossible to tax. Note, for example, the references to some settlements in the area as *vici* or villages even into the 3<sup>rd</sup> century: cf. RMD 131 and 133.

<sup>6</sup> Tacitus is the only classical historian to use the phrase in its entirety, the instances being conveniently listed in Sherck 1955, 400 n. 2 and 3.

<sup>7</sup> The distinction is made quite clear in Tac. Hist 2.81, an account of events in 68: '*quidquid provinciarum adluitur mari Asia atque Achaia tenus, quantumque introrsus in Pontum et Armenios patescit, iuravere; sed inermes legati regebant, nondum additis Cappadociae legionibus*', which may be broadly rendered as 'All the maritime provinces [in the Aegean] as far as Asia and Achaia and the whole expanse of the interior towards Pontus and Armenia, took the oath of allegiance [to Vespasian]; however, the legates of these provinces were 'unarmed' as at this time Cappadocia did not have any legions assigned to it'.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Rémy 1988, 215-218, for the status of the province's governors during the principate, and *ibid* 1989, 341-357, for a list of the known governors between 72 and the mid 3<sup>rd</sup> century, to which list we can now add Calpurnius Caestianus, who assumed the office in 120/121 (see Pferdehirt 2004 55 n. 3; also this article, below). For the change in status of the provincial governor in the 3<sup>rd</sup> century, see Rémy 1986, 110, with *ibid*, 1988, 218.

## The *Auxilia* of the Roman Army

As indicated above, the *inermes provinciae*, such as Cilicia, were provided with a garrison of one or more units of *auxilia*. As the nature of these regiments is unlikely to be familiar to some readers of this journal -for aspects of the Roman military feature rarely in the journals devoted to Anatolian archaeology- then a brief introductory account of their form and substance might be of use before proceeding any further<sup>9</sup>.

To begin with, it is necessary to know that from a very early date in the Republican period Rome had relied on her allied states for the 'voluntary' supply on a short-term basis of auxiliary military units to assist various Roman generals on their campaigns. This system came to an end with the establishment of the principate, when in connection with a series of army reforms introduced at an early point in his reign, Augustus (31/27 BC - AD 14) decided to establish a permanent force of auxiliary units, using volunteers and conscripts from those foreign territories that were either directly controlled by or allied to Rome<sup>10</sup>. The exact number of such units created during Augustus' lifetime is disputed: but what is clear is that regiments of *auxilia* continued to be created under the Julio-Claudian and later emperors, the practice apparently only coming to an end during the reign of the emperor Hadrian (117-138). That period saw the creation of the national *numeri*, regiments formed using recruits from the frontier regions of the Roman Empire, a few of these being later transformed into regular auxiliary units<sup>11</sup>.

Generally speaking each auxiliary unit was distinguished by a number and an 'ethnic' title, the latter indicating which place or tribe provided the original complement for the unit when newly raised, the former indicating the sequence in which these units were created. Although some of those units formed under Augustus added the epithet *Augusta* to their title, it was not until the Flavian period that newly formed auxiliary regiments began regularly to incorporate the reigning emperor's name in their title. And so, generally speaking - there are exceptions to the rule - it seems that those units with the additional name 'Flavia' were established by one of the Flavian emperors (between 69-96); those with 'Ulpia' by Trajan (98-117); and those with 'Aelia' by Hadrian. As a broad rule of thumb, therefore, a unit lacking an imperial name in its title is likely to be a creation of the Julio-Claudian period, although there is no hard evidence that this is always the case.

Wherever and whenever they were initially raised, until the time of Nero (54-68), all auxiliary units were *quingenaria*, that is to say, they had a nominal complement of 500 men, although at about the beginning of the First Jewish Rebellion (66-72), larger *milliaria* units, with a nominal complement of 1,000 men, were in existence. Whatsoever their numerical size, the auxiliary units came in one of three forms: the *cohortes peditatae*, units of infantry; the *cohortes equitatae*, regularly-sized (*quingenaria* or *milliaria*) units of infantry with an additional complement of cavalry equivalent equalling roughly one third the numbers of infantry; and the *alae*, or cavalry squadrons.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Bennett 2011, 251-253, for a more detailed account. Holder 1980, and Saddington 1982, are the current standard works on the subject, although much can still be gleaned from the seminal work of Cheesman 1914.

<sup>10</sup> An account of those auxiliary units raised in Cilicia before and after the creation of the province in 72 is provided in Bennett 2011, 261-67.

<sup>11</sup> Southern 1989 is the standard work on the national *numeri*.

