

THE AUXILIARY GARRISON OF ASIA PROVINCE

Julian Bennett*

In memoriam G.L. Cheesman, 14 September 1884–10 August 1915**

Abstract

The Roman province of Asia was one of those grouped by some ancient authors as being among the inermes provinciae of the Roman Empire. In fact just like all the others in this group of ‘unarmed provinces’ it contained a garrison of auxiliary soldiers, there to help maintain internal security. This article catalogues and discusses the limited evidence available for the garrison of Asia province in part to correct the still common if often un-stated view that it lacked any form of regular Roman military garrison, but also to help in understanding the overall Roman ‘Order of Battle’. In addition, it highlights the importance of Eumeneia as one of the very few sites in Asia Minor identifiable as the location of a purpose-built Roman fort.

INTRODUCTION

The primary intention of this paper is to establish the identities and histories of the auxiliary units based in Asia province during the Principate, that is to say, the period between the administrative and other reforms of Augustus and those that were introduced by Diocletian.¹ As such this article follows at long remove the seminal work of G.L. Cheesman in analysing the epigraphic evidence for the various auxiliary units of the Roman army as a means of improving our knowledge of the ‘Order of Battle’ of the Roman army, if especially so here with regard to current knowledge of the various provincial garrisons of Asia Minor.² An additional aim, though, is to draw attention to the role and indeed the very presence of the Roman military in the province, a subject sorely neglected in studies not just of this particular territory, but also for most of the other provinces in this region.³ That neglect arises in part from the

* Department of Archaeology, Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey. I owe many thanks to the library staff at the British Institute in Ankara for their patience and help, and I am most grateful to my colleagues Asuman Coşkun Abuagla and Jacques Morin for reading and commenting on this article: naturally, any mistakes that remain in this are the author’s entirely.

** Fellow of New College, Oxford, instigator of modern research into the Roman *auxilia*, and 2nd lieutenant, 10th Hampshire Regiment: killed in action on Hill Q in the ‘Battle for Chunuk Bair’, Gallipoli, and with no known grave, so commemorated on the Helles Memorial. *Dulce et decorum est pro patria mori* (Hor. *Od.* 3.2.13).

¹ Omitted from any discussion here are the non-auxiliary units epigraphically attested in Asia province, as with, for example, the *Cohors VII Praetoria* stationed at Ephesus (*ILS* 2051 and 2052), and the legionary detachment on service at Aulutrene (Eldere, Dombay Ovası: cf. Christol and Drew-Bear 1995, 69–79).

² Cheesman 1914; see also M.P. Speidel 1989, 102–103.

³ Cf. Bennett 2007a, for the auxiliary garrison of Lycia-Pamphylia, and Bennett 2012, for that of Cilicia. Further articles will explore the evidence for the *auxilia* in provinces of Galatia and Cappadocia, with a final piece assessing

general belief that aside from the two legions and the associated auxiliary units in Cappadocia province, especially those forces concentrated along the Upper Euphrates in that territory, the Roman military was conspicuous by its absence from the other administrative regions in Asia Minor. While it is true that there is a notable dearth of artefacts of any kind relating to the Roman army in these territories, one suspects it is also encouraged by a pernicious confidence in the authority of Tacitus. His repeated stress in the *Histories* on how the provinces of Asia Minor belonged to that group he termed the *inermes provinciae*, those that were ‘unarmed’, carries with it the implication that they lacked any form of regular Roman military presence.⁴

Over six decades ago R.K. Sherk exposed the fallacy of this view in an important work on the topic.⁵ He demonstrated how Tacitus was in fact stressing the absence of any form of legionary presence in these provinces during the Civil War of 68-69, the period he was specifically writing about. As such Tacitus’ observation is in line with that of Josephus when writing of Asia province in the same period: the Jewish renegade’s comment that the province lacked a garrison in Asia province in the last years of Nero’s reign was specifically related to the absence of a legionary presence there.⁶ The point being, as Sherk made clear, that it was wrong to conclude from Tacitus that the *inermes provinciae* in either Asia Minor or elsewhere in the Roman Empire lacked a permanent military presence at any time in their history. Quite simply there was a wide variety of evidence available to confirm the presence of one or more auxiliary units in each of these ‘unarmed’ provinces. The fact was, although Sherk did not labour the point, that all the provinces in this group were those governed at the time by either an equestrian *praefectus* or a senatorial *propraetor*, officials who, on account of their appointment and status, were not eligible to command a legion. More to the point, though, was the actuality that while each of the large *poleis* in Asia Minor doubtless had their own urban police units of *paraphylakes*, there was no contemporary equivalent to a modern police force for the rural areas of region, and so these areas required some form of military presence for internal security and duties of a like kind. Indeed, this is clearly indicated by certain of the letters sent to the emperor Trajan by Pliny the Younger when serving as governor of Pontus-Bithynia. They reveal how, when it was necessary, Pliny could call upon men from at least two auxiliary units in his province for one or other purpose, such as escort duties when collecting food supplies from a neighbouring district, or providing an ‘honour guard’ for the commander of the Pontic fleet.⁷

As it is, in the six decades since Sherk addressed the issue, it has become abundantly clear from the epigraphic and sub-literary evidence that regiments of *auxilia* were regularly em-

the impact of the Roman army on Anatolia in the Imperial period, a subject provisionally examined in Bennett 2013.

⁴ E.g., Tac. *Hist.* 1.11, I.16, 2.81 and 83, and 3.5.

⁵ Sherk 1955, 400-413, esp. 400-401: the precise meaning of the term as used by Tacitus is made most clear in Tac. *Hist.* 1.16 and 2.81 and 83. For an earlier and more general article on the subject of the *inermes provinciae* see Ritterling 1927.

⁶ Jos. *Bell. Jud.* 2.366.

⁷ E.g., Ep. 10.19, on the possibility of using soldiers to guard prisoners; 10.21, soldiers on secondment from two or more cohortes for service with the *praefectus orae Ponticae*; 10.27, soldiers guarding a grain shipment from Paphlagonia; and 10.106, a mention of the *Cohors sexta equestris*. Note also Ael. Arist. *Rom. Or.* 67a, on how in the mid-2nd century, cavalry and infantry detachments served *ex urbe* ‘for the protection of whole countries’.

ployed as garrisons in all the *inermes provinciae*. Moreover, in almost every case these regiments were of the most common type, that is to say, either *cohortes quingenariae peditatae* or *cohortes quingenariae equitatae*, units with a paper strength of respectively 480 infantry, or that same number of foot soldiers with an additional cavalry force of 120 troopers. It seems, however, that there was no ‘by-the-book’ system that determined the type or number of unit supplied as a garrison to the individual *inermis provincia*. However, *cohortes equitatae* seem to have been favoured, their cavalry arm being useful for wide-ranging patrols and as a quick response unit if needed to deal with a local emergency. In terms of numbers of units, though, there is no obvious pattern. Cilicia, for example, seems to have been provided usually with a single *cohors*, while Bithynia, as we have seen, had at least two *cohortes*, one at least of these being a part-mounted unit, while two seems to have been the normal complement assigned to Thrace also, although three were deployed there on occasion.⁸

True, it might be conjectured that the exact status of the provincial governor had something to do with the number of units he commanded. So, just as a man with proconsular status was entitled to 12 *lictores*, while five only were provided for one of propraetorian rank,⁹ then perhaps the number of auxiliary units allocated to a province was linked to the status of its governor. There is, however, nothing to support such a belief. The cumulative evidence is that the size and nature of the auxiliary garrison in any ‘unarmed’ province would naturally vary according to the local circumstances. And so, during the Hadrianic period, the ‘unarmed’ provinces of Mauretania Tingitania and Caesariensis, both governed by imperial procurators of equestrian rank, were provided with 17 and 15 units of *auxilia* respectively. Moreover, in addition to the usual *cohortes quingenariae*, the garrison of the first of these included a *cohors milliaria*, with between 800 and 1,040 men, depending on whether it was entirely of infantry or part-mounted, while *alae*, 480-strong units entirely of cavalry, were to be found in both provinces, such units as a rule being found in a legionary frontier province only.¹⁰ These large garrisons of varied unit types in the two Mauretanias, each under the overall command of an exceptionally trusted imperial appointee, were required simply by the nature of the commands, territories bordered by ‘desert’ on one side and enclosing the type of mountainous terrain that proved ideal for brigands.

