

“Becoming a Roman”: Anatolians in the Imperial Roman Navy

Julian BENNETT*

Introduction

Although much has been written concerning the Roman army and its legions and auxiliary regiments, far less is available and accessible regarding the nature and role of the Roman navy¹. This is especially true with regard to the origins and other associated matters of those men who served in this force, a lacuna this article seeks to redress to some extent by focusing on those members of the Imperial Roman Navy certainly or probably recruited from the Anatolian provinces. However, to place this study into context, Part I provides an overview of the origins and nature of the Imperial Roman Navy, a subject likely to be unfamiliar to most readers of this journal, and so an essential prelude to Part II, which details what is known of those certain or probable natives of the Anatolian provinces who served in this force as provided by the evidence of the epigraphic sources available, these being presented in summary form in Part III.

Part I: An Overview of the Imperial Roman Navy

Genesis

The genesis of the Imperial Roman Navy lies with the fleet that won victory for Octavian over Antony and Cleopatra at Actium on 2 September 31 B.C.², allowing him to assume sole authority at Rome. In the winter of 28/27 B.C. he introduced the system of Roman government we

* Yrd. Doç. Dr. Julian Bennett, Bilkent Üniversitesi, İnsani Bilimler ve Edebiyat Fakültesi, Arkeoloji Bölümü 06800 Bilkent – Ankara. E-mail: bennett@bilkent.edu.tr

I am most grateful for the help and support towards the writing of this article given freely by my former Bilkent colleague A. Coşkun Abuagla, and current colleagues J. Morin and L. Zavagno, who naturally bear no responsibility for the final product! I also thank the staff of the Bodleian Library, Oxford; the Society of Antiquaries Library, London; the library of the British Institute in Ankara; and the inter-library loans section of Bilkent University Library. Their willing help in finding and supplying the necessary reference material was vital. Finally, as so often before, a great debt is owed to the Epigraphik-Datenbank Clauss / Slaby – EDCS - http://db.edcs.eu/epigr/epibeleg_de.php for ease of access to the relevant epigraphic data. And an equal debt is owed to the two anonymous referees for their incisive and helpful comments on how to improve the text.

¹ The seminal studies on the origins and other matters relating to the Imperial Roman Navy are those of Ferrereio 1878, 1884, and 1899, used extensively for the better-known summary account presented by Starr 1960, and to a great extent the epigraphic corpus provided by Spaul 2002. Other useful accounts on the topic include: Mason 2003; Pitassi 2012; Reddé 1986, Reddé 1995, and Reddé 2000; Saddington 2007; and Sander 1957. One suspects that when it becomes publicly available, the currently embargoed Oxford University D.Phil thesis by L. D. C. Hopkins, *Fleets and Manpower on Land and Sea: The Italian “Classes” and the Roman Empire 31 BC - AD 193* (2014), will be of great value to students of the subject.

² Saddington 2007, 205-208, provides a clear and useful summary of the action.

know as the principate, for which he received in return the *agnomen* Augustus. A fundamental aspect of the principate was the creation by ca. 25 B.C. of a standing army of twenty-eight legions and an array of full-time auxiliary units³. The decision to establish a permanent navy was probably made at the same time, even though Rome no longer faced any other naval power in the Mediterranean⁴. In which case the need for a fleet in Augustus' new military arrangements was presumably prompted by the potential for rampant piracy in the Mediterranean region if there was no navy ready to combat this, along with perhaps a recognition of how warships could be used as a tactical force in alliance with land campaigns – “combined operations” in modern parlance⁵. Whatever the reason(s), the fact remains that, despite the absence of any clear rival to Rome in terms of its sea power at the time of its creation, the Imperial Roman Navy remained a significant part of the Roman Empire's military command structure for three hundred years and more after its creation.

The Fleets and their Bases

Augustus' new legionary army of twenty-eight permanent legions was formed by retaining some of his own twenty or so, and some of the twenty-three that fought for Antony at Actium, the remainder being disbanded and their members transferred to a retained unit or discharged from service⁶. We might assume that Augustus took a similar approach in connection with the 400 or so ships and crews of his own fleet and the roughly 350 that had served Antony at Actium, now despatched to Forum Julii to await a verdict on their future⁷. Whatever transpired, a permanent navy of two sections was established sometime (probably) before 22 B.C., with one part based at Misenum (modern Miseno) at the northwest point of the Bay of Naples, and the other at Ravenna at the head of the Adriatic⁸. According to Suetonius, the choice of these places as naval bases reflected the anticipated roles of the two fleets, that at Misenum responsible primarily for matters on the “greater” or Tyrrhenian Sea, while that at Ravenna held authority in the “lesser” or Adriatic, Vegetius adding that in practice, it oversaw the entire Eastern Mediterranean⁹. In fact the epigraphic evidence is that both fleets operated throughout the *Mare Nostrum*, the greater number of records of the Misene fleet in both parts of the Mediterranean reflecting its senior status in terms of its number of warships¹⁰.

Both fleets were at first named for their main base and by the early Flavian period were known formally as the *Classis Misenensis* and the *Classis Ravennatis* respectively¹¹. However, like the legions and the auxiliary units of the Imperial Roman army, they later acquired

³ Cf. Dio Hist. 52.1-40. Although it remains unclear when the first “professional” units of *auxilia* were formed, they logically came into being in association with the creation of the new legionary army.

⁴ Indeed, after Actium a Roman navy was not involved in any major naval battle until the two battles of the Hellespont in A.D. 324, when a fleet supporting Constantine defeated one fighting for his rival Licinius: Zosimus Hist. Nov. 2.23-24. The next (and last) time the entire Imperial Roman Navy was involved in a major sea battle was against the Goths at Sinigallia in 551: Procopius Hist. 8.23.

⁵ E.g., Tacitus Ann. 2.16, for the Imperial Roman Navy being used during the later campaigns of Drusus and of Tiberius in Germania for landing armed men to deal with local disturbances as and where needed.

⁶ Cf. Keppie 1984, 128-140, passim, with 201-202.

⁷ Tacitus Ann. 4.5.

⁸ Cf. Suetonius Aug. 49.1, with Tacitus Ann.4.5.1. The creation of the senatorial province of Gallia Narbonensis in 22 B.C. meant that any military forces stationed at Forum Julii now came the authority of the provincial governor, and so the need for Augustus to base the fleet in Italy about this time to keep it under his personal command.

⁹ Suetonius Aug. 49.1; Vegetius De Re Milit. 4.31.

¹⁰ As will be shown below.

¹¹ Cf. CIL 16.12, of 9/2/71 (*Misenensis*) and CIL 16.14, of 5/4/71 (*Ravennatis*).

agnomina for one or other reason, the first being the title *Praetoria*, the Misene fleet receiving this sometime between 9 November 71 and the end of 114, becoming the *Classis Praetoria Misenensis*, while that at Ravenna was renamed as the *Classis Praetoria Ravennatis* between 5 April 71 and 12 June 100¹². More significantly, the adoption of the *agnomen* – which we can be sure came on the same day for both fleets – indicates a clear change in their status, placing them on a level similar to that of the Praetorian Guard, the emperor’s personal “bodyguard”. The change evidently came about in connection with a reform to the equestrian hierarchy made by Vespasian that saw their commanders appointed henceforth from the senior levels of that body alone and given the rank of *praefectus*¹³. As such, it can be associated with other poorly referenced reforms made by that emperor in 73/74¹⁴. Be that as it may, it seems probable that it was Vespasian also who established the *Castra Misena* and the *Castra Ravennatis* at Rome, the former near the Flavian amphitheater for those members of the Misene fleet stationed there to operate the *velarium* at that place, the latter in *Transtiberium* for those from the Ravennate fleet seconded for duty at the nearby *Naumachia Augusti*¹⁵.