Those provinces garrisoned by one or more legions always had a number of auxiliary troops stationed alongside them, and it seems that the general intention was to match the numbers of legionary soldiers in a territory with an equivalent total number of auxiliary troops. So, for example, a single legion province such as Arabia had eight auxiliary units of various types representing some 5,000 soldiers, thus approximately matching the number of men in the legion<sup>12</sup>. In the case of the *inermes provinciae* the size of the auxiliary garrison varied from one to the other according to the degree or level of danger faced by that territory. Those that were deemed liable to attack from an external enemy frequently had quite large auxiliary garrisons: for example, under Hadrian, Mauretania Caesariensis and Mauretania Tingitana were garrisoned respectively by between 15 and 17 auxiliary units<sup>13</sup>. In other words, the combined numbers of men in each of these two provinces equalled more-or-less the numbers of men in a regular legion with its usual complement of auxiliary troops, so constituting a force that was sufficiently large to deal with any external as well as internal threat. By contrast, those territories far removed from any direct threat contained far fewer such units: Lycia-Pamphylia, for instance, was garrisoned regularly by a succession of single auxiliary units throughout the early and high Empire<sup>14</sup>, although during the reign of Trajan, the governor of the much larger province of Pontus-Bithynia had two such units under his command for certain, but probably no more<sup>15</sup>. As will be shown below, the evidence, slight as it is, is sufficient to propose that no more than a single auxiliary unit was ever based at any one time in the new province of Cilicia during the period up to at least the early 2<sup>nd</sup> and probably into the 3<sup>rd</sup> century.

## Auxiliary Units serving in Cilicia

### 1) The *cohors IIII Gallorum equitata*

The evidence for the *cohors IIII Gallorum equitata*, a unit originally raised from one or more of the Gallic provinces, having been stationed in Cilicia at one point during its existence is provided by a *diploma*, one of those bronze documents confirming the previous military service and the citizenship status and rights of a time-served auxiliary soldier, this particular one having been issued on 9 viii 121<sup>16</sup>. The provenance of the single surviving leaf from this particular document is unknown. Many of those that are increasingly becoming available on the international art market (as was the case with this one) are known or thought to have come from the Danube region<sup>17</sup>, but it will be shown that there are good reasons for assuming this particular example was found in modern Turkey or Syria. That aside, the prologue to the document indicates that it was issued by a previously unknown governor of Cilicia province, Calpurnius Cestianus, who must have succeeded

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Weiß - Speidel 2004, 264.

<sup>13</sup> Holder 2003, Tables 10 and 11.

<sup>14</sup> Bennett 2007, *passim*, but esp. 148.

<sup>15</sup> Pliny Ep. 10.21, while governor of the province, talks of the *cohortes* supplied to him, indicating that at least two were there, but none of the junior imperial or senatorial provinces in areas away from the frontiers of the Roman Empire are known to have had any more than two units stationed within them at any one time.

<sup>16</sup> Pferdehirt 2004, 55-56.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Pferdehirt 2004, in which 35 of the 64 complete or partial *diplomata* listed there are known or believed to have come the Danube region. Of the remainder, most are of unknown origin, except for one (no. 22) from Şanlıurfa.

his predecessor, Julius Castus (or Gallus) sometime in late 120 or early 121<sup>18</sup>. The *diploma* also informs us that at that time the *cobors IIII Gallorum equitata* was commanded by one Surdenus Priscus, an apparently previously unknown equestrian officer<sup>19</sup>, but of greater significance is that the phrasing of the document indicates beyond any doubt that the province was garrisoned by a single auxiliary unit<sup>20</sup>.

As for the *diploma* itself, this was issued to an infantry soldier named Alexander, the son of Andronicus, and as such documents became available only at or about the time an auxiliary soldier had completed his regular 25 years honourable service, then we can assume he was originally recruited or conscripted into the *auxilia* in about 96. The *diploma* notes that at the time it was issued Alexander had three sons and one daughter, and as no wife is named on the document she must have been dead by then<sup>21</sup>. The *diploma* also specifies that Alexander was a native of an Antiochia, unfortunately without any further elaboration, although we might note that all of the places named Antiochia that were within the Roman Empire at the relevant date are now in either modern Turkey or Syria. As many auxiliary veterans appear to have settled in either the place where they served or in their hometown, then there is a strong chance that the *diploma* was originally found in one of these countries.

Although there are three units known with the number and name of the *cobors IIII Gallorum equitata*, that in which our Alexander was serving at the time of his discharge must be the same as that first reported on a *diploma* for Moesia in 75<sup>22</sup>, the date of issue of this *diploma* strongly suggesting the regiment was originally raised c. 50<sup>23</sup>. The unit is next reported on *diplomata* for Moesia Inferior for 97 and 105<sup>24</sup>, and is subsequently named on a *diploma* for Thracia issued on 19 vii 114<sup>25</sup>, after which it appears in Cilicia in 121. Economy of hypothesis suggests that the unit was transferred to Thrace c. 113 to replace a regiment from that province which required to be redeployed further east in connection with Trajan's forthcoming Parthian campaign, and was then sent on to Anatolia in c. 115/116 when Trajan realised how badly he needed extra troops in a vain attempt at holding the new provinces of Armenia, Mesopotamia, and Assyria<sup>26</sup>.