With regard to Asia province, one of the two most senior provincial commands during the principate – Africa province being the other –, establishing the size and the type of its auxiliary garrison is not a straightforward matter. This is simply because of the paucity of evidence relating to the subject compounded by the inherent problems in the interpretation of what there is. To begin with, as far as it is known there is but one example for Asia province of what modern scholars refer to as a *diploma* or ‘Entlassungsurkunde’, those officially certified documents confirming the grant of Roman citizenship to a named auxiliaryman on completion of

⁸ Cilicia: Bennett 2012; Bithynia-Pontus: cf. Plin. *Ep.* 10.21; Thrace: Eck and Pangerl 2014a.

⁹ Vervaet 2007, 131.

¹⁰ Cf. Holder, 2003 138, noting the possibility that Hadrianic Mauretania Caesariensis may even have been home to an *ala milliaria*, with between 720-864 cavalrymen.

his military service.¹¹ When complete, these consist of two sheets of bronze measuring between 10 x 12 and 21 x 16 cm with identical inscribed texts front and back, fastened together with a sealed strip containing the seals of the officials who certified them so that a single continuous text and the name of these officials was visible on the outer faces. Their great value to the scholar today is that in addition to naming the recipient and the unit and province in which he was serving at the time he was discharged, as well as giving the day, month and year his emancipation was authorised, they also list, along with other salient points of information, all those other units in that same province with men who were eligible for release from military service at the same time. As such, a complete *diploma* provides – in a well-honed phrase – a ‘snapshot’ of that province’s garrison on the day it was registered. What these documents cannot do, on the other hand, is provide proof for the precise number of auxiliary units in any single province at the time it was issued: each one records only that or those units which had members eligible for discharge on the date concerned.¹²

Aside from a scant few literary references, then as might be expected, the bulk of evidence for the garrison of Asia province comes in the form of inscriptions on stone. However, unlike the western parts of the Roman Empire, where members of the Roman army displayed a high level of ‘epigraphic consciousness’, in the sense of producing relatively large numbers of inscriptions of an official and private nature, members of the Roman military based in the Eastern provinces, and in Anatolia in particular, were epigraphically shy. That is to say, there are really very few inscriptions relating to the presence of the Roman army in the region, an area where a passion for epigraphy – at least in the form of texts inscribed on stone – never seems to have taken root amongst either ordinary soldiers or their officers.¹³ Of what there is, some are official inscriptions, in the sense of recording building or other work carried out by a unit, while some are private dedications of one form or another, the remainder being funerary texts.¹⁴

Whatever their precise nature, each of these texts requires careful interpretation as to its significance and its relevance or not to the matter we are concerned with here, the garrison

¹¹ Remarkably few *diplomata* have been recorded for the seven or so provinces of Asia Minor – less than ten altogether, a quite insignificant number when compared with, for example, the over 50 for the period 90–161 known in 2014 for Moesia Inferior alone. The reason for this lack could be that most auxiliary regiments in Asia Minor recruited locally from people who already had citizenship status in their own communities and so needed no proof of concomitant Roman citizenship. That said, in Egypt, certain papyrus and wooden tablets seem to have served a like purpose to the bronze *diplomata* known for other provinces (e.g., Mann and Roxan 1988): as the evidence suggests the bronze documents were individually purchased, then men recruited and retiring locally may not have felt the same need to acquire such a document.

¹² Hence the remarkable contrast between the units listed on a *diploma* of 100 for Galatia and Cappadocia, which names two men from exactly two units, while on the evidence of *diplomata* for 94, 99, and 100, the standing garrison for the province in that year was no less than four *alae* and 14–15 *cohortes*. Cf. Eck and Pangerl 2005 (for 100); *id.* 2014b (for 99); and Pferdehirt 2004, no. 7, with p. 18 (for 95 and 101).

¹³ While inscriptions erected by others to honour army officers serving or domiciled in the Eastern provinces are fairly common there are remarkably few other military-linked inscriptions in the region. For example, the two-legionary province of Cappadocia has produced less than ten ‘military’ texts, whereas a single auxiliary fort in Britannia province might produce that number or more.

¹⁴ The broad range of Roman military inscriptions are discussed in M.A. Speidel 2014a.

of Asia province. After all, some at least of the units sent from the Western provinces for service in the several wars between Rome and Parthia are likely to have passed through Asia province and so could well have left an epigraphic record during their transit. Thus the need to verify if a unit epigraphically attested there was present on a formal and 'permanent' basis, or if it was simply passing through on its way to somewhere else. This is not an entirely straightforward matter where dedications and funerary texts are concerned, and it requires careful analysis of the text and of the history of the particular unit to establish especially if it was erected by or on behalf of a soldier serving in Asia province rather than one transiting the region – or even an army veteran who happened to retire in Asia province after completing his military service elsewhere. And once that issue has been determined there remains the matter of establishing the date to which such a text belongs. A few contain internal evidence through naming a specific emperor: most, however, can only be broadly dated, if at all, by the presence of certain epigraphic conventions accepted as having a value in this way, even though this method is certainly not fool-proof. Nonetheless, as a general rule, certain mannerisms in the form or wording of a specific text may provide at least a broad idea as to the general period it belongs to, as with, for example, the practice until around the middle of the 2nd century of indicating the full *tria nomina* of a Roman citizen, but his *nomen* and *cognomen* only on texts belonging to the late Antonine and later periods.

With these caveats in mind, it is time to progress with this narrative focussing on those auxiliary units confirmed as being in Asia province on a more than transient basis at some stage in its history and so present there as part of the standing provincial garrison. As such, we need to reject first from consideration those units epigraphically attested in the province but which are highly unlikely – on the basis of current evidence – to have been part of its standing garrison. These are the *Alae I Bosporanorum* and *I Gaetulorum*,¹⁵ and the *Cohortes I Bosporanorum*, *I Hispanorum*, and *I Lepidiana*.¹⁶ Thus this article is concerned with the following units in what appears to be their rough chronological appearance in the province: the *Cohortes Apula civium Romanorum*, *I Claudia Sugambrorum veterana equitata*, and *I Raetorum equitata*. In each case a brief history of the relevant unit is given followed by a discussion of the evidence relating to their presence in Asia province.

¹⁵ Full-strength *alae* were never permanently posted outside of the frontier provinces. So, the *Decurion* of the *I Bosporanorum* named on an honorific text from Sebaste (Payamalani: *MAMA* 11.65) was probably there sourcing supplies in connection with the eastern campaigns of Corbulo or Trajan (*contra* Thonemann 2015, 155, suggesting the unit was part of the provincial garrison). The two members of the *Ala I Gaetulorum* who died at or in the vicinity of Aulutrene in the Severan period, on the other hand, did so while the unit was temporarily stationed there to deal with local brigands or passing through Asia in connection with one of the 'Parthian' campaigns of the time (cf. Christol and Drew-Bear 1995, 79-84).