Under Caracalla, probably in late 211 or early 212, both fleets were granted the imperial epithet *Antoniniana* as part of a systematic process in which that emperor honored several military units for – it would seem – remaining “faithful” to him despite his arranging the assassination of his imperial colleague Geta¹⁶. This *agnomen* was briefly dropped following Caracalla’s own assassination in 217¹⁷, but was revived shortly afterwards by Elagabalus, his eventual successor¹⁸, and who also apparently gave both fleets the additional title *Pia Vindex*¹⁹. In 222 Severus Alexander, Elagabalus’ immediate successor, replaced *Antoniniana* with his own imperial epithet of *Severiana*²⁰, this practice being followed by his eventual successors Gordian, Philip, and Decius, who in their turn honored the fleets as *Gordiana*, *Philippiana*, and *Deciana* respectively²¹. Throughout this period the title *Pia Vindex* is used sporadically on *diplomata* and on inscriptions relating to both fleets²².

In addition to the two main fleets in Italy, there were several smaller regional and riverine ones. Of these we need to take note of two only, namely the *Classis Pontica* and the *Classis Syriaca*, as they certainly or probably included men of Anatolian origin. The first was formed

¹² *Misenensis*: AE 1997.173 with CIL 16.60, of 114; *Ravennatis*: CIL 16.14, 15, and 16, all of 5/4/71, with AE 1989.315 = RMD 3.142, of 12/6/100.

¹³ Previously, the commanders of the two fleets were often Imperial freedmen ranked as procurators, but subsequently they ranked immediately below the top four prefectures available to the equestrian class, those of the Praetorian Guard, of Egypt, of the *Annonae*, and of the *Vigiles*.

¹⁴ Mann 2002, 232-33.

¹⁵ Richardson 1992, 77-79.

¹⁶ On the date, see the discussion in Fitz 1983, 73-84, with RMD 1.74 of 30/8/212, and RMD 2.131 of 27/11/214, for its adoption by the Misene fleet; and CIL 16.138 of 213/217, for that at Ravenna.

¹⁷ Fitz 1983, 73-84.

¹⁸ Cf. RMD 3.192 of (? 27/11/) 218 and 4.307 of 29/11/221, for the Misene fleet; and RMD 5.457/317 and 5.458 of (9/1/ or 11/9/) 221, for that at Ravenna.

¹⁹ The title is found on CIL 3.168, a text with the imperial epitaph *Antoniniana* and so dating to the time of Caracalla or Elagabalus, but is absent from the latest known fleet *diploma* of Caracalla’s reign, RMD 2.131, of 27/11/214, so making its bestowal by Elagabalus more likely.

²⁰ Cf. Fitz 1983, 90-140.

²¹ E.g., *Classis Praetoria Misenensis Pia Vindex Gordiana*: CIL 10.3336: *Classis Praetoria Philippiana Pia Vindex*: CIL 16.152, of 28/12/247; and *Classis Praetoria Deciana Pia Vindex Ravennatis*: CIL 16.154, of 28/12/249.

²² E.g., RMD 2.133, of 27/11/229, naming the *Classis Praetoria Severiana Pia Vindex Misensis*, whereas RMD 5.463, of 14/11/ - 11/12/ 224, with 3.194, of 28/12/255, simply give the *Classis Praetoria Severiana Ravennatis*

from the existing fleet of Polemon II after Nero annexed Pontus Polemiacus in 63²³. It was evidently responsible for the entire Pontus Euxinus with a main base probably at Sinope, the only place where its presence is epigraphically confirmed²⁴, and a region troubled in some periods by piracy²⁵. As for the *Classis Syriaca*, a late or even a post-Vespasianic date for its foundation seems likely²⁶, although there is no secure independent dating evidence for its existence until the Hadrianic period, when it is named on a *diploma* issued between 14-31 December 119 to one of its members after completing twenty-six years of service²⁷. This might suggest that the fleet was in existence certainly by 93 or so, the year the *diploma* recipient joined the Roman military, although a later date is possible if he had been transferred from another fleet to the *Classis Syriaca*²⁸. Be that as it may, the Levantine coast was evidently the prime responsibility of the *Classis Syriaca*, and we can be fairly confident it was based at Seleucia Pieria, a long-established harbor town where at least two of its members were buried and which also served elements of the *Classes Misensis* and *Ravennatis* while on detached duty in the eastern Mediterranean²⁹. However, it evidently operated in the Aegean also, as is shown by a record at Ephesus of a member who describes himself as an *oppicarius* or “shipbuilder”³⁰.

The Ships

The Imperial Roman Navy used the same mixture of oar-powered ships of war as those used by the Hellenic city states and the Hellenistic kingdoms and which in turn had formed the models for those used in the navy of the Roman Republican period³¹. Provided with a single main and a foresail for use when not in action, and generically termed “long ships” (*navis longa/naves longae*)³², these vessels were classed into types according to the number of “remes”

²³ Josephus *BJ* 2.367; also Wheeler 2012, esp. 124-147, who inter alia argues on no real evidence for this being an Imperial rather than a provincial fleet.

²⁴ See below, Part III, no. 60. But note also French 2004, 72-74, no. 102, for an inscription imaginatively restored to refer to a possible *Vicus veteranorum classis orae ponticae* at Sinope; and French 2004, 92-93, n. 126, for an honorific inscription at Sinope to a *Praefectus* of the *Classis Pontica*.

²⁵ E.g., Strabo 11.2.12-14 and 17.3.24; Ovid *Pont.* 4.10.25-30; and Josephus *B. J.* 2.366-67.

²⁶ It not mentioned by Josephus or Tacitus in their detailed accounts of the First Jewish Rebellion of 66-72.

²⁷ RMD 5.354, of 14-31/12/119 (see below, Part III, no. 61). One S. Cornelius Dexter was awarded military honours for his role in Hadrian's Jewish War of 132-136 while the serving commander of the *classis Syriaca* (cf. CIL 8.8934 = ILS 1400), and so some members of that fleet may have been engaged actively in that campaign as infantry.

²⁸ Transfers between auxiliary regiments are attested (e.g., Bennett 2010, 432), and so in theory would be possible between fleets also, and especially so in this case, as the *Classis Syriaca* was most probably formed around a core element of trained men transferred from one or both of the Italian fleets.

²⁹ Cf. Seyrig 1939, 451-459, listing seventeen memorials recording two men there from the *Classis Syriaca*, and twelve from the Misene and three from the Ravennate fleets. These memorials were found near the so-called “Titus tunnel” but do not necessarily mean that the men they commemorate were involved in its making, as Seyrig suspected, even though members of the fleets were often engaged in building activities (cf. Saddington 2009, 131). Note also AE 1896.21 = FIRA 3.132, recording the sale of a seven-year-old slave from “beyond the Euphrates” in February 166 by a member of the *Classis Praetoria Misensis* to one of his officers at “*Seleucia Pieriae in castris in hibernis vexillationis clas(sis) praetoriae Misensium*”, the document indicating that at least five ships from the same fleet were then present there.

³⁰ AE 1972.582 = AE 1974.621 = IK 13.668. Note also CIL 3.434 = ILS 2913 = IK 16.2274 (see below, Part III, no. 7), another member of the *Classis Syriaca* recorded at Ephesus, considered here to be a native of the place who retired there. Ephesus evidently served as a base for the Imperial Roman Navy on occasion, as we learn from, e.g., ILS 2888 = IK 2232a, recording a *scriba* of the *Classis Misensis* who died on duty there, and AE 1956.10 = IK 737, dated ca. 244-249, honoring Vibius Seneca, *dux vexillationis Classis Praetoriae Misensium et Ravennensium*.