With the evidence currently available we cannot know if the *cobors IIII Gallorum* was sent directly from Thracia to Cilicia to replace a unit dispatched from there further east in c. 115-117 -although, as will be shown, that does seem possible- or if it arrived in Cilicia as a result of Hadrian's reorganisation of the army in the eastern provinces in 117<sup>27</sup>. On

<sup>18</sup> Pferdehirt 2004, 55, n. 3, with Syme 1969, 363-364, and Rémy 1989, 342-43.

<sup>19</sup> However, given that a number of cohort commanders went on to command an *ala* after an intervening term as a legionary tribune, then it is possible that he is the same as the 'Priscus' who commanded an *ala* in Arabia in 127: PME 131 ter.

<sup>20</sup> Pferdehirt 2004, 55, n. 4.

<sup>21</sup> Unless, that is, she was already a Roman citizen.

<sup>22</sup> RMD 2.

<sup>23</sup> A Julio-Claudian date for the original formation of the *cobors IIII Gallorum* is also suggested by the lack of an imperial *nomen* in the unit's title

<sup>24</sup> RMD 338 (for 97); and CIL 16.50 (for 105).

<sup>25</sup> Pferdehirt 2004, 54-55, n. 2, with RMD 338 (for 97); and CIL 16.50 (for 105); and RMD 227 (for 114).

<sup>26</sup> Bennett 2010, 443.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Bennett 2010, 444.

the other hand, a *diploma* certifies that by 153, the unit was in Syria<sup>28</sup>, perhaps having arrived there in connection with the Second Jewish Rebellion of 132-135, and it is also named on the latest known *diploma* for the same province, issued in 157<sup>29</sup>. This would seem to be its last appearance in the historical record, unless it is the same as the *cohors quarta Gallorum* reported in the *Notitia Dignitatum* as being the garrison of the province of Rhodopa in Scythian Moesia<sup>30</sup>. This is possible: the crushing defeat suffered by the Roman army at Adrianople in 378 quite probably resulted in some of the units stationed in the eastern provinces being sent to Europe, with the *cohors III Gallorum* from Syria being one of these.

## 2) The *cohors VI Hispanorum* (?*equitata*)

A fragment from a tombstone found sometime before 1977 at Anazarba indicates the presence of the *cohors VI Hispanorum* in Cilicia at some point in its history<sup>31</sup>. The remaining part preserves a dedication to the deceased, one Aemlius Crispus, the text continuing by indicating that he had died while serving as an infantryman in the century of Romanus in the *cohors VI Hispanorum*. What is left of the monument concludes with the name of a Marcus Domitius, most probably the man who organised the making and erection of this funerary monument.

Unlike most of the other auxiliary regiments raised in what is now Spain and Portugal, very little is known about the *cohors VI Hispanorum*. Indeed, apart from the Anazarba fragment and two other fragmentary texts erected at their hometown reporting ex-commanders of the unit<sup>32</sup>, there are precisely four other epigraphic references to a unit of this name: one from Syria; two from Arabia; and the fourth being a *diploma* of 141-142 for that last province. However, given the geographical proximity of these provinces to Cilicia, we can be reasonably certain that we are dealing with the same unit. The earliest of these texts is probably that from Syria, a tombstone from Al Bazuriyah, 90 km south-west of Palmyra on the road to Damascus, with epigraphic features consistent with a late 1<sup>st</sup> or early 2<sup>nd</sup> century date<sup>33</sup>. It records the burial of one Caius Laberius Fronto, a soldier in the century of Nymphidides of the *cohors VI Hispanorum*, the memorial having been erected by his father, Heliuss. Next in chronological sequence is the *diploma* for Arabia of 141-142<sup>34</sup>, followed by an inscription internally dated to 212/213, commemorating the building of a new castellum at Qaṣr al Hallabāt in Arabia province by the *cohors VI Hispanorum*, along with the *cohortes I Thracum* and *V Afrorum Severiana*<sup>35</sup>. The fourth text reporting the unit is an undateable dedication to Athena set up at Ein Saharonim, between Petra

<sup>28</sup> Weiß 2006 264-69, and 278-79.

<sup>29</sup> CIL 16.106.

<sup>30</sup> ND. Or. 50.

<sup>31</sup> Dagon - Feissel 1987, 164 no. 103 = AE 2006 = Sayar 2000, 70 no. 71

<sup>32</sup> CIL 11.4376, from Amelia (Umbria), and IGR 4.728, from Phrygian Eumenia.

<sup>33</sup> AE 1933.215, originally read as referring to the *cohors II Hispanorum*, but emended to refer to the *cohors VI Hispanorum* by H. Seyrig: cf. Speidel 1977, 706 (= *ibid* 1984, 248). A date in the 1<sup>st</sup> or early 2<sup>nd</sup> century for this text is suggested by the way it indicates the *praenomen* of the deceased, funerary monuments from the time of Hadrian onward usually omitting this.

<sup>34</sup> Weiß - Speidel 2004, esp. 255.