¹⁶ The *Cohortes I Bosporanorum* and *I Hispanorum*, recorded on a honorific text at Ephesus (*ILS* 9499 = *IK* 13.715), were part of the garrison of Galatia (cf. Speidel, 1984 14-15 = Speidel 1983, 280-281, and 300). The *Cohors I Lepidiana*, named on a Latin-language funerary text from Magnesia ad Sipylum (*CIL* 3.12251 = *ILS* 2590 = *AE* 1890.159) was presumably transiting Asia province on a journey east: other evidence shows it in Moesia Inferior from the 1st century until at least 127, and it is next recorded on a text dated precisely to 199 from the Cappadocian Euphrates at Chorsabia/Carsaga (Melik Chérif: *AE* 1908.22), subsequently featuring in the *Notitia Dignitatum* as the garrison of Caene-Perembole in Pontus (?Canayer: *Not. Dig. Or.* 38.35): it was perhaps deployed to the east to in connection with the Second Jewish Rebellion or the campaigns of Verus or Severus.

Cohors Apula/Apuleia (*civium Romanorum*)¹⁷

Most Roman auxiliary units were named either for the region or the city where they were first embodied and in the case of the *Cohors Apula (civium Romanorum)* this has to be the Apulia region of Italy. Given how the rights of Roman citizenship were extended to the region's free-born citizens sometime after the Social War but certainly before the end of the 1st century BC, this unit was evidently one of the so-called 'citizen cohorts' raised in a period of crisis when it was deemed more expedient to recruit a small unit of citizen volunteers rather than a new legion. As it is, the earliest evidence for the unit's existence is also the earliest evidence for its presence in Asia province, in the form of an inscription from Alexandria Troas. It provides the *cursus honorum* or list of official positions held by C. Fabricius Tuscus, a former commander of the unit and probable native of the place; it reports how he and the unit were involved in some form of building activity there.¹⁸ More to the point, in detailing Fabricius' full civil and military career the text allows us to date its composition to sometime in the late Augustan or early Tiberian period, while the sequence of commands listed leaves little doubt the unit was at Alexandria Troas around the turn of the 1st century BC.¹⁹ As such, the text not only attests to the involvement of a military unit in the physical foundation of the Augustan *colonia* at Alexandria Troas, but reveals that this particular unit was embodied before the severe military losses Rome suffered in the events of AD 6-9, the *Bellum Batonianum* followed by the *Clades Variana*. These episodes had promoted the creation of at least 18 and perhaps as many as 44 new *cohortes*, most on a temporary basis, and designated as either *voluntariorum* or *ingenuorum* in addition to having the epithet *civium Romanorum*, so stressing the voluntary nature and citizen status of their members.²⁰ The absence of either suffix in the title of the *Cohors Apula* thus confirms its creation at an earlier date.²¹

The next record of the unit is provided by an incomplete bilingual funerary text found at Side recording one Lucius Salvius, son of Lucius, of the *Sergia tribus*, and a member of the [COHO]RTE APULA.²² As the text records Lucius' filiation and *tribus* he is clearly a Roman citizen, while the lack of a *cognomen* suggests a date before the mid-1st century AD, as is also implied by the way his *praenomen* is transliterated into Greek as Λεύκιος rather than Λούκιος.²³ Although at first sight it might seem odd that a Roman citizen should choose to enlist in the *auxilia* this was not an uncommon practice,²⁴ and while it could be that Salvius had taken Roman citizenship on discharge, the lack of a *cognomen* tends to favour his being a

¹⁷ Spaul 2000, 21, with Bennett 2007a, 137-139.

¹⁸ AE 1973.501 = 1975.806 = 1978.790 = IK 53.III.34.

¹⁹ PME F.18; cf. Brunt 1974; with Speidel 1976, 340: note also Orth 1978, 57-60.

²⁰ Haynes 2013, 46-47.

²¹ Note also how the text describes Fabricius as *praefectus*, another pointer to the *Cohors Apula* having been established under a different system from the citizen cohorts of AD 6-9, as until the mid-Imperial period, the commander of a *cohors voluntariorum* or *ingenuorum* always ranked as *tribunus*: Le Glay 1972.

²² AE 1966.478 = IK 44.202.

²³ Cf. Speidel 1976, 339; also Holder 1980, 332, and Christol and Drew-Bear 1986, 42.

²⁴ Cf. Holder 1980, 86-90; also Speidel 1970, with Pferdehirt 2002, 16, and Dobson 1972.

citizen from birth. Be that as it may the incomplete nature of the text makes the nature of Salvius' connection with the *Cohors Apula* quite uncertain, whether as a serving soldier or a veteran. But even if Salvius was a retired veteran, his presence at Side points to the possibility at least that the *Cohors Apula* was stationed in Pamphylia at some point in its history: army veterans are known to have retired at the place where they were stationed. Working on this basis then the unit could well have been re-deployed to Pamphylia in the pre-Flavian period, when that region was still part of Galatia. However, as it is not mentioned on any of the four *diplomata* for Galatia-Cappadocia issued between 99 and 101,²⁵ this allows for the probability that it became the garrison of Lycia-Pamphylia during the Flavian reorganisation of the Anatolian provinces.²⁶

Wherever the *Cohors Apula* was stationed when Salvius' funerary text was erected at Side, by the later Hadrianic period it was clearly in Cappadocia. This is shown by its inclusion in the army led by L. Flavius Arrianus, governor of that province from 131 to 137, for his pre-emptive campaign in 135 against the Alani. In the Ἐκταξις κατὰ Αλάνων, Arrian's own literary account of that venture, he twice mentions a unit he terms the Ἀπύλανοι, recording that it was then under the command of one Secundinus, an otherwise unknown *praefectus*.²⁷ Given how, as already mentioned, the *Cohors Apula* is not named on any of the four known *diplomata* for Galatia-Cappadocia of early Trajanic date, it was perhaps re-deployed to Cappadocia (presumably from Lycia-Pamphylia) in connection with Trajan's Parthian War,²⁸ or possibly later, in connection with Hadrian's visit to Cappadocia province in about 123 to avert through diplomacy a perceived Parthian threat to the region.²⁹

Nothing more is known about the *Cohors Apula* until the very end of the 4th century, when it is listed in the *Notitia Dignitatum* as the *Cohors Apuleia civium Romanorum*, with its station at Ysiporto (?Araklıçarşısı) on the Pontic coast.³⁰ The appellation *civium Romanorum* added to the unit's name in this text indicates that at some point in the unit's history it had received a block grant of Roman citizenship for all its' then serving non-citizen members. As the unit itself was formed originally from citizens of Apulia, all of whom had Roman citizenship at that time, there would be no need for this *agnomen* to appear in the original title. Thus it

²⁵ Pferdehirt 2004, no. 7, with p. 17, discussing a currently unpublished example; also Eck and Pangerl 2005; and *id.* 2014b.

²⁶ On the formation of Lycia-Pamphylia, see Bennett 2011.

²⁷ Arr. *Ekt.* 7 and 14.

²⁸ For the extensive re-deployments necessitated by that campaign see, e.g., Bennett 2010.

²⁹ HA *Hadr.* 12.8, and 21, 11-13. It was on this occasion that the Cappadocians presented the emperor with a number of slaves for military service, although in what capacity they were intended to serve the needs of the army is unclear: perhaps as army servants, slaves being proscribed by law from entering military service, although Augustus, for one, is known to have used freed slaves in his army. On this matter in general see also Bennett 2007b, 136-139.