³¹ Cf. D'Amato 2016, *passim*.

³² Cf. Livy 38.38.8, and Bell. Alex. 44, with Ferrero 1878, 25.

providing the main propulsion, the word being adapted from the Latin *remus* for "oar"³³. Thus, as iconographic and other evidence confirms, a *bireme* was powered by two horizontal "remes" or rows of oars and a *trireme* used three, each oar being operated by a single man. However, in the case of those ships referred to in contemporary literature and on inscriptions relating to the Imperial Roman Navy as being either a *quadrireme*, a *quinquereme*, or a *hexareme*, with respectively four, five, and six "remes", it seems that the term "reme" refers to the "rows" of men in the sense of the numbers operating any one vertical set or bank of oars. Thus, the *quadrireme* was a wider version of the *bireme*, with two men per oar and so four "remes", while a *hexareme* and *quinquereme* were wider versions of the regular *trireme*, the first with two men per oar and so six vertical "remes", and the second with two men per oar for the lower and middle levels, and one for the upper, and so five "remes".

As it is, most inscriptions on stone relating to individual members of the Imperial Roman Navy refer to their ships by type, using the relevant Roman numeral to indicate the number of "remes" (for example, "III" for a *trireme*), and by the individual ship name also³⁴. As these inscriptions record almost always the fleet that a man belonged to, this allows an approximation of the numbers of individual ships serving with the two main fleets, suggesting there was a combined minimum total of about 120 ships in regular service with these³⁵. In addition, we can determine the numbers of the different types of vessel they used, so we can identify the largest ship in either fleet as a *hexareme* named "*Ope*" based at Misenum, and presumably a flagship of sorts³⁶. Likewise, it is clear that while *quinqueremes* and *quadriremes* were quartered at both Misenum and Ravenna³⁷, the Imperial Roman Navy's most favored ship-of-war was the *trireme*³⁸, as was the case also with the Hellenic and Hellenistic navies – and with good reason, as was shown from sea trials with the *Olympias*, a full-scale replica of a *trireme* completed for the modern Hellenic Navy in 1987³⁹. Next to the *trireme* the most favored class of ship used by the Imperial Roman Navy was the *bireme*⁴⁰, often referred to as the *liburna* from it allegedly being modeled on the ships used by the piratical Liburnians of the Adriatic Sea⁴¹, and highly favored for their mobility in close combat, allowing them to punch above their weight, as it were⁴².

³³ Appian *Illyr. Civ.* 3.

³⁴ Starr 1960, 54, with Reddé 1986, 671-672, on ship names; also Bru 2011, 200, on the significance of the ship names represented at Seleucia Piera.

³⁵ To those who might object that not all these ships need have been in service throughout the entire principate, it is worth recalling that when properly maintained, wooden ships can survive for well over a century with relatively minimal repairs to their hulls. Such is the case, for example, with HMS *Trincomalee* at Hartlepool, UK, built in 1812, and the even older USS *Constitution* at Boston, USA, built in 1797. By contrast with these two, which have remained afloat more-or-less continuously since they were built, HMS *Victory* at Portsmouth, UK, the oldest serving ship in any world navy today, and first "floated out" in 1765, has been kept in a dry dock since 1922, the result being that since then, most of her main timbers and probably all of her secondary works, have been replaced.

³⁶ Cf. CIL 6.3163.

³⁷ Cf. Reddé 1986, 665-671, listing one *quinquereme* and ten *quadriremes* at Misenum, and two *quinqueremes* and six *quadriremes* at Ravenna, for a total of nineteen ships of both classes.

³⁸ Cf. Reddé 1986, 665-67, with fifty-two at Misenum, and twenty-five at Ravenna, totaling seventy-seven.

³⁹ The *Olympias*, with its fifty-four oars in each of the two lower horizontal banks and sixty-two in the upper, each oar "manned" by a single rower and so 170 in all, could attain speeds of nine knots (seventeen km/h) and complete a 180 degree turn within sixty seconds; cf. Morrison, et al., 2000, with Coates, et al., 1990, 83, 87-89.

⁴⁰ Cf. Reddé 1986, 665-67, listing seventeen at Misenum and five at Ravenna, totaling twenty-two.

⁴¹ Vegetius *De Re Milit.* 4.33. For a detailed analysis of the type see Zaninović 1988.

⁴² Cf. Plutarch *Ant.* 62, and Vegetius *De Re Milit.* 4.33, who both credit Octavian's victory at Actium to the skilful use of *liburnae*.

The Men

The recruits for the Imperial Roman Navy were almost invariably peregrine by origin, non-Roman but freeborn men who held the citizenship of a *polis* or (in the Western Roman Empire) a *civitas*, a recognizable semi-independent political entity. Presumably, as was the case with those peregrines that served with the Roman *auxilia*, the Imperial Roman Navy included both volunteers and conscripts, but contrary to popular belief, not slaves⁴³. The attraction of voluntary service for a peregrine with the various Roman provincial fleets was doubtless the same as that which attracted others of their status to join the *auxilia*: the grant of Roman citizenship for themselves, their legal wife, and their children on completion of the necessary period of service⁴⁴. For those who qualified for the Misene or Ravennate fleet, however, there was an even better reason to volunteer. From about A.D. 71-73/74, they were awarded Roman citizenship at or soon after they formally enlisted, taking or being assigned a Roman-type name at the same time, so bringing the men of the Italian fleets “into line with every other [military] unit stationed in Italy, all of whose members were Roman citizens”⁴⁵.

The change in status is demonstrated by onomastic analysis of the epigraphic data. Prior to the Flavian period all those who served with the Italian fleets are recorded on inscriptions and on *diplomata* in the usual peregrine form: by *nomen*, patronymic, and (usually) their place of origin⁴⁶. But from the Flavian period onward, they are identified using the regular formula applicable to a Roman citizen, and so *praenomen*, *nomen*, patronymic, and *cognomen*, with inscriptions on stone often adding a *supernomina* while omitting the patronymic, and after about 150 or so leaving off the *praenomen* also⁴⁷. Nonetheless, the peregrine origin of these men is revealed often by either their place of origin, or a non-Roman patronymic, or a *supernomina* of a non-Roman form. However, as none of these members of the fleets of peregrine origin were – as far as it is known – ever assigned to one of the thirty-five Roman tribes, then perhaps, as was the case with a Junian Latin, there was some form of legal qualification as to their exact citizenship status⁴⁸.

That matter aside, and whatever the precise reason for the particular benefit of immediate citizenship bestowed on those who joined the two Italian fleets, the number of years they served for was the same as those who joined all the other fleets. All of the surviving naval *diplomata* indicate that by the early Flavian period this was set at twenty-six years and remained so until sometime between 22 November 205 and the end of 207, when it was extended to

⁴³ No reliable classical author mentions the use of slaves in the Roman fleets except during the period of the Triumviral Wars: e.g., Appian Bell. Civ.5.1., Suetonius Aug. 16, and Dio 48.34.4., and 49. However, it is clear from the first two sources that these slaves were emancipated and given freedman status before their enrollment.

⁴⁴ According to the Gnomon of the Idiologos 55 (Hunt – Edgar 1934, 51), however, only those native-born Egyptians who served with the *Classis Misensis* qualified for Roman citizenship at the end of their service. This helps explain the substantial numbers of these men in that unit, although as Starr 1960, 76-77, observed, given how many native-born Egyptians are recorded as members of the *Classis Ravennatis*, then in reality, the right to citizenship was applicable to those who served in either fleet.