<sup>35</sup> Littmann - Magie - Stuart 1921, 22-23 no. 17.

and Gaza by a Marcus Antonius or Annius, a soldier of the *cobors VI Hispanorum*<sup>36</sup>: as Ein Saharonim is within the territory of Arabia province the text must date to after its formation in 106. Other than these documents it has been plausibly suggested that the *cobors IV Hispanorum* was one of those regiments that were later elevated to the status of an *ala*, becoming the *ala VI Hispanorum* listed in the garrison of Arabia in the *Notitia Dignitatum*<sup>37</sup>: if so, this might suggest that the unit was originally a *cobors equitata*<sup>38</sup>.

Despite the paucity of records for this unit a plausible reconstruction of its history can be offered. To begin with, as its formal title lacks an imperial epithet based on a reigning emperor's name then it was most probably formed in the Julio-Claudian period. The complete absence of any epigraphic evidence for the unit in the European provinces strongly suggests that it was deployed to one of the Eastern provinces within a short time of its initial establishment<sup>39</sup>. This would allow for it having been stationed in one of these when Vespasian reconstituted the province of Cilicia, and it may well be that the unit was redeployed at that time to become the province's initial garrison<sup>40</sup>. Either way, it is more than likely that the unit was a *cobors equitata*, as such units, with their mounted contingent, would logically be of more use for patrol duties than a complement of infantry alone. As we have seen, the Al Bazuriyah inscription indicates that the unit was in Syria around the turn of the 1<sup>st</sup> century, making it entirely conceivable that it arrived there in the aftermath of Trajan's Parthian Wars<sup>41</sup>. This would allow for a scenario in which sometime between c. 113-117, the *cobors VI Hispanorum* was redeployed for service in connection with Trajan's Parthian War, later being assigned to Syria, or, alternatively, that it was sent directly to Syria, to replace a unit removed from there for that same campaign. Either way, after a short period of service in Syria it was evidently transferred to Arabia, perhaps in connection with the Second Jewish Rebellion, remaining in that province for the remainder of its existence.

## The role of the garrison of Cilicia

The *communis opinio* is that those of the *inermes provinciae* that, like Cilicia, did not share a border with a potential aggressor were provided with an auxiliary garrison essentially for the purposes of maintaining internal security. At first sight this would certainly seem to be an obligation on the part of the Roman state with regard to Vespasian's new province of Cilicia: during the Republican period the western part, Cilicia Tracheia, had been infamous for its pirates and brigands, and even in Vespasian's own lifetime, in 36

<sup>36</sup> AE 1993.1652: the dedication and the soldier's name are in Greek, his military status and the unit title in Latin.

<sup>37</sup> *ND Or.* 37.26: Weiß – Speidel 2004, 264.

<sup>38</sup> Roxan 1976, 61, where it is also proposed that the change in status for those *cobortes* converted to *alae* took place between the mid 3<sup>rd</sup> and early 4<sup>th</sup> century.

<sup>39</sup> Spaul 2000, 136, has suggested that the *cobors VI equitata* reported in Pontus-Bithynia by Pliny (Ep. 10.21) under Trajan might be the same as this *cobors VI Hispanorum*, employing IGR 4.728 from Eumonia in Asia Province in support of his case. However, this is not a dedication erected by the *cobors VI Hispanorum*, as indicated by Spaul, but a regular *cursus honorum* erected by the community to one of its members, a former commander of that unit. The fact remains that Pliny's unit might be one of at least two other sixth cohorts whose whereabouts at this time are unknown.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. Dagron – Feissel 1987, 164.

<sup>41</sup> Weiß – Speidel 2004, 264, have suggested that the *cobors VI Hispanorum* took part in the annexation of Nabataea in 106, implying that it may have been in Syria immediately before then. This seems unlikely, as the unit is not listed on any of the *diplomata* issued for Syria for the years 88, 91, and 93.

and again in 52, Rome had been forced to send legionary troops there to deal with the revolting inhabitants<sup>42</sup>. However, the evidence indicates that by the time Vespasian reconstituted the province of Cilicia, the region had been generally peaceful for an entire generation, with brigandage only becoming a problem again in the 3<sup>rd</sup> century<sup>43</sup>.

But what is much more to the point is how inscriptions and literary evidence testify that in Cilicia, as in all those Anatolian provinces removed from the frontier zone, Rome preferred not to place the responsibility for internal security entirely in the hands of the provincial governor, but assigned this duty to locally elected ‘police’ superintendents. These were the officials known as the *irenarchs* in the urban centres, those entrusted with overall safety in the countryside being the *paraphylaces*, both types of officers being able to call on a police force of a kind, the *diogmitai* or ‘chasers’, when required<sup>44</sup>. Even so, the Roman state was fully aware that a community might not have sufficient manpower to deal with each and every potentially serious situation. This is why all provincial governors were provided with at least one regular Roman army unit for dealing with those disturbances that perchance proved beyond the competence of locally elected officials.