³⁰ *Not. Dig. Or.* 38.34. There is no consensus concerning the exact location of Ysiporto, a settlement, which – to add to the confusion – appears to be identical with one named in other sources as either Psoron Limen, Hyssos, Sousarmia, and Sousourmena: e.g., Wheeler 2012, 646: but note that many of the geographical locations suggested by that author generate seemingly from misconceptions regarding the sources, possibly compounded by a lack of familiarity with the region (cf. Braund 1995); even so, despite its several flaws and errors, and its misrepresentations and speculations (cf. M.A. Speidel 2014b, 631), the article remains the most recent and comprehensive attempt at locating and identifying the places listed in *Not. Dig. Or.* 38.

represents a block award for some meritorious action, perhaps bravery in the field, or simply for showing loyalty to the reigning emperor at a time of crisis.³¹ In that case it was clearly awarded at a time when there were no more Apulian or other Roman citizens in its ranks, and certainly before 212, when Caracalla's *Constitutio Antoniniana* granted Roman citizenship to all free-born people in the Roman Empire.³²

Cohors I Claudia Sugambrorum veterana equitata³³

The Sugambrini, a Germanic tribe centred on the Lippe valley region, are first attested in the historical record in connection with Caesar's campaigns in North-western Gaul, and were a focus of his sally across the Rhine in 55 BC to "intimidate the Germans, punish the Sugambrini, [and] to relieve the Ubians from Suebic harassment."³⁴ They were evidently a tribe with some martial standing. In 16 BC, they crossed the Rhine with their allies, the Tencteri and Usipetes, and defeated M. Lollius, the consular governor of Gallia Belgica, capturing the eagle standard of the *Legio V* in the process.³⁵ A further speculative foray into Roman territory followed in 12 BC, causing so much alarm that Nero Claudius Drusus, Augustus' stepson, was despatched to deal with them, leading two successful campaigns into their territory in 11 and 10 BC.³⁶

Exactly when Rome began to recruit regiments of *auxilia* from among the tribe is uncertain. However, at least one cohort of Sugambrians was in existence by AD 26, for Tacitus refers to *Sugambrae cohortis* in his account of Sabinus' campaign from Moesia into Thrace that year.³⁷ As it is, the tribe is known to have provided men for at least three *cohortes*, namely that we are concerned with here, the *Cohors I Claudia Sugambrorum veterana equitata*, and also the like-numbered *I Claudia Sugambrorum tironum*, along with a *IIII Sugambrorum*.³⁸ The numeral attached to the last of these allows for the possibility that there were also a *II* and *III Sugambrorum*, to fill the sequence, although it may have been simply that the existence of the first two did away with the need for a 'third' cohort of Sugambrians.

Be that as it may, the respective *agnomina* of the first two, *veterana* and *tironum*, was most likely meant to identify the first as a time-tried unit, and the other as a 'probationary' one, in the sense of being the 'junior' of the two. Indeed, both being assigned to the garrison of Moesia in the Flavian period, the one before the other, might explain the presence of these *agnomina* in their titles, although as it is, they both make their first appearance on two parallel

³¹ Cf. Maxfield 227-233.

³² Four instances suggest themselves for its award: service in Trajan's Parthian War; or in that of Lucius Verus; or faithfulness in the 175 rebellion of Avidius Cassius; or service in Severus' Parthian campaigns.

³³ Spaul 2000, 245-246.

³⁴ Caes. *Bel. Gal.* 4.16.2-3 and 4.18.2-19.4.

³⁵ Vell. Pat. *Hist. Rom.* 2.97.1; Dio *Rom. Hist.* 54.20.4-5.

³⁶ Dio *Rom. Hist.* 54, 32-33.

³⁷ Tac. *Ann.* 4.47.

³⁸ For these two units, see Spaul 2000, 246 and 247.

diplomata for the province issued in the same year, 75.³⁹ After Domitian divided Moesia into two separate commands they both became part of the garrison of Moesia Inferior, but neither is listed with the title *Claudia* until much later, this first appearing for the *tironum* on a *diploma* for 111, and for the *veterana* on one of 134.⁴⁰ The absence of the imperial *nomen* from earlier *diplomata* is best explained by the way in which the scribes responsible for these documents often substantially abbreviated unit names when dealing with the demand to list several regiments in the available space. As such, then, the imperial *nomen Claudia* may have been a part of the formal title from a much earlier period, pointing to the possibility that they were raised during the reign of Claudius himself, or that he authorised the award of his *nomen* to these regiments for their service in a campaign perhaps the annexation of Thrace in 43.⁴¹ Either occasion would fit with the two units having men ready for discharge in the year 75.

Whatever the reason for the inclusion of the imperial *nomen* in the titles of these two units of Sugambrians, the existence of two *cohortes* with virtually identical titles results in some specific problems in tracing their individual histories. Except, that is, that the *tironum* was clearly re-deployed sometime after 116 to become part of the permanent garrison of Syria, the transfer most probably taking place in connection with Trajan's Parthian War.⁴² The *veterana*, on the other hand, is registered on a series of *diplomata* for Moesia Inferior issued in the years 97, 99, 111, 134, 135, 145, 146, (?)147, (?)155, and (?)157,⁴³ although a brief re-deployment to Asia province under Hadrian is signalled an altar found at Eumeneia (Işıklı). The altar itself is dedicated to Juppiter Optimus Maximus, the 'good health' of the emperor Hadrian, the Senate and the People, and the *Cohors I Claudia Sugambrorum veterana equitata*, and was set up by M. Iulius Pisonianus, the *praefectus* of the unit, 'in fulfilment of a vow' after 'bringing' the unit to Asia 'from the fort at Montanensi in Moesia Inferior'.⁴⁴ Unfortunately nothing in the text provides any closer way of dating it within the reign of the emperor Hadrian.⁴⁵ The gaps in the *diplomata* for Moesia Inferior, though, would, in theory, allow for it having been in Asia province at some point between either 116 and 134 or 134-145. There again, a date in the latter part of Hadrian's reign is indicated by a series of *cistophori* minted at Eumeneia sometime after 128,⁴⁶ for as is well known, the arrival of a military garrison often stimulated an increase in

³⁹ *Veterana*: RMD 2, for 28/4/75; *tironum*: Weiß 2008, 270-273, and Eck and Pangerl 2008, 318-321.

⁴⁰ RMD 222.

⁴¹ Cf. Matei-Popescu 2010/2011, 209, for the suggestion, derived from Tac. *Ann.* 3.39.1, that these and other Moesian units named *Claudia* may have been awarded this in 46 or 47 for their service under Cotys I in the Crimean Bosporus.

⁴² Cf. Weiss 2006, 277-278.

⁴³ E.g., CIL 16.44, for 14/9/99; RMD 222, for 25/9/111; CIL 16.78, for 2/4/134; Eck and Pangerl 2009, 541-542, for 135; RMD 399, for 7/4/145; RMD 270, for 146; Weiß 2008, 307-309 for (?) 147; RMD 414, for 155; and RMD 50, for (?)157.

⁴⁴ AE 1927.95; PME I.95; Buckler *et al.* 1926, 74-75, no. 201; Christol and Drew-Bear 1987, 58. On Pisonianus, see PME 95.

⁴⁵ Pisonianus describes himself as a citizen of Tyre, which is described as being *metropolis Phoenices et Coeles Syiae*. The title was once thought to have been assumed in about 129, but is now known to have been in use from at least 102: cf. Thonemann 2015, 153, n. 50.

⁴⁶ Metcalf 1980, 62-63, with certain examples dateable to after 128/129.

local coin production.⁴⁷ Be that as it may, the most likely occasion for the temporary transfer of the *Cohors I Claudia Sugambrorum veterana equitata* to Asia was in association with the closing stages of the Second Jewish Rebellion of 132-136, presumably replacing a unit that had been posted from Asia further to the east for service in connection with that campaign.