⁴⁵ Cf. Mann 2002, 232-233. Hence the well-known letter of 2nd-century date from the Egyptian Apion to his parents after he was formally registered with the Imperial Roman Navy at Misenum: “I am now [known as] Antonius Maximus”; Hunt – Edgar 1932, 112.

⁴⁶ E.g., CIL 16.7 (see below, Part III, no. 3), a *diploma* issued 22/12/68 to “Diomedes, Artemonis *filius*, ex *Phrygia Laudic(ea)*”.

⁴⁷ Cf. Salway 1994, 131, for the omission of the *praenomen* on stone inscriptions. Of the naval tombstones at Misenum and Ravenna, 90% employ *tria nomina*, the remainder omitting the *praenomen*, perhaps indicating a 3rd-century date for these; cf. Mann 2009, 232.

⁴⁸ Cf. Mommsen 1881, 466-469 (=Mommsen 1908, 410-411).

twenty-eight years⁴⁹. For reasons that remain unfathomable this initial term of twenty-six years was one year more than that set for an auxiliary soldier, although the reason for its extension to twenty-eight years can be suggested as responding to a shortage of trained men and/or volunteers.

This naturally brings us to the nature of the actual service of those who joined the Imperial Roman Navy, in the sense of “what were their duties”? On this matter there is some debate. The problem is that whereas the sources for the Republican period on this matter often distinguish between the “rowers” who powered the ships of the Roman navy and the “marines” who supplied the military muscle⁵⁰, those for the Imperial period do not provide a clear picture. Insofar as the literary sources are concerned, for example, they refer frequently to these men generically as *classarii*, or “members of the fleet”⁵¹, or as *remiges*, “rowers”⁵². Tacitus, though, does on a single occasion distinguish between the rowers (*remiges*), sailors (*nautae*), and the “fighters” (*propugnatores*) of one particular ship, while Vegetius in his essay on the Imperial Roman Navy talks of “rowers and soldiers” (*remigibus et militibus*) at one point in his text, although elsewhere he simply names the men of the fleet as “rowers”⁵³. On the other hand the 3rd-century jurist Ulpian, in speaking of the right of soldiers to make wills while their fathers were yet alive, states categorically that “*in classibus omnes remiges et nautae milites sunt*” – “All those rowers and sailors who serve in the fleets are soldiers”⁵⁴.

In other words, in legal terms, and we should assume in practical matters also, all those who served with the Imperial Roman Navy were nothing other than a sea-based version of the legions and the *auxilia*, and so men employed and trained preeminently as soldiers. Indeed, such is confirmed by the well over 800 surviving epigraphic texts relating to these men of which a mere three only – all *diplomata* – refer to members of the fleet specifically as “rowers”⁵⁵. With one exception, where a naval veteran is referred to as a “sailor” (*veteranus ... nauta*), with no further definition⁵⁶, all the remaining epigraphic texts recording members of the Imperial Roman Navy and which refer to them by their status, rank, or function, do so using titles commonly found in texts relating to members of the legions and the *auxilia*⁵⁷. So, for example, both inscriptions and papyri make abundantly clear that the members of a ship’s

⁴⁹ Those *diplomata* issued under Galba and early in Vespasian’s reign to men transferred from the fleets to serve in the *legiones I* and *II Adiutrix* do not specify a precise period of service, but the earliest “normal” fleet *diplomata*, CIL 16.12 and 13, of 9/2/71, gives this as twenty-six years. For the extension to twenty-eight years see Eck and Lieb 1993, 80. One noteworthy and remarkable difference in the terms of service between those in the *auxilia* and those with the fleets is how in more than 90% of the known naval *diplomata*, members of the fleets served for exactly the length of time stipulated, whether twenty-six or twenty-eight years, in clear contrast to members of the *auxilia*, who from at least the reign of Hadrian might serve beyond the normal twenty-five years; cf. RMD 3.171, of 6/2/158. Also noteworthy is how ex-members of the fleets continued to receive *diplomata* after 203, the year when the last known auxiliary equivalents were issued.

⁵⁰ Cf. Saddington 2009, 123-124.

⁵¹ Cf. Suetonius Galba 12; Tacitus Ann. 12.56; Hist. 1.6.2, 31.2, 36.3; and 2.67.2; and CIL 16.32, of 17/2/86.

⁵² E.g., FIRA 3.171; Tacitus Ann.13.30; Suetonius Galba 12; Plutarch Galba 15.

⁵³ Tacitus Hist. 4.16 with 2.35 (*propugnatores* is used in the same sense in Caesar BC 3.27.2, and in B.Alex. 10.4, and 46.5); Vegetius De Re Milit. 4.32, and 4.37.

⁵⁴ Ulpian Dig. 37.13.1. The right of soldiers to make wills was itself decreed by the emperor Trajan, among other reforms relating to service in the Roman military; cf. Gaius Inst. 2.11, with Bennett 1996, 214.

⁵⁵ CIL 16.1, of 11/12/52; RMD 4.205, of 5/4/71; and CIL 16.24, of 8/9/79.

⁵⁶ ILS 9218 = (see below, Part III, no. 6).

⁵⁷ While it is possible that those members of the Imperial Roman Navy referred to on their funerary epitaphs as simply being members or veterans of that body were principally rowers, as with, for example, CIL 10.3553 (see below, Part III, no. 46), this seems highly unlikely.

company belonged to a *centuria* assigned to a named ship rather than to the named ship itself⁵⁸. Accordingly, although each naval *centuria* would clearly vary in size according to the type of ship and its complement⁵⁹, its commander was designated as a centurion, a few of those in naval service describing themselves more specifically as *centurio classicus*, “centurion of the fleet”⁶⁰. What is more, those men in a naval *centuria* who were appointed to a specific military duty carry regular army titles, and so we find individuals on a ship named as *principalis*, *optio*, *medicus*, *armorum custos*, *faber*, and so on, several attaching the regular army suffix *duplicarius* to their rank designation to indicate they were on “double pay” on account of their expertise⁶¹.

These specialists aside, the overwhelming majority of the other members of the Imperial Roman Navy are referred to simply as being a *miles* (“soldier”), with a specific *centuria*, or a ship, or a navy, in many cases with all three qualifiers. The only exceptions to the use of this term for an ordinary “ranker”, other than the *veteranus ... nauta* mentioned above, are on those *diplomata* issued to fleet veterans, which describe the recipient unfailingly as a *gregalis*, a military status found otherwise applied only on those *diplomata* issued to cavalryman who served in an auxiliary *ala* or *cobors equitata*. Another exception is how some inscriptions on stone and texts on papyri describe a serving or former member of the fleets as a *manipularis*, a rather old-fashioned designation from the Republican period used to denote a member of a legionary manipule⁶². In fact, and this needs to be stressed, the only purely naval terminology we find associated epigraphically with members of the Imperial Roman Navy is applied to those men who were clearly professional sailors with specifically nautical duties. That is to say, the *navarchs*, who commanded a squadron of ships; the *trierarchs*, captains of individual vessels; the *gubernatores*, a first mate in modern parlance; the *proreta*, or second mate; the *nau-fylax*, or bosun, and so on. These Greek titles derived directly from those originally borrowed for use by the Republican Roman Navy⁶³. What is not at all clear, though, is the relationship between in particular the *trierarchs*, the captains of the ships, and the centurions who served on the same ship, although logically the centurion would be the senior officer.

⁵⁸ E.g., CIL 6.3165, and P.Mich.8.490f. There is but one known exception to this rule, namely CIL 11.340, which records a centurion in charge of a *numerus Pannoniorum* on the *triere Hercule*, with *numerus* being used in this case as a synonym for a “unit”, and so a *centuria*.