Given how the maintenance of internal security in Cilicia was chiefly the responsibility of these locally elected officials it is reasonable to ask what was the substantive role of the single auxiliary unit stationed within the province. Precise evidence is lacking, although it is habitually asserted that the main task of the auxiliary garrisons in the *inermes provinciae* such as Cilicia was little more than to guard places of military importance<sup>45</sup>. This concept developed from the existence of epigraphic texts reporting *stationarii*, one or more soldiers detached from their parent units and assigned to *stationes*, guard- or watch-posts located along the main road routes, or in the countryside, or even in urban centres<sup>46</sup>. As it is, only two literary texts say anything about the duties of the *stationarii*, one indicating they were used for chasing and capturing bandits, the other stating how they were used for capturing escaped slaves<sup>47</sup>. On the other hand it seems that Pliny’s *stationarius* at Nicomedia<sup>48</sup>, served as a link between the governor and the locally appointed ‘police’ officers and civic officials<sup>49</sup>. To be sure, the majority of the *stationarii* must have also served in this way, as local representatives of Roman rule in both urban and rural contexts, and for this reason they are fairly well represented in the epigraphic record of most of the Anatolian provinces<sup>50</sup>. In Cilicia, however, there is but a single record of a *stationarius*, a tombstone from Artanada recording a Caius Julius Valens, the son of Julius Valens, who had twice been appointed to that duty<sup>51</sup>.

<sup>42</sup> Tac Ann 6.41.1, for 36; and 12.55, for 52.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. Mitchell 1993, 234-235 *passim*, with Wolff 2003, 121-132, who also observes how large-scale brigandage resumed in Cilicia Tracheia in the 3<sup>rd</sup> century. But cf. Brélaz 2005, 331-333, where it is argued that the evidence does not support entirely a substantial increase in brigandage in Cilicia Tracheia at this time.

<sup>44</sup> Brélaz 2005, 68-230.

<sup>45</sup> E.g., Brélaz 2005, 231-284 esp. 282-84; also Mitchell 1993, 122-124.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. Austin - Rankov 1996, 195-96; cf. Pliny Ep. 10.74, reporting a single soldier, named Appuleius, serving as the *stationarius* at Nicomedia.

<sup>47</sup> Ter. Apol. 2.8; Dig. 11.4.1.2.

<sup>48</sup> Pliny Ep. 10.74.

<sup>49</sup> Sherwin-White 1985, 661.

<sup>50</sup> Mitchell 1993, 141 with 122 and 233.

<sup>51</sup> IGR 812. We might reasonably assume he was an auxiliary soldier, as all *stationarii* seem to have been recruited from auxiliary *cobortes*.

Employment as *stationarii* aside, we learn from Pliny's correspondence with Trajan when Pliny was serving as governor of Pontus-Bithynia (between 110-112), that soldiers stationed within the *inermes provinciae* might be employed on a wide range of tasks. So, for example, some members of the garrison had been assigned to guard prisoners on remand in local jails, while ten others, classed as *beneficarii* (soldiers below the rank of centurion), along with two cavalymen and a centurion, were on detached duty with the *praefectus Orae Ponticae*, the official responsible for security along the Pontic Shore<sup>52</sup>. These men apart, a further ten soldiers had been detached from their cohort(s) for service with the equestrian *procurator Augusti Ponti et Bithyniae*, the imperial agent responsible for taxation and for managing the imperial estates in the province, while some other infantrymen and two cavalymen had been sent to escort the procurator's assistant on a grain collecting mission in Paphlagonia<sup>53</sup>. Pliny also refers to the need to send a centurion and/or soldiers to help control military traffic passing through Juliopolis, on the main west-east road through Bithynia<sup>54</sup>, and even requests architects to be sent from Rome to help with various civil engineering projects in the province, plausibly projects that he planned to complete using members of the garrison, given that such work was among the responsibilities of a provincial governor<sup>55</sup>.

## Discussion

The evidence, then, indicates that two auxiliary units were certainly stationed in succession in Cilicia province, the *cobors VI Hispanorum (equitata ?)*, from an unknown date until probably around the time of Trajan's Parthian War of 114-117, when it was replaced by the *cobors III Gallorum equitata*, which remained in Cilicia until, probably, the outbreak of the Second Jewish Rebellion of 132-135. Whether or not the *cobors VI Hispanorum* was the first garrison of Vespasian's new province cannot be known from the evidence to hand, although it is possible. Equally uncertain is whether Cilicia received a replacement garrison after the *cobors III Gallorum* left the province, although this is likely. We simply have no evidence on either point, and in the absence of such, further speculation must be avoided.