Cohors I Raetorum equitata (Gordiana)⁴⁸

The Alpine region known to the Romans as *Raetia* was the home of several tribes whose precise ethnicity and relationship to one another is unclear. Taken under Roman control in 15 BC,⁴⁹ the available evidence reveals that in later decades at least eight and in all probability ten if not more *cohortes* were recruited with the title *Raetorum*. Uncertainty over the exact number is caused by evidence pointing to at least two and perhaps even three quite separate *cohortes* each numbered and named as *I Raetorum*, one of which, as we will see, was most certainly based in Asia province.⁵⁰

The obvious point at which to start any analysis of the evidence, and so determine how many *Cohortes I Raetorum* existed, from which we might identify that serving in Asia province, is with the earliest known record for such a unit. A *diploma* issued in Moesia on 28 April 75 to an Antiochene named Heras on his discharge from the *Cohors I Raetorum* provides what is needed here.⁵¹ It has been assumed that when Heras was recruited into the *auxilia*, in about the year 50, the *Cohors I Raetorum* was based in Syria province, on the basis that auxiliary regiments recruited required locally through a *dilectus*, and that the unit redeployed to Europe in the army that Mucianus took there from the east in 68.⁵² However, a recent analysis has shown how in the early principate, so-called ‘local recruitment’ into the *auxilia* is unlikely to have been a major factor when maintaining auxiliary units at their nominal strength.⁵³ So, for example, a papyrus dated to September 117 details how some 125 recruits were despatched from Asia province to Egypt to help bring the *Cohors I Lusitanorum* up to its full strength, presumably because the unit had suffered heavy losses in the Jewish rebellion of 116.⁵⁴ In that case the presence of a Syrian in the *Cohors I Raetorum* need not mean that it was ever deployed in that province. More tellingly, in this case, though, there is good literary and other evidence to show that at least until the time of Vespasian, and even long after, it was common practice for auxiliary regiments to serve in the province or region where they were originally embodied.⁵⁵

⁴⁷ E.g. Ziegler 1996.

⁴⁸ Spaul 2000, 276-8, lists the raw data for three units named *Cohors I Rateorum*, although as will be shown, there were three with the like number and name.

⁴⁹ Dio *Rom. Hist.* 54.22.3-4.

⁵⁰ For an earlier discussion of the problem see Overbeck 2001, 274.

⁵¹ RMD 2.

⁵² Cf. Speidel 1984, 278-279, and Matei-Popescu 2001/2002, 222-223, both arguing for a connection with events described in Tac. *Hist.* 2.82-83.

⁵³ Haynes 2013, 121-134, esp. 133-134.

⁵⁴ Fink 1971, no. 74.

⁵⁵ Cf. Haynes 2013, 61, with 121-122.

Thus all the early Raetian *cohortes* are likely to have served initially in their own home region or, at the very least, in an adjacent territory.

The later history of this Moesian-based *Cohors I Raetorum* is unknown, but by the Trajanic period, there is clear evidence for the existence of two *cohortes* sharing the number and name. One has the additional titles *equitata civium Romanorum pia fidelis*, indicating it was a part-mounted *cohors*, and it is registered as serving in Germania Inferior at various dates between 98 and 152.⁵⁶ The second like named and numbered unit was a regular infantry *cohors* that lacked any form of *agnomen*, and is recorded in Raetia itself on *diplomata* issued between 105 and 157.⁵⁷ One of these two will presumably be the lineal descendant of the *Cohors I Raetorum* already discussed, but there is no way of identifying which.

Where a significant complication arises, though, is with the wide variety of evidence for what must almost certainly be a third *Cohors I Raetorum* that was also an equitate unit and which is recorded as serving in Cappadocia and Asia at various dates between 135 and the 390's. This unit can only be identical with either the like-named unit one in Germania Inferior or that in Raetia (assuming it was equitate) if it – or both? – served on an exceptionally peripatetic basis. This seems highly unlikely, as by the High Principate, most auxiliary units had long settled down in permanent bases which they only left when they were temporarily or, on rare occasions, permanently posted to another province in a time of crisis. Thus we should conclude that the *Cohors I Raetorum equitata* registered in Asia Minor between the Hadrianic and Theodosian periods represents an entirely separate and so third unit with the same name.

The earliest evidence for the existence of this third *Cohors I Raetorum equitata* is likewise the earliest evidence for its presence in Asia Minor, namely its inclusion in the army that Arrian, governor of Cappadocia, assembled for his foray against the Alani in 135. Although described in the text simply as the 'First Raetians', the text makes it clear that it was an equitate unit for its troopers were included in the mounted forces preceding the infantry on the march against the Alani,⁵⁸ its part-mounted status also being confirmed, as we will see below, by an inscription found at Eumeneia

The next securely dated element of evidence for the unit comes in the form of the single known *diploma* for Asia province.⁵⁹ It was issued towards the end of the year 148, most probably between September and December, to a time-served soldier named Lualis, son of Mamas, who gives his origin as Isauria.⁶⁰ At the time Lualis was recruited, in about 123, Isauria was still part of Galatia, allowing for the possibility that if he was recruited directly into this regiment, it was attached to the garrison of that province at the time. In which case the unit's absence from the *diplomata* issued between 99 and 101 for Galatia-Cappadocia might indicate

⁵⁶ E.g., *RMD* 216, for 20/2/98; *RMD* 239, for 20/8/127, and *RMD* 408, for 5/9/152.

⁵⁷ E.g., *CIL* 16.55, for 30/6/107; *RMD* 229, for 16/8/116; *RMD* 386, for 30/10/139; *RMD* 387, for 11-12/140; and *RMD* 170, for 28/9/157.

⁵⁸ Arr. *Ekt.* 1.

⁵⁹ First published and discussed in Overbeck 2001, subsequently reported as *RMD* 100.

⁶⁰ It is not clear from the *diploma* if Lualis' stated origin was simply the general region of Isauria, or one of the two homonymous *poleis* in that region, namely Isauria Nova and Isauria Vetus.

that it was based elsewhere in that period: except, of course, that as noted already, the absence of a unit from any one *diploma* may simply be because it had no soldiers ready for discharge on that date concerned.⁶¹

Either way, the *diploma* makes it quite clear that our *Cohors I Raetorum* was redeployed from Cappadocia to Asia province sometime before 148. And as a series of later inscriptions report its presence at Eumeneia in Asian Phrygia until at least the early 3rd century, we can reasonably speculate that it moved there to replace the *Cohors I Claudia Sugambrorum veterana equitata* whenever that unit returned to Moesia Inferior, apparently in the early Antonine period. That said, the first dated record of the unit at Eumeneia is a Latin-language building inscription of the year 196 recording how it had rebuilt their *castrum* there after this collapsed in an earthquake.⁶² As it is, there is every chance that the poorly built 90 m. length of wall still visible at the edge of modern Işıklı may survive from this re-building. With parts still standing up to 3 m. high in places, it is built mainly in the coursed rubble masonry style familiar from other Roman-period structures in Asia Minor, and although now lacking almost all its facing material, it certainly incorporates re-used masonry as might be expected in the rebuilding of such a wall following on from a severe earthquake (Figs. 1 and 2).⁶³



Fig 1. External face of the probable Roman fort wall at Işıklı showing re-used masonry (photograph courtesy of B. Claasz Coockson).

⁶¹ The relevant *diplomata* are referenced above, n. 14.

⁶² AE 1995, 1511 = CIL 3.14192 = MAMA 4.328; cf. Christol and Drew-Bear 1995, 64. The site of the fort has been provisionally identified as an area measuring some 90 x 90 m. at the edge of modern Işıklı, delineated by a clearly Roman-period 2-3 m. high coursed rubble wall built with some re-used masonry: cf. Ballance 1995, 188-190. Ballance noted also that this area was half that required the area needed for a fort garrisoned by a *cohors peditata*, and Thonemann (2015, 154) has suggested that the fort may have been half-size as one half of the unit was permanently outposted at Ephesus. Personal inspection by the writer with B. Claasz Coockson in 2008 suggests it is much more likely that if this length of wall does belong to the re-built Severan-period *castrum* of the *Cohors I Raetorum*, it is all that remains from a much larger complex.