⁵⁹ There is no clear and unambiguous indication as to the number of men employed on any of the ships in the Imperial Roman Navy, although such information does exist for its Republican equivalent; cf. Polybius *Hist.* 1.26.7, reporting a *quinquereme* with a total crew of 420 of which 300 were rowers and the rest “marines”. Note also IGRR 1.843, an incomplete Republican-period inscription listing the captain and seven officers of a ship of unknown type along with twenty or more *epibatai* (“marines”) before a break in the text, the rest of which is lost. As for crew numbers in the Greek and Hellenistic navies, IG 2/2 1604-1632 indicates around 200 for a trireme, with about 170 dedicated rowers, the remainder being “marines”; cf. Pitassi 2012, 56.

⁶⁰ See Tacitus Ann.14.8, for a *centurione classiaro comitatum*, or “centurion of a ship’s company/military”. The title also occurs in Republican contexts; cf. ILS 2231.

⁶¹ Although the expression *faber* for a skilled craftsman has not been attested in legionary contexts, it is fairly well represented in the records of the auxiliary units stationed at Vindolanda in Britannia; cf. Bowman, et. al., 2010, 211. Sander 1959 remains the standard work on the *duplicarii*.

⁶² This may reflect influence from members of the Praetorian Guard who sometimes use the expression *commanipularis* on funerary monuments to denote the relationship between the deceased and his heir; e.g., CIL 6.2613, and FIRA 3.132 = AE 1896.21. The expression is also found on a single legionary epitaph found at Novae, of a member of the *legio Italica*: CIL 3.7441; cf. also Starr 1960, 59.

⁶³ Cf. Saddington 2009, 123-124.

What all this means is that as there is no epigraphic evidence to identify a separate category of men in the Imperial Roman Navy classed precisely as a “marine” in modern parlance, then the men of the fleets must have functioned in a dual role: as soldiers in a regular military sense but as trained rowers also. But it was their function as soldiers that came first, and so they were, strictly speaking, *militēs classiarīi*. Hence the apparent ease by which Nero and Vespasian were each able to form a complete legion using men seconded directly from the Misenene and Ravenna fleets for service in this way, the *legiones I* and *II Adiuatrix* respectively, and why members of the Misenene fleet could be drafted directly into the *legio X Fretensis* sometime between 125/126 and 150⁶⁴.

Part II: *Militēs Classiarīi Ex Asia Minore*

Origins and Civil Status

A natural place to start any investigation into those Anatolians who served in the Imperial Roman Navy is their origins. The epigraphic evidence detailed in Part III below reveals that of the sixty-one men with certain or probable Anatolian origins who entered naval service, no less than twenty-nine were from Cilicia. Five of them specify their exact place of origin with two from Selinunte, and one each from Claudiopolis, Corycaea, and Titopolis, to which we might add a veteran who died at Selinunte and so was probably from there⁶⁵. Of the remainder, a clear majority of nineteen are from Bithynia and Pontus, four naming Nicaea as their origin, and one from Prusa⁶⁶. Then come eight from Asia (including Phrygia) with one giving his origin as “Laodicea” [sic]⁶⁷; three from Lycia-Pamphylia with two specifying their homes as Laerta and Oinoanda respectively⁶⁸; and one each from Cappadocia and Galatia⁶⁹.

That Cilicians represent almost 50% of the known Anatolians serving in the Imperial Roman Navy is, perhaps, to be expected. The prowess in nautical piracy of these people was such a clear and present danger in the Eastern Mediterranean during the Republican period that two campaigns were directed specifically against their region, one by P. Servilius Vatia in 77 B.C. and a second by Cn. Pompeius Magnus – Pompey the Great – in 68 B.C.⁷⁰. In fact, one of “our” Anatolians in the navy of the principate originated from Pompeiopolis, a place formerly known as Soli, and where Pompey resettled numerous Cilician pirates after his victory over them, and so “our” man may well have been descended from one of these⁷¹. Indeed, it may well have been the case that the region was specifically targeted for recruits and/or conscripts whenever the Italian fleets were active in the Eastern Mediterranean, even if Cilicians as a whole were apparently not considered suitable for naval service in the late Republican period, presumably

⁶⁴ For the *legiones I* and *II Adiuatrix*, see Suetonius Galba 12, and Plutarch Galba 15, with RE 12, 1380 and 1437. For the *legio X Fretensis*, see Vitelli 1929, no. 1026, a likely occasion for the transfer being in connection with losses suffered by the legion during the Second Jewish Rebellion.

⁶⁵ Part III, nos. 10-38, with nos. 10, 15, 20, 37, and 38 specifying their precise origin; with no. 19, from Selinunte.

⁶⁶ Part III, nos. 43-61, with nos. 45, 54, 55, and 61 from Nicaea, and no. 58 from Prusa.

⁶⁷ Part III nos. 1-8, with no. 3 from Laodicea.

⁶⁸ Part III, nos. 40-42.

⁶⁹ Part III, nos. 9 and 39.

⁷⁰ Although somewhat dated, Ormerod 1967 remains a valuable and focused study of Cilician and other piracy in the Anatolian region, a subject covered to some extent in the wide-ranging study offered by Grünewald 2004.

⁷¹ Part III, no. 14.

because of their piratical background⁷². Second to Cilicia in terms of the numbers of Anatolians who served in the Imperial Roman Navy comes Pontus-Bithynia. Here the explanation for their numbers is presumably connected to this being an essentially maritime region, with numbers of men “born to the sea”, as it were. Indeed, after the annexation of Pontus Polemiacus in 69, the Pontic renegade Anicetus was able to form what was in essence a notorious piratical fleet that operated throughout the Pontus Euxinus, although he claimed to be operating on behalf of the emperor Vitellius to deal with those in opposition to his rule⁷³. A familiarity with the sea would likewise help explain why men from Asia and Lycia-Pamphylia, in third and fourth place respectively, might willingly or otherwise be enrolled in the Roman navy. But it is less easy to explain at first sight why men from the inland provinces of Cappadocia or Galatia may have been attracted to naval service, although a possible reason will be suggested later.

With regard to their civil status, it was made clear in Part I that the members of the Imperial Roman Navy were almost invariably peregrine by status, although from the Flavian period onwards, all those who served in the Italian fleets, and so any Anatolians who did so, were given some form of Roman citizenship at or shortly after being registered for service. Those who served in the provincial fleets won that status on completion of their engagement. However, there are two men who are fairly certainly of Anatolian origin and who possessed Roman citizenship before they served with the Imperial Roman Navy. The texts relating to them indicate both were enrolled in the *Quirina tribus*, one of the original Roman tribes, but common for men from the Flavian colonies in Spain and elsewhere who won Roman citizenship for one or other reason⁷⁴. One of the two men is an anonymous, of unknown rank, who served with the *Classis Syriaca*. Buried at Teos, probably his hometown, his citizenship status makes it likely that he was a *navarchus*, the commander of a naval squadron. The other man is C. Numisius Spuri f. Primus, certainly a *navarchus* who was most probably attached to the *Classis Pontica* as he is commemorated at Sinope⁷⁵. The texts that survive for both men naturally say nothing about why they were in naval service when as Roman citizens they could have chosen to follow a legionary career. However, *navarchs* serving with the Imperial Roman Navy could move sideways, so to speak, and enter a legion at a high grade, as a centurion or even as a *primus pilus*⁷⁶, and so both men may have chosen naval service in the hope of making this career shift.

Onomastics

For those Anatolians and others who enrolled in the Italian fleets an early requirement after enlistment was to choose a suitable Roman name – assuming, of course, that this was not given to them by the enrolling officer. Whatever the case may have been, a significant number of those enrolled in either fleet possessed an imperial *nomen*, this being the case for some 22% of those with the Misene fleet and 19% of those based at Ravenna, with “Julius” representing more than 50% of such names at both places⁷⁷. As for those naval recruits from

⁷² Cf. Cicero Phil.11.30, where Cilicia is omitted from a list of those eastern provinces that could potentially provide ships and their sailors for Roman service.