On the other hand, it is noteworthy that from the time of its reconstitution by Vespasian, Cilicia, once a highly troublesome area in terms of internal security, warranted a remarkably small Roman garrison from the time of its inception to an uncertain date in the late 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> century. After all, if the garrison regularly consisted of a single auxiliary unit, as seems to be the case, then if this was normal *cobors peditata*, it represented at most 480 infantry; and if that garrison was a *cobors equitata*, as was the *cobors III Gallorum equitata*, and probably also the *cobors VI Hispanorum*, we have the same number of infantry with an additional 120 cavalymen, and so 600 soldiers in all. Evidently this number was regarded as sufficient to step in when necessary to support the locally elected 'police' officials in implementing the law within the province. That said, if the situation became too extreme for this small force, the extra troops required could be supplied easily from the

<sup>52</sup> Prison duty: Pliny Ep. 10.19 (also Dig. 48.3.12 and 14, indicating that by the 3<sup>rd</sup> century, if not before, this was a regular duty assumed by a provincial garrison); service with the *praefectus Orae Ponticae*: Pliny Ep. 21 with 22.

<sup>53</sup> Pliny Ep. 10.27 and 28.

<sup>54</sup> Pliny Ep. 10.77 with 78.

<sup>55</sup> Pliny Ep. 10.37 and 39 with Dig. 1.16.7.1.

legions or from the sizeable auxiliary garrison based in neighbouring Cappadocia<sup>56</sup>, just as the garrison of Syria had dealt with affairs in Cilicia after the Republican province was dismembered<sup>57</sup>.

That aside, one final matter that needs to be addressed before concluding this review is where the auxiliary garrison of Cilicia was based, in the sense of where did the commanding officer, his staff and his soldiers physically live? As it is, the question of ‘Where did they put the soldiers?’ has long puzzled students of the Roman army in the eastern provinces, simply because although these were home to a substantial number of auxiliary units from the Augustan period onwards, there is a distinct lack of evidence from the pre-Severan period for any permanent military installations for the *auxilia* matching the auxiliary forts so familiar in the western provinces<sup>58</sup>. From this it is generally concluded that until that time, if only outside of the frontier areas, auxiliary soldiers were mainly billeted among the population in the urban and rural centres<sup>59</sup>.

It so happens that literary evidence can be adduced to support the belief, that the soldiers of Roman army units in certain -if not all- of the eastern provinces were billeted on a regular basis among civilians. For example, the mid-2<sup>nd</sup> century rhetor Aelius Aristides, a native of Adriani in Mysia, claimed that the military units in what he evidently means the *inermes provinciae* of the eastern provinces were “scattered through the countryside rather than being based in the urban centres, so that in many provinces the inhabitants do not even know where their garrison is based”<sup>60</sup>. In one of his sermons on virginity, Basil of Galatian Ancyra, who was executed in 362, made reference to how a unit of soldiers might insinuate its way into a private house for billeting purposes and then appropriates it for their own use<sup>61</sup>. Libanius of Antioch on the Orontes, writing between 362 and 365, refers to soldiers being billeted in groups of villages in his home territory of Antioch in such a way as to indicate it was common practice<sup>62</sup>. To this we might add the comment of Vegetius, writing somewhere in the western empire at the end of the 4<sup>th</sup> century that a military unit might be based ‘in *castris* or in a city’<sup>63</sup>. However, this need not mean that those units based within an existing community were necessarily billeted in and shared civilian accommodations. At Dura Europas in Syria, for example, the western part of the town was taken over completely by the Roman army, whose soldiers then proceeded to knock down old room divisions while building new ones, as well as enlarging kitchens, in the process littering the rooms of these former private houses with pieces of armour and graffiti<sup>64</sup>.

<sup>56</sup> A review of the garrison in Cappadocia province is currently underway. Suffice to note here that in addition to its one legion (from 72-c. 75) and then two (after c. 75), the auxiliary garrison grew from perhaps six units in the Julio-Claudian period to a probable minimum of 16 in the Hadrianic period and after.

<sup>57</sup> As, e.g., in 36 and in 52: Tac Ann 6.41.1 and 12.55.

<sup>58</sup> E.g., the only military installation for an auxiliary unit identified for certain within Anatolia is that at Gordion: cf. Bennett - Goldman 2008 and (in more detail) Bennett - Goldman 2009

<sup>59</sup> Cf. Gregory 1995, 28-31 and 58.

<sup>60</sup> Ael.Arist. To Rome 67.

<sup>61</sup> Migne 1857, 700d-701a.

<sup>62</sup> Lib. Or. 47: De patrociniis.

<sup>63</sup> Veg. Ep.rei Milit. 3.8.1.

<sup>64</sup> Cf. Pollard 2000, 54-56 and 105-106.

When all is said and done, it has to be conceded that the question as to where the main part of the auxiliary garrison of Cilicia might have been based cannot be answered at present. Suffice to say, though, that it is likely to have been Tarsus, the nominal capital of Cilicia province, although whether the garrison had its own distinct enclave within the settlement, as at Dura Europas, or whether it was billeted amongst the inhabitants of the city or in villages within the province, is as yet unknown. On the other hand, as has been shown elsewhere in Anatolia, a wider knowledge of the artefacts intrinsically associated with the Roman army and a survey of existing museum and excavation collections might well point the way forward to answering this question by identifying those artefacts indisputably associated with the Roman army<sup>65</sup>.