⁶³ Ballance 1995, 188-190, in reporting this structure thought that it defined one side of an area measuring some 90 x 90 m., noting also that this area was half that required for a fort garrisoned by a *cohors peditata*, while Thonemann (2015, 154) has suggested that the fort may have been half-size as one half of the unit was seconded permanently to Ephesus. Personal inspection by the writer with B. Claasz Coockson in 2008 suggests it is much more likely that if this length of wall does belong to the re-built Severan-period *castrum* of the *cohors I Raetorum*, it is all that remains from a much larger complex.



Fig 2. Inner face of the probable Roman fort wall at Işıklı showing its coursed rubble construction (photograph courtesy of B. Claasz Coockson).

number of other inscriptions from there. For example, a Greek-language honorific text set up there by the ‘*boule* and the people’ of Eumeneia for Aelius Asklepiodotos, who is described thereon as χειλίαρχος χώρτης πρώτης Ρωμανῶν Γορδιανῆς or ‘cheiliarchos of the Cohors I Raetorum Gordiana’.⁶⁴ In this case, the presence of the *agnomen* ‘Gordiana’ indicated that the unit had been honoured by the emperor Gordian III between during his reign, from 240-244, for some unknown service: as the unit is unlikely to have stressed the honour under later emperors, then it helps date the text probably to that specific period.⁶⁵ That aside, a notable feature of the text is in how it follows a practice common in the Greek-speaking Eastern provinces through in distinguishing Asklepiodotos, whose actual rank was *praefectus*, or ἔπαρχος in Greek, with the title χειλίαρχος, literally the ‘commander of a 1,000 men’, this being the Greek equivalent of *tribunus*, the official title of a man who commanded one of the citizen cohorts or a double-strength *cohors milliaria*.

In addition to the two dateable texts from Eumeneia recording the *Cohors I Raetorum* just cited, the place has produced three others that refer directly to members of the unit, further confirming its long-term presence there. One of these is another Greek-language honorary text set up by the ‘*boule* and people’ of Eumeneia, in this case to a [P]. Aelius Faustianus, who is described thereon as χειλίαρχος χώρτης ἔκτης Ἰσπανῶν καὶ χώρτης ἔκτης Ρωμανῶν, and so ‘cheiliarchos of the Cohors VI Hispanorum and Cohors I Raetorum’.⁶⁶ The reference here to

In terms of dated inscriptions, the *Cohors I Raetorum* deployed in Asia province features next in the epigraphic record on a Latin-language inscription from Ephesus that can be assigned broadly to the reign of Caracalla, and set up by members of the unit to honour L. Lucilius Pansa Priscillianus, *procuator Augusti provinciae Asiae* at the time.⁶⁴ These men, however, were presumably on detached duty from their home base, as clear evidence that this was Eumeneia is provided by a

⁶⁴ *AE* 1988.1023, with Demougin 1990; also Christol and Drew-Bear 1995, 64-65.

⁶⁵ *MAMA* 11.28.

⁶⁶ Fitz 1983, 168, where it is noted that most units awarded this title were stationed in areas threatened by the Sarmatians and so these units at least probably won theirs for service against that tribe.

⁶⁷ *IGR* 4.728; *PME* F.104.

Faustianus' command of the *Cohors VI Hispanorum* as well as the *Cohors I Raetorum* should not be taken to indicate, however, that he was in charge of both simultaneously. If that were the case there would be no need to repeat his rank in association with both units, and so this part of the text is essentially an acknowledgment of his transfer from the one to the other. Once again, it is to be observed how the honorand has been inappropriately elevated to the rank of *χειλίαρχος* or *tribunus* instead of being described as *ἐπαρχος*, for *praefectus*.

The two other texts from Eumeneia that record specifically the *Cohors I Rateorum* are both Greek-language funerary monuments. One commemorates a Julius Papia, who describes himself as being *ἱππεῖ ὀπλοφύλαξ σπείρ[ης π]ρώτης Ραιτῶν*, or 'cavalryman and weapons custodian' (*custos armorum*) of the *Cohors I Raetorum*, and who set up the memorial 'for himself while he was alive and for my nephew Menecrates, son of Gaius'.⁶⁸ A lady named Polla set up the second of these texts, in this case to commemorate her 'husband' Antonius, *στρατιώτης σπείρης πρώτης Ραιτῶν*, that is, 'a soldier in the *Cohors I Raetorum*'.⁶⁹ To these we might add two other texts from Asia province recording deceased cavalrymen who are likely to have been members of this unit. One, from Maeonia in Lydia, commemorates a trooper named Aurelius Nicias, and reports how he was now 'deprived of the good company of his messmates at Ephesus'; the other, as yet unpublished, from Phrygian Hierapolis (Koçhisar), was set up by a *decurion* named Nicator to an Aurelius Menander. In both cases the presence of the *nomen* Aurelius suggests men who received their citizenship under the *Constitutio Antoniniana*, in which case they should be members of the *Cohors I Raetorum equitata* as that was the only unit recorded in the province in the Severan period.⁷⁰

DISCUSSION

The evidence as it currently stands, though it is hardly definitive, indicates that during the principate, the governor of the proconsular province of Asia was normally allotted a single *cohors quingenaria*, either *peditata* or *equitata*, for maintaining security in the area under his command. The initial imperial period garrison of Asia province was the *Cohors Apula*, the unit likely remaining there until the Flavian or Trajanic period when apparently transferred to Lycia-Pamphylia. There remains the possibility, though, that during the early Flavian period the garrison of Asia province may have consisted of two or more auxiliary regiments. Such is suggested from the way that Vespasian's proconsul of Asia, T. Clodius Eprius Marcellus, was kept in post for a triennium instead of the usual single year. A prolongation such as this, well beyond the usual term limit, points to the likelihood of some serious unrest in the region that

⁶⁸ *IGR* 4.736, an inaccurate reading, corrected as *MAMA* 11.33. On the responsibilities of the *custos armorum* see Speidel 1992; also Breeze 1976, 132, where it is noted that there this was a post held by a *principalis*.

⁶⁹ *CIG* 3902q = *IGR* 4, 729: cf. Thonemann, 155-156, for other possibly relevant texts at Eumeneia and in the immediate region.

⁷⁰ Aurelius Nicias: *TAM* 5/1.474, with Christol and Drew-Bear 1995, 65, n.57; Aurelius Menander: cf. Thonemann 2015, 155.

demanded a firm and experienced hand,⁷¹ and so, perhaps, a larger than usual military force to deal with this.

Be that as it may, there is, as yet, no evidence for a garrison in Asia province between the departure of the *Cohors Apula* sometime in the later 1st century and the arrival under Hadrian – and at that on a temporary basis only – of the *Cohors I Claudia Sugambrorum veterana equitata*. A military presence of some kind in addition to the Praetorians stationed at Ephesus must have existed, but the vagaries of the epigraphic record in Anatolia mean that there is no evidence for such. On the other hand, as the *I Claudia Sugambrorum* was in Asia province on a temporary basis only, it is logical to conclude it was redeployed there to replace a unit transferred elsewhere. As is still the case today, the transfer of even a single military unit over a significant distance required a major effort and expense on the part of the responsible authorities, and is almost always done in response to a critical situation crisis that requires the immediate despatch of reinforcements. Thus the temporary redeployment of the *I Claudia* from Moesia Inferior to Asia province, as the replacement for that province's regular standing garrison, is best explained as taking place in connection with Second Jewish Rebellion.