⁷³ Tacitus Hist. 3.47-48.

⁷⁴ Alföldy 1996, 457. Note that earlier Hispanic-origin members of the *tribus* are suspected; e.g., CIL 2.159 = AE 1946.253, of possibly Claudian date.

⁷⁵ Part III, nos. 8, 60.

⁷⁶ E.g., CIL 8.1322, and 10.3348.

⁷⁷ Reddé 1986 527-529.

Anatolia, fifteen likewise possessed imperial *nomina*, eight having “Julius”, two “Claudius”, two “Flavius”, one “Ulpius”, and two “Aurelius”⁷⁸. Only slightly less common than the use of imperial *nomina* among all members of the Italian fleets, and of “Julius” in particular, were “Valerius” and “Antonius”, at second and third place respectively⁷⁹. True to form, as it were, both of these are represented among the Anatolian members of the Italian fleets, with two “Valerii” and three “Antonii”⁸⁰.

Most of the other *classarii* of Anatolian origin with the Imperial Roman Navy bore one or other of the common Roman *praenomina* and *nomina*, with one significant exception: the ex-centurion and Cilician M. Didius Heliodorus, recorded on a *diploma* issued 30 August 212⁸¹, who shares his *praenomen* and *nomen* with M. Didius Iulianus, governor of Bithynia between 182-190, and briefly Roman emperor 28 March - 1 June 193. That this is not purely by coincidence is suggested by the fact that Heliodorus’ wife was a citizen of Nicaea in Bithynia, and that he was enrolled into the Imperial Roman Navy in or about 184 when Didius Iulianus was in office in *provincia* Bithynia. It is right to conclude from the evidence available that Heliodorus took his citizen name directly from Iulianus, although the precise reasons behind this must remain uncertain. However, it is possible that Heliodorus came to the governor’s attention after marrying into a family of some prominence in the province, and was even directly appointed into the centurionate by Iulianus, adopting his name as a means of expressing his thanks. It is well-known, after all, that prominent private citizens and so provincial governors also could directly appoint legionary tribunes, and it seems highly likely that they could also appoint centurions⁸².

The *cognomina* of our Anatolian recruits to the Italian fleets are likewise mainly of common “Roman” form, with a fair number of distinctly “Hellenic” origin⁸³. However, two are much more exotic in being geographically-based, being derived from Anatolian personal names: Phrygian in one case and Cilician in the other⁸⁴. And yet, despite this overwhelming evidence in which Anatolian recruits to the Italian fleets displayed how thoroughly they had become “Roman” by choosing familiar “Roman” naming patterns, a reasonable number chose not to ignore or forget completely their peregrine origins. This is shown by those funerary texts that employ *supernomina* or *signa* after their “Roman” name, using the “X *qui et (vocatur)* Y” formula, meaning “X who is also (called) Y”, to indicate their original birth name and – we assume – the name by which they were known commonly in military service and in daily life⁸⁵.

⁷⁸ Part III, nos. 7, 18-20, and 49-52 (“Julius”); 1-2 (“Claudius”); 40 and 48 (“Flavius”); 56 (“Ulpius”); 12 and 46 (“Aurelius”). Note that, while the use of the imperial *nomen* Aurelius is commonly believed to indicate a person who received their citizenship under Caracalla and the introduction of the *Constitutio Antoniniana* of 212, it was shared by Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius also so an earlier date cannot be automatically excluded.

⁷⁹ Cf. Reddé 1986, 529.

⁸⁰ Part III, nos. 32-33 (“Valerii”), 10-11, and 44 (“Antonii”).

⁸¹ Part III, no. 14.

⁸² Cf. Pliny Ep. 3.8., 4.4., with Birley 1981, 9.

⁸³ E.g., Part III, nos. 13, 22, 39, 49, 58-59.

⁸⁴ Part III, nos. 2 (“Isauricus”), 18 (“Antiochus”), 50 (“Ponticus”); 10 (Phrygian), and 42 (Cilician).

⁸⁵ Part III, nos. 11, 51, and 55.

Ranks

Very few of the Anatolians who served with the Imperial Roman Navy achieved high rank in strictly naval terms, that is to say, as “shipboard” officers. Of the five who did, two only – admittedly both probably rather than certainly Anatolian – were appointed as *navarchus*, namely the anonymous from Teos with the *Classis Syriaca*, and C. Numisius Primus, who probably served with the *classis Pontica*⁸⁶. Of the remainder, only Julius Hilarius, *trierarch* of the *liburna “Grypi”*, of the *classis Syriaca*, attained a captaincy of his own, although once again, we cannot be certain he was of Anatolian origin⁸⁷. Of the three certain Anatolians who ranked as “shipboard officers”, all were with the Misenene fleet. One, Julius Polionus, became a *gubernator*, while two, Aurelius Marullus and Q. Servilius Iasonis, each fulfilled the duties of a *naufylax*⁸⁸.

Turning to those Anatolians who had a more decidedly “military” role on board their ship, four reached the highest such rank as centurions, while one more was appointed as an *optio* and another as a *principalis*, senior assistants to their centurions⁸⁹. Several others were assigned specialist roles within their unit, some as *duplicarii*, on double pay because of their skills. Thus four were assigned to the duty of *armorum custos*, or weapons officer; three as *faber*, and so as a *faber navalis* or ship’s carpenter (two of them as a *duplicarius*); one as *medicus duplicarius*, “medical assistant”; one as *cornicularis duplicarius*, an administrative assistant; and one described simply as a *duplicarius* with no named specialist assignment⁹⁰. The great majority though were, as might be expected, ordinary “soldiers”, in the sense of men who “served” or were “serving” with one or other fleet. In several cases this is all the information provided, but more usually these men are described as being either a *miles* or (rarely) *manipularis* on their funerary texts or in the case of *diplomata* only, as *regalis*.

Recruitment and Service

Both the inscriptions on stone and the available *diplomata* concerning those Anatolians who served in the Imperial Roman Navy provide a certain amount of tangible personal data. For example, of the thirty-three for which we have the details regarding their age on recruitment and their military service, sixteen, and so about 50%, were between nineteen and twenty-three when they were enrolled into military service, so conforming more-or-less with what has been previously observed for the Roman fleets as a whole, that the average age on entry was twenty-one⁹¹. Two, however, were exceptionally young on enlistment, aged only fifteen, one of them dying at the age of thirty, the other aged forty, just one year short of being discharged, while the oldest recruit we know of was twenty-seven years of age when he began his service, dying eighteen years later⁹².

⁸⁶ Part III, nos. 8 and 60. Note that Wheeler 2012, 144, is against Numisius having any connection to the *Classis Pontica*, without providing supporting evidence or reasons.

⁸⁷ Part III, no. 7.

⁸⁸ Part III, nos. 20, 12, and 30, respectively.

⁸⁹ Part III, nos. 1, 14, 19, and 31 (centurions); 44 (*optio*); and 17 (*principalis*).

⁹⁰ Part III, nos. 40, 46, 55, and 56 (*custos armorum*); 18, 50, and 54 (*faber*); 26 (*medicus duplicarius*: note that owing to his responsibilities for an entire ship’s complement, a naval *medicus* ranked higher than an infantry *medicus* and so – as here – he was almost invariably appointed as a *duplicarius*; cf. Davies 1972, 9-10); 45 (*cornicularis duplicarius*); and 4 (*duplicarius*).

⁹¹ Cf. Fitzhardinge 1951, 20.