---

<sup>65</sup> E.g., as was the case at Gordion: the discovery of artefacts characteristic of the Roman military allowed its identification as a probable Roman military base before its secure identification as such: cf. Bennett - Goldman 2009, 1642-1643.

## Bibliography

- Austin – Rankov 1996 N. J. E. Austin – B. Rankov, *Exploratio: military and political intelligence in the Roman World* (1996)
- Bennett 2006 J. Bennett, “The Origins and Early History of the Pontic-Cappadocian Frontier”, *AnatSt* 56, 2006, 77-92.
- Bennett 2007 J. Bennett, “The Roman Army in Lycia-Pamphylia”, *Adalya* 10, 2007, 131-153.
- Bennett 2010 J. Bennett, “Auxiliary Deployment during Trajan’s Parthian War: some neglected evidence from Asia Minor”, *Collections Latomus* 323, 2010, 423-445.
- Bennett 2011 J. Bennett, “The Regular Roman Auxiliary Regiments formed from the Provinces of Asia Minor”, *Anatolica* 37, 2011, 251-274.
- Bennett – Goldman 2008 J. Bennett – A. L. Goldman, “Roman Military Occupation at Yassihöyük (Gordion), Ankara Province, Turkey”, *Antiquity* 81/314 (on-line <http://antiquity.ac.uk/ProjGall/bennett/index.html>).
- Bennett – Goldman 2009 J. Bennett – A. L. Goldman, “A Preliminary Report on the Roman Military Presence at Gordion, Galatia”, in: A. Morillo - N. Hanel - E. Martin (edd), *Limes XX: Estudios Sobre La Frontera Romana* (2009) 1605-1616.
- Brélaz 2005 C. Brélaz, *La sécurité publique en Asie Mineure sous le Principat (Ier-IIIème s. ap. J.-C)* (2005).
- Cheesman 1914 G. L. Cheesman, *The Auxilia of the Roman Army* (1914).
- Dagron – Feissel 1987 G. Dagron – D. Feissel, *Inscriptions de Cilicie* (1987).
- Freeman 1986 P. Freeman, “The Province of Cilicia and its Origins”, in: P. Freeman – D. Kennedy (edd), *The Defence of the Roman and Byzantine East* (1986) 253-275.
- Gregory 1995 S. Gregory, *Roman military architecture on the eastern frontier* (1995).
- Holder 1980 P. A. Holder, *Studies in the Auxilia of the Roman Army from Augustus to Trajan* (1980).
- Holder 2003 P. A. Holder, “Auxiliary Deployment in the Reign of Hadrian”, in: J. J. Wilkes (ed), *Documenting the Roman Army: studies in honour of Margaret Roxan* (2003) 101-145.
- Littmann – Magie – Stuart 1921 E. Littmann – D. Magie – D. R. Stuart, *Syria: publications of the Princeton University Archaeological Expeditions to Syria in 1904 and 1909. Division III, Greek and Latin Inscriptions* (1921).
- Magie 1950 D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor to the end of the third century after Christ* (1950).
- Mitchell 1993 S. Mitchell, *Anatolia: Land, Men and Gods in Asia Minor I: the Celts and the impact of Roman rule* (1993).
- Oktan 2011 M. Oktan, “The route taken by Cilicia to Provincial Status: why and when?”, *Olba* 19, 2011, 267-286.
- Pferdehirt 2004 B. Pferdehirt, *Römische militärdiplome und entlassungsurkunden in der sammlung des Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseums* (2004).
- Pollard 2000 N. Pollard, *Soldiers, Cities, and Civilians in Roman Syria* (2000).
- Ritterling 1927 E. Ritterling, “Military forces in the Senatorial Provinces”, *JRS* 17, 1927, 28-32.

- Rémy 1986 B. Rémy, L'Évolution Administrative de L'Anatolie aux trois premiers siècles de Notre ère (1986).
- Rémy 1988 B. Rémy, Les Fastes Sénatoriaux des provinces romaines d'Anatolie au haut-Empire (1988).
- Rémy 1989 B. Rémy, Les Carrières Sénatoriales dans les provinces romaines d'Anatolie au haut-Empire (1989).
- Roxan 1976 M. Roxan, "Pre-Severan Auxilia named in the Notitia Dignitatum", in: R. Goodburn – P. Bartholomew, Aspects of the Notitia Dignitatum (1976) 59-78.
- Saddington 1982 D. Saddington, The Development of the Roman Auxiliary Forces from Caesar to Vespasian (49 BC-AD 79) (1982).
- Sayar 2000 M. H. Sayar, Die Inschriften von Anazarbos und Umgebung (= IK 56) (2000).
- Sherk 1955 R. K. Sherk, "The inermes provinciae of Asia Minor", *AJPh* 76, 1955, 400-413.
- Sherwin-White 1985 A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Letters of Pliny Oxford* (3<sup>rd</sup> corrected edition: 1985).
- Southern 1989 P. Southern, "The Numeri of the Roman Imperial Army", *Britannia* 20, 81-140.
- Spaul 2000 J. Spaul, *Cohors 2* (2000).
- Speidel 1977 M. P. Speidel, 'The Roman Army in Arabia', *ANRW*, 2.8, 687-730 (= M. P. Speidel, *Roman Army Studies* (1984) 229-272).
- Syme 1969 R. Syme, "Legates of Cilicia under Trajan", *Historia* 18, 1969, 352-366.
- Weiß 2006 P. Weiß, "Die Auxilien des syrischen Heeres von Domitian bis Antoninus Pius: Eine Zwischenbilanz nach den neuen Militärdiplom", *Chiron* 36, 2006, 249-356.
- Weiß – Speidel 2004 P. Weiß – M. P. Speidel, "Das erste Militärdiplom für Arabia", *ZPE* 150, 2004, 253-264.
- Wolff 2003 C. Wolff, *Les Brigands en Orient sous le Haut-Empire Romain* (2003).