One consequence of this transfer was to provide us today with the first piece of epigraphic evidence for a permanent Roman military presence at Eumeneia. And yet, there are indications that it had been the home of a military garrison from at least the Neronian period. This should, in one sense, come as no surprise given the strategic location of Eumeneia, on an important route from the Maeander valley proper into Phrygia. This was clearly what persuaded Attalus II Philadelphus to create a *polis* there shortly after his accession in 159/158 BC. Like his brother Eumenes II, for whom Eumeneia was named, Attalus II was keen to secure control of and access to the borderland between Pergamene territory and that controlled by the Galatians.⁷² But added to the strategic considerations that made the location so desirable to Attalus was how the site chosen for the new *polis* also controlled an extensive agricultural and other resource-rich territory between the lower Glaucus and its confluence with the Upper Meander. As such, the combination of Eumeneia's location in terms of providing direct access to and beyond Phrygia along with its large and productive territory may well have suggested itself to the Roman administration as a logistics centre in connection with Roman campaigns much further to the east.

The thing is that a relatively extensive series of coins were minted at Eumeneia under Nero and Domitian, and as already noted, an increase in the production and issue of local coinage in Asia Minor is often an indication of the arrival of a substantial military contingent at a place, usually where there was no such presence previously. In this case, then, we might tentatively suggest that the initial decision to position a Roman garrison at Eumeneia was occasioned by the need to collect and provide supplies for, at first, the eastern campaigns of Corbulo, and then for the substantial garrison established in Galatia-Cappadocia by Vespasian.⁷³ As has been

⁷¹ Dräger 1993, 39-65.

⁷² Cf. Thonemann 2015, 170-177, with Mitchell 1993, 26, for the political context.

⁷³ Note Thonemann 2015, 151-152, who also raises the possibility of a Roman military presence at Eumeneia from the Vespasianic period, but without detailing his reasons.

discussed elsewhere in connection with this issue, the sudden demands imposed on a region by the presence of a substantial military force would have placed an enormous and immediate pressure on local methods of supply.⁷⁴ Thus it may well have been the case that, as at Gordion in Galatia, Eumeneia served as a major logistical centre for the Roman army in Anatolia in the Neronian-Flavian/Trajanic period.⁷⁵

In fact Eumeneia could well have operated in such a scheme of things into later times. While we can reasonably assume that, once established, the garrison of Cappadocia received its supplies from local sources, there is a school of thought that Central Anatolia probably played in supplying the Roman army in other regions, at least with goods that could be safely transported over long distances.⁷⁶ This might explain the establishment in the early 2nd century of what was a highly-organised production centre for the making of either wine or olive oil at Hendek Kale, within the territory of Eumeneia, and so a facility conceivably created on behalf of the Roman military for the local production of these much-needed commodities, essential in the regular diet of the Roman army.⁷⁷ Whether that was the case or not, on the evidence of the visible ceramics the complex at Hendek Kale was operating when the *I Claudia* was at Euemenia and continued to do so into the later 2nd century, by when the *Cohors I Raetorum* was based there.

Whether or not there was a direct relationship between the military garrison at Eumeneia and the production centre at Hendek Kale, the deployment of the *Cohors I Raetorum*, in, probably, the early Antonine period, testifies to the desire to maintain a military presence at the location. Indeed, as it was, a military presence was evidently required there during the reign of Septimius Severus to deal actively with a long period of substantial unrest at that time in the region as a whole. The many letters Septimius Severus wrote to the various communities of Asia Minor concerning these disturbances testify to their widespread scale,⁷⁸ while the creation of a short-lived military base at Alutrene, on the road to Apollonia, provides evidence for how this unrest affected the region around Eumeneia.⁷⁹

Exactly how long Eumeneia served as a military base for the *I Raetorum*, certainly still present there in the early 3rd century, or as the home for any replacement unit, cannot be determined on the evidence to hand. Nonetheless, what we can point to is the major impact the presence of a Roman military garrison made on the place. As we have already seen, production of the local coinage peaked under Nero and the Flavians, and did so again in the late Hadrianic period, and was to do so one more time in the Antonine period. It is likely that Eumeneia's increasing inclusion in the Roman monetisation process was reflected in local construction

⁷⁴ Cf. Bennett 2013.

⁷⁵ See Bennett and Goldmann 2009.

⁷⁶ Cf. Mitchell 2005.

⁷⁷ Bennett and Claasz Cookson 2009.

⁷⁸ MAMA 11.27, a fragmented bilingual rescript and petition to a Severan emperor is perhaps related to these disturbances, given how there are many examples of such texts from Asia Minor that relate to local rebellions. See also Wolff 2003, 199–210, on the growing for *stationarii* at this time and later serving as local police forces.

⁷⁹ Christol and Drew Bear 1987, with *id.* 1988.

and civic activities, although precise evidence for these is scant. But there again, given how in the mid 1st century BC, a *polis* such as Tralles, comparable in many ways in size and potential prosperity to Eumeneia, received annual revenues of 225,000 *denarii* from its inhabitants,⁸⁰ then the impact of a permanent military base at Eumeneia, with soldiers receiving regular disbursements of money, must have significantly impacted on the local economy. How this did so is a matter for others to examine. Here it is sufficient to note that Eumeneia takes first place in Asia Minor with regard to the relatively large corpus of military-related inscriptions it has produced. Those directly relevant to this article have all been reviewed above, but it would be remiss not to conclude this essay without making reference to the seven or so others from the place referring to serving soldiers or veterans, none of them naming the unit they belonged to, but which display through their choice of style and language – Greek and/or Latin – the impact of the Roman military on local life, a subject to be discussed in more details elsewhere.⁸¹

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ballance, M. 1995 — Survey of Roman and Byzantine Remains at Dinar, İşikli and Pınarbaşı, 1994. *Araştırma Sonuçları Toplantısı* 13/2: 85-198.
- Bennett, J., 2007a — The Roman Army in Lycia and Pamphylia. *Adalya* 10:131-154.
- Bennett, J., 2007b — A Centurion and his Slave. A Latin Epitaph from Western Anatolia in the Rijksmuseum van Oudheden, Leiden. *Anatolica* 33: 129-142.
- Bennett, J., 2011 — Why did Claudius Annex Lycia? *Adalya* 14: 119-136.
- Bennett, J., 2012 — The Garrison of Cilicia during the Principate. *Adalya* 15: 115-128.
- Bennett, J., 2013 — Agricultural Strategies and the Roman Military in Central Anatolia during the Early Imperial Period. *Olba* 21: 315-344.
- Bennett, J., and B. Claasz Cookson, 2009 — Hendek Kale: a Late Roman multiple lever press site in

⁸⁰ Cic. *Pro Flacco*, 91.

⁸¹ CIL 3.363 = IK59.94 = MAMA 11.33; AE 1978.796; IGR 4.732; 4.734 (= CIG 3898); 4.735; 4.737; and 4.738.