⁹² Part III, nos. 18, 32, and 27 respectively.

There is simply no precise evidence to indicate where or how or when any of these men were enrolled in the Imperial Roman Navy. Voluntary service and conscription are well-attested for other branches of the Roman military and so we might expect the same to have applied to those who served with Rome's naval forces⁹³. All that can be said on this matter is how in the well-known case of the Egyptian Apion, he seems to have traveled from Egypt to Misenum before being formally enrolled as a member of that fleet with the name Antonius Maximus⁹⁴. In other words, he was selected for military service in Egypt after passing the *probatio*, or formal interview, to establish his citizen status. Upon taking the military oath he formally became a *classiarius* after registering with his unit at Misenum⁹⁵. We can only assume that recruits from Anatolia followed the same process.

Nor can we say much about any trends in recruitment from the various Anatolian provinces into the Imperial Roman Navy during the principate. It is possible that some such men may have been recruited or conscripted from the coastal regions of Anatolia, and in particular Cilicia, when the Italian fleets were active in the Eastern Mediterranean. However, the evidence we have simply does not allow us to identify any clear pattern regarding the precise periods at which these men or others from Anatolia were enrolled for naval service. All that can be said on this topic is how the inscriptions available to us suggest that most of the Anatolians who joined the Imperial fleets did so in the 2nd century. For example, the invocation found most commonly on the funerary texts for Anatolian members of the Italian fleets is *D M*, the abbreviated form of *Dis Manibus*, with thirty-six instances. It is generally accepted that this abbreviation began to be commonly used during the course of the mid to late 1st century A.D., and so it suggests that the majority of Anatolians who enrolled in the Imperial Roman Navy did so during or after the Flavian period. Indeed, in the specific case of those twenty-seven inscriptions recording men who served with the Misenene fleet, twenty-four of these name it as the *Classis Praetoria Misenensis* which, if taken at face value, means these texts were inscribed between the reigns of Vespasian and Caracalla. Of the others, one only refers to this unit simply as the *Classis Misenensis*, the usual pre-Flavian title, two name it as the *Classis Praetoria Antoniniana Misenensis*, and so date to the reigns of Caracalla or Elagabalus, and one gives the title as the *Classis Praetoria Severiana Pia Vindex Misenensis*, as used under Severus Alexander⁹⁶.

What this data reveals is, as might be expected, that many Anatolians who joined the Imperial Roman Navy did so between the mid to late 1st century and the reign of Severus. This time period saw Rome involved in several major campaigns in the Eastern provinces. But if an explicit need for *classiarii* in connection with these major campaigns had directly influenced local recruitment, then it is interesting to see how none of the available texts point to any extensive recruitment from Anatolia for service with Rome's fleets during the "Third Century Crisis", a period that witnessed several attacks by sea-faring Goths. In which case then, we might conclude that the existence of so many mid to late 1st and 2nd century texts relating to Anatolians in the service of the Imperial Roman Navy has no real significance at all with regard to recruitment patterns. Rather it simply reflects the well-observed "epigraphic habit" by which

⁹³ Cf. Brunt 1974, *passim*.

⁹⁴ Hunt - Edgar 1932, 112.

⁹⁵ Cf. Watson 1969, 38, with 42-44; also Pliny Ep. 10.28

⁹⁶ Part III, nos. 45; 14 and 17; and 15, respectively. Note also, however, Part III, no. 3: a man of Anatolian origin serving with the *legio I Adiutrix* and discharged in 68, who must have previously served with the *Classis Misenensis*.

“the production of inscriptions in the Roman Empire was not constant over time, but rose over the first and second centuries A.D. and fell in the third”⁹⁷.

Be that as it may, whatever their age on recruitment or the place, method, or date where this took place, the fact remains that a great number of the Anatolian recruits for which we have the relevant details never reached veteran status. This is to be expected, given the high mortality rates and the generally younger ages at death common in the Roman world, especially for those involved in military life with all its inherent dangers. Thus of the thirty-three men known from inscriptions on stone already discussed, once we take into account also the eight men known from *diplomata* who certainly completed their agreed service with the fleets, and so forty-one in all, thirteen only managed certainly to complete their twenty-six or twenty-eight years of service, although another two who are recorded as having served more than twenty-six years could well have been veterans, even if not described as such⁹⁸. One man, though, somewhat surprisingly, is recorded as still being with the navy when he died at age fifty, having served already for thirty years⁹⁹.

Placement

The overwhelming majority of Anatolians who served with the Roman Imperial Navy did so with the *Classis Misenensis*, the texts or the findspots of no less than fifty-one of the sixty-one relevant inscriptions indicating membership of that unit, compared to a mere four indicating service with the *Classis Ravennatis*, three the *Classis Syriaca*, and one probably for a man with the *Classis Pontica*¹⁰⁰. This massive imbalance in the numbers of the Anatolian men serving with the two Italian fleets – some 83% with that based at Misenum compared to about 7% at Ravenna – cannot be explained simply by the Misenene fleet being the larger. With some eighty-one known ships, it provided 68% of the 119 combined total of known named ships shared between the two navies and so was only slightly rather than significantly larger, meaning that we might reasonably explain a more proportionate distribution of Anatolians between the two units. A satisfactory explanation for this matter is hard to find, but it might just have been the case that there was a deliberate policy of excluding in principle men of Anatolian origin from the *Classis Ravennatis* as this was the fleet most likely to be called into action against pirate fleets operating from Anatolian bases¹⁰¹.

Insofar as the assignment of these Anatolians to individual ships is concerned, by name or by type, there is nothing to indicate from the admittedly meager data that any single ship or type might have had a preponderance of men with this origin. All in all, they seem to have been distributed fairly evenly between the various ships and types, with ones and twos here and there, although the Misenene-based *liburna Virtute* does stand out by virtue of having no less than four Anatolians named among its complement¹⁰².

⁹⁷ Cf. Meyer 1990, 74, with 94, where it is concluded that the use of inscriptions to indicate citizen and social status was common until the introduction of the *Constitutio Antoniniana* and the coincidental impact of the economic decline that characterized the “Third Century Crisis”.

⁹⁸ Part III, nos. 3, 10, 13-15, 17, 19, 37-38, 41-42, 45, and 61, with nos. 1 (26 years) and 54 (28 years)

⁹⁹ Part III, no. 57.

¹⁰⁰ It would be tedious to list all these fifty-one with the Misenene fleet here and so for the sake of brevity we need note only those with the Ravennate fleet: Part III, nos. 6, 36, 58, and 59; the Syrian fleet, Part III, nos. 7, 8, and 61; and the Pontic fleet, Part III, no. 60.1

¹⁰¹ Interestingly enough, Cicero, in discussing the needs of Dolabella when in command of Syria, seems to have been reluctant to use Cilician ships and sailors in the service of Rome. He recommends to Dolabella that these be appropriated, when necessary, from the provinces of Asia, Bithynia, Pontus, and Syria itself; Cicero Phil. 11.30.

¹⁰² Part III, nos. 5, 40, 46, and 55.

Marriage and children

Until the time of the emperor Severus, men serving as professional soldiers in the Roman military were forbidden to contract a legal marriage. But as might be expected, this did not prevent them from taking a concubine and entering what today is referred to as a "common-law marriage"¹⁰³. Thus, just as is the often the case with the epigraphic testaments of many legionary soldiers and members of the *auxilia* who died before being discharged from military service, thirteen of those thirty-three Anatolians with the Imperial Roman Navy who died before completing their twenty-sixth or twenty-eighth years of military service are commemorated on their memorials by a woman who usually describes herself as his "wife", and/or by his or their children¹⁰⁴. On the other hand, of those thirteen Anatolians who evidently survived long enough to be discharged from the military, only nine seem to have been formally married¹⁰⁵. Naturally we cannot say how many of these men took a former concubine for their legal wife, but on the basis of the *diplomata* issued to auxiliary soldiers down to the Antonine period, this was a common practice among those men. So it is likely to have been equally common among the *milites classarii*.