## Özet

### Principatus Döneminde Kilikia Garnizonu

Roma İmparatorluğu Kilikia Eyaleti'nin kendi garnizonunun varlığı konusunda uzun süredir şüpheler bulunmasına karşın, kanıtlara ilk kez 2004 yılında ulaşıldı. O yıl yayımlanan bu epigrafik metinden *cobors III Gallorum equitata*'nın İ.S. 121 yılında eyalette hizmet verdiği ve eyaletin o güne kadar tanımadığımız Calpurnius Cestianus adlı bir valinin yönetimine girdiği anlaşıldı. Söz konusu belge, Roma Dönemi'nin Anadolu'sunu çalışan bilim adamlarınca pek bilinmediğinden, bu makale konuya açıklık kazandırmak amacıyla kaleme alınmıştır.

Çalışmamızda, Kilikia Eyaleti'nin İmparatorluk döneminin erken ve orta evrelerinde sahip olduğu garnizon yapısı; Roma İmparatorluğu'nun taşra idari sistemi dâhilinde, Kilikia Eyaleti'nin statüsü ve Roma ordusunun Kilikia gibi bir eyalete hizmet veren garnizon türü olan *auxilia* birimleri irdelenmiştir.

Ardından, *cobors III Gallorum equitata*'nın Kilikia Eyaleti'ndeki varlığına işaret eden kanıtlar incelenerek, bu birimin tarihçesi ve Kilikia'ya geliş ve ayrılış tarihleriyle ilgili bilgiler gözden geçirilmiş; Kilikia'da varlığı saptanan diğer tek garnizon olan *cobors IV Hispanorum* (?*equitata*) da yine eyalete geliş ve ayrılış tarihleriyle birlikte değerlendirilmiş; Kilikia Eyaleti garnizonunun muhtemel rol ve işlevi sorgulanmıştır. Elimizde mevcut bilgilere göre, erken ve orta Roma İmparatorluk döneminde eyalette asayiş ve düzenle ilgili birincil sorumluluk, yerel olarak seçilen sivil memurların üzerindedir ve daha ciddi durumlarda kullanılmak üzere ise valinin emrine tek bir *auxilium* birimi veriliyordu. Henüz başlangıcı bilinmeyen bir tarihten itibaren Kilikia'ya yerleşen *cobors VI Hispanorum*, Traianus'un Parth Savaşı'na kadar eyalette kalmış ve muhtemelen bu tarihte yerini *cobors III Gallorum*'a bırakmış, ki bu birim de İ.S. 132-135 yıllarındaki İkinci Yahudi Ayaklanması'na kadar bölgedeki varlığını sürdürmüş olabilir. *Cobors VI Hispanorum* olasılıkla yeni Kilikia Eyaleti'nin ilk garnizonu idi ve *cobors III Gallorum* eyaletten ayrıldıktan sonra yerine bir başka birimin gelmiş olması muhtemeldir. Fakat burada dikkat çeken konu, Roma Cumhuriyet Dönemi'nde ve de sonra İ.S. 3. yy.'da namılı korsanların ve haydutların yuvası haline gelmiş bir eyalette, kuruluşundan itibaren en azından 2. yy.'ın başlarına kadar giden bir dönemde, topu topu 480 ila 600 adamdan müteşekkil tek bir *auxilium* biriminden oluşan şaşkıncı derecede küçük bir garnizon bırakılmış olmasıdır.

Makalenin sonunda, Anadolu'nun çoğu için geçerli olduğu üzere, Kilikia'daki *auxilia* birimlerinin fiziksel olarak nerede konuşlandığına dair hiçbir net bilgi mevcut olmamasına dikkat çekilmiş; askerlerin, kentsel ve kırsal alanlarda halk arasında konaklatıldıkları ya da çoğunluğu Dura Europos örneğindeki gibi bir kentsel alanda veya Gordion örneğindeki gibi sabit askeri yerleşimde konuşlandırılmış olabileceği olasılığı üzerinde durulmuştur.