- western Asia Minor. *Antiquity Project Gallery* online at: <http://www.antiquity.ac.uk/projgall/bennett319/>
- Bennett, J., and A.L. Goldmann, 2009 — A Preliminary Report on the Roman Military Presence at Gordion, Galatia. In: A. Morillo, N. Hanel, and E. Martin (eds.), Limes XX: Estudios Sobre La Frontera Romana (Leon): 1605-1616.
- Birley, E., 1978 — Alae named after their Commanders. *Ancient Society* 9: 257-273 (= E. Birley, Roman Army Papers (Amsterdam): 368-384).
- Braund, D., 1995 — Georgia in Antiquity Again: a response. *Bryn Mawr Class. Rev.* 95.09.28, online at: <http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/1995/95.09.28.html>
- Breeze, D.J., 1976 — A Note on the Use of the Titles *Optio* and *Magister* below the Centurionate during the Principate. *Britannia* 7: 127-133.
- Brunt, P.A., 1974 — Gaius Fabricius Tuscus and an Augustan *dilectus*. *ZPE* 13: 161-185.
- Buckler, W.H., W.M. Calder and C.W.M. Cox, 1926 — Asia Minor 1924 III: Monuments from central Phrygia. *JRS* 16: 53-94.
- Campbell, J.B., 1978 — The Marriage of Soldiers under the Empire. *JRS* 68: 153-166.
- Cheesman, G.L., 1914 — The Imperial Roman Army (Oxford).
- Christol, M., and T. Drew-Bear, 1986 — Documents latins de Phrygie. *Tyche* 1: 41-87.
- Christol, M., and T. Drew-Bear, 1987 — Un castellum Romain près d'Apamée de Phrygie (Wien).
- Christol, M., and T. Drew-Bear — 1995, Inscriptions militaires d'Aulutrene et d'Apamée de Phrygie. In: Y. Le Bohec (ed.), La hiérarchie (Rangordnung) de l'armée romaine sous le Haut-Empire (Paris): 57-92.
- Dobson, B., 1972 — Legionary Centurion or Equestrian Officer. *Ancient Society* 3: 193-208.
- Dräger, M., 1993 — Die Städte der Provinz Asia in der Flavierzeit (Frankfurt am Main).
- Drew-Bear, T., 1978 — Nouvelles inscriptions de Phrygie (Zutphen).
- Demougin, S., 1990 — L. Lucilius Pansa Pricillianus Procurateur d'Asie. *ZPE* 81: 213-223.
- Eck, W., and A. Pangerl, 2005 — Eine Bürgerrechtskonstitutionen für Zwei Veteranen des Kappadokischen Heeres. *ZPE* 150: 233-241.
- Eck, W., and A. Pangerl, 2008, Moesia und seine Truppen: Neue Diplome für Moesia und Moesia superior. *Chiron* 38: 317-394.
- Eck, W., and A. Pangerl, 2009 — Moesia und seine Truppen II: Neue Diplome für Moesia, Moesia inferior und Moesia superior. *Chiron* 39: 505-589
- Eck, W., and A. Pangerl 2014a — Zwei Diploma für die Truppen der Provinz Thracia. *ZPE* 188: 250-254.
- Eck, W., and A. Pangerl 2014b — Das vierte Diplom für die Provinz Galatia et Cappadocia. *ZPE* 192: 238-246.
- Fink, R.O., 1971 — Roman Military Records on Papyrus (Case Western).
- Haynes, I., 2013 — Blood of the Provinces: the Roman *Auxilia* and the making of provincial society from Augustus to the Severans (Oxford).
- Holder, P.A., 1980 — The *Auxilia* from Augustus to Trajan (Oxford).
- Holder, P.A., 2003 — Auxiliary Deployment in the Reign of Hadrian. In: J.J. Wilkes (ed.), Documenting the Roman Army: essays in honour of Margaret Roxan (London): 101-146.
- Le Glay, M., 1972 — Le commandement des *cohortes voluntariorum* de l'armée romaine. *Ancient Society* 3: 209-221.
- Mann, J.C., and M. Roxan, 1988 — Discharge Certificates of the Roman Army. *Britannia* 19: 341-347.
- Matei-Popescu, F., 2001/2002 — Trupele auxiliare din Moesia Inferior. *Studii si Certari de Istorie veche si Archeologie* 52/53: 173-242.
- Matei-Popescu, F., 2010/2011 — The Roman Auxiliary Units of Moesia. *Il Mar Nero* 8: 207-230.
- Metcalf, W.E., 1980 — The Cistophori of Hadrian (New York).
- Mitchell, S., 1993 — Anatolia: Land, Men and Gods in Asia Minor I: the Celts and the Impact of Roman Rule (Oxford).
- Orth, W., 1978 — Zur Fabricius-Tuscan-Inschrift aus Alexandreia/Troas. *ZPE* 28: 57-60.

- Overbeck, B., 2001 — Das erste Militärdiplom aus der Provinz Asia. *Chiron* 11: 265-76.
- Pferdehirt, B., 2002 — Die Rolle des Militärs für den sozialen Aufstieg in der Römischen Kaiserzeit (Mainz).
- Pferdehirt, B., 2004 — Römische Militärdiplome und Entlassungsurkunden in der Sammlung des Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseums (Mainz).
- Ritterling, E., 1927 — Military Forces in the Senatorial Provinces. *JRS* 17: 29-32.
- Sherk, R.K., 1955 — The Inermes Provinciae of Asia Minor. *AJP* 76/4: 400-413.
- Speidel, M.A., 2007 — The Development of the Roman Forces in Northeastern Anatolia. New evidence for the history of the *exercitus Cappadocius*. In: A.S. Lewin and P. Pellegrini (eds.), The Late Roman Army in the Near East from Diocletian to the Arab Conquest (Oxford): 73-90 (= M.A. Speidel (ed.), Heer und Heerschaft im römischen Reich der Hohen Kaiserzeit (Stuttgart: 2009): 595-632).
- Speidel, M.A., 2014a — The Roman Army. In: C. Bruun and J. Edmondson, Roman Epigraphy (Oxford): 319-344.
- Speidel, M.A., 2014b — Connecting Cappadocia. The Contribution of the Roman Imperial Army. In: V. Cojocaru, A. Coşkun, and M. Dana (eds.), Interconnectivity in the Mediterranean and Pontic World during the Hellenistic and Roman Periods (= Pontica et Mediterranea 3: Cluj-Napoca): 625-640.
- Speidel, M.P., 1970 — The Captor of Decebalus: a new inscription from Philippi. *JRS* 60: 142-153 (= M.P. Speidel, 1984: 173-187).
- Speidel, M.P. 1976 — Citizen Cohorts in the Roman and Imperial Army. New Data on the Cohorts Apula, Campana, and IIII Campestris. *TAPhA* 106: 339-348 (= M.P. Speidel 1984: 91-100).
- Speidel, M.P. 1982, Auxiliary Units Named after Their Commanders: Four New Cases from Egypt. *Aegyptus* 62 (1982): 165-172 (= M.P. Speidel 1984: 101-108).
- Speidel, M.P., 1983 — The Roman Army in Asia Minor: recent epigraphical studies and research. In: S. Mitchell (ed.), Armies and Frontiers in Roman and Byzantine Anatolia (Oxford 1983), 7-34 (= M.P. Speidel, 1984: 273-300).
- Speidel, M.P., 1984 — Roman Army Studies I (Amsterdam).
- Speidel, M.P., 1989 — Work to be done on the Organisation of the Roman Army. *Bulletin of the Institute of Archaeology* 26, 99-106.
- Speidel, M.P., 1992 — The weapons keeper (*armorum custos*) and the ownership of weapons in the Roman army. In: M.P. Speidel (ed.), Roman Army Studies II (Stuttgart): 131-139.
- Thonemann, P., 2015 — The Maeander Valley: A Historical Geography from Antiquity to Byzantium (Oxford).
- Vervaet, F.J., 2007 — The reappearance of the supra-regional commands in the late second and early third centuries CE: constitutional and historical considerations. In: O. Hekster, G. de Kleijn, D. Slootjes (eds.), Crises and the Roman Empire (Leiden): 125-140.
- Weiss, P., 2006 — Die Auxilien des syrischen Heeres von Domitian bis Antoninus Pius: Eine Zwischenbilanz nach den neuen Militärdiplomen. *Chiron* 36: 249-298.
- Weiß, P., 2008 — Militärdiplome für Moesia (Moesia, Moesia Superior, Moesia Inferior). *Chiron* 38: 267-316.
- Wheeler, E.L., 2012 — *Notitia Dignitatum*, Or. 38 and Roman Deployment in Colchis: Assessing Recent Views. In: B. Cabouret, A. Groslambert, and C. Wolff (eds.), Visions de l'Occident romain. Hommages à Yann Le Bohec (Paris): 621-676.
- Wolff, C., 2003 — Les brigands en orient sous le haut-empire romain (Paris).
- Ziegler, R., 1996 — Civic coins and imperial campaigns. In: D. Kennedy (ed.), The Roman Army in the East (Ann Arbor, MI): 119-134.