Whatever the actual legal status of the women these men "married", and so the legal status of their children also, except that those born to a woman with Roman citizenship would automatically have that¹⁰⁶, most of these ladies and their offspring have good "Roman" names, such as "Marcellina", "Tertia", "Tiberius", and "Secunda"¹⁰⁷. Two of the wives, though, have names of Anatolian type, while one has a Hellenic-style *cognomen*. Two of the three sons of one man have names of geographical origin, Caricus for Caria and Putiolanus for Puteoli, perhaps commemorating their conception or birth there¹⁰⁸. In a scant few cases, mainly on *diplomata*, the actual origin of the wife is given in precise or general terms, as with Antonia from Selinunte, Didia from Nicaea, Aurelia Maia from Africa, Herrenia from "Vicus Calloso" in Isauria, Domitia from Sydera in Cilicia, and Valeria from "Greece"¹⁰⁹.

Conclusion

While achieving one aim in making better known a previously ignored aspect of "Roman" Anatolia, it is conceded that this review has produced no notable surprises regarding received wisdom about the nature of the Imperial Roman Navy in general. But, if truth be told, it was not really expected to do so, even though the listing of the Anatolians known to have served Rome in this way may well be of better use to others in the future. Be that as it may, the analysis has broadly confirmed how the service conditions of those Anatolians enrolled in the Roman fleets matches what is known for those peregrines from other regions in this branch of

¹⁰³ See Campbell 1978, especially 159-161. The existence of this ban on a legal marriage, and a recognition of such "common-law marriages", is made explicit by the wording of the *diplomata* issued to those specified in the original imperial constitution, that the man concerned had been "... granted citizenship for themselves, their children, and their descendants, and the right of marriage with the wife they had when the citizenship was granted to them, or, in the case of unmarried men, with those they may afterwards marry, but not more than one wife to one man". Such at least was the usual formula up to about 140, after which only those children born after the man had legally married were granted citizenship; cf. Roxan 1986; also Pferdehirt 2002, 38-57. 23

¹⁰⁴ Part III, nos. 1-2, 7, 12, 18, 20, 22, 29, 36, 44, 46, 50, and 58.

¹⁰⁵ Part III, nos. 10, 13-15, 17, 19, 37, 45, and 61

¹⁰⁶ Campbell 1978, 153-154.

¹⁰⁷ E.g., Part III, nos. 1-2.

¹⁰⁸ Part III, nos. 20 and 46 (Anatolian); 50 (Hellenic); 17 (Caricus and Putiolanus).

¹⁰⁹ Part III, nos. 10, 14, 15, 17, 37, and 45.

the Roman military structure. That said, the marked numerical presence of Cilicians among the Anatolians serving in the Imperial Roman Navy – almost 50% of the total number – is of interest in how it seems to speak of a strong maritime tradition maintained in the region from earlier times. Of course, what we do not know is what proportion of these men were volunteers as opposed to conscripts, nor can we say anything about their individual social and economic backgrounds. On the other hand, just as was the case with those Anatolians who served in the Roman *auxilia*, then whatever the background and individual circumstances of these Anatolian *classarii*, service with the Imperial Roman Navy would have been attractive to many given its guaranteed rates of pay and its medical services, never mind the chance to qualify for Roman citizenship immediately if one was fortunate enough to be enrolled in the Italian fleets.

In which case the analysis is noteworthy also in pointing to how the number of sixty-one certain or probable Anatolians identified as having served in the Imperial Roman Navy comes remarkably close to the total number of Egyptians known to have done so¹¹⁰. This suggests that these two ethnic groups may well have been equally represented in the Imperial Roman Navy on a proportionate basis, and that the same reasons lay behind their enrollment, whatever those reasons might have been. More significantly, though, when we take into account that, on the basis of the surviving epigraphic evidence, the number of Anatolians in the two Italian fleets far exceeds the number who served in the regular *auxilia* – a matter to be addressed more fully elsewhere – this does point to one interesting conclusion. For many an Anatolian of peregrine status, then, just as seems to have been the case with many native-born Egyptians, from the time of Vespasian's reforms to the fleets onwards, service with the Italian fleets was recognized as a sure way of quickly "becoming a Roman". And a such provided an excellent chance to improve immediately one's social and civil status in the wider world, which, perhaps, accounts for the presence of men from land-locked regions such as Cappadocia and Galatia in the Imperial Roman Navy.

Part III: Epigraphic Sources

Part III offers a summary account with the relevant references to those inscriptions relating to men certainly or probably from the Anatolian provinces known to have served with one or other of the various fleets in the Imperial Roman Navy. It is arranged in the first place alphabetically according to the Imperial Provinces from which these men certainly or probably originated, with – for convenience – Phrygia assigned to Asia, Isauria to Cilicia, and Pamphylia to Lycia. Secondly it is arranged by the fleet they served with. The principal pertinent details for each man then follows in a standard summary format: name, alphabetically by *nomen gentilicium*; filiation (if given); origin (as on the text); rank (if known with (?)*miles* offered otherwise except in one case); type of ship and its name; name of fleet as in the text; find spot of the text; and references to formal publications, beginning where applicable with the inscription number according to the various works of Ferreo (abbreviated here as FERR.). There follows a transcript of the relevant inscription, from which it will be seen that in the case of those inscriptions from Misenum and Ravenna that fail to name the fleet of the person named thereon, it is assumed the subject of the inscription served with the fleet based at or near to the place the text was found.

¹¹⁰ Cf. Reddé 1986, 532.

Asia

Classis Misensis

- 1) Tib. Claudius Piso, *Asianus*, *centurio*, *triere* “*Venera*”: Ischia = FERR. 654 = CIL 10.6800.
D(is) M(anibus) / Ti(beri) Cl(audi) Pison(is) cen/[t(urionis)] III Vener(a)e n(atione) Asianus / stip(endiorum) XXVI q(ui) v(ixit) a(nnos) XLIII m(enses) X d(ies) XX / Cl(audia) Marcellina uxor / et Ti(berius) Cl(audius) Pison(is) filius / b(ene) m(erenti) f(ecerunt)
- 2) C. Claudius Isauricus, *Phryx*, (?)*miles*, *triere* “*Concordia*”: Misenum = FERR. 653 = CIL 10.3565.
D(is) M(anibus) / C(ai) Claudi Isaurici III(triere) Con/cordia nati(o)ne Phryx / vixit annis XXXVIII mil(itavit) / annis XVIII curante Cn(aeus!) / Domitius(!) Faustus(!) fiduc(i)aris(!) beredes Tertia / coniugi et Secunda / filia bene mer(enti) fec(erunt)
- 3) Diomedes, Artemonis *filius*, *ex Phrygia Laudic(ea)*, *gregalis*, *legio I Adiutrix*: Stabia = CIL 16.7¹¹¹.
... veteranis qui militaverunt in legione I Adiutrice ... Diomedi Artemonis f(ilio) Phrygio Laudic(ea) ...
- 4) C. Servilius Paulinus, *Asianus*, *duplicarius*, *triere* “*Danuvio*”, *Classis Praetoria Misensis*: Misenum = FERR. 143 = CIL 10.3508.
D(is) M(anibus) / C(ai) Servili Paulin(i) / mil(itavit?) dupl(iciarius?) cl(asse) pr(aetoria) Mis(en)sen(ense) III(triere) Danu(v)io Asia(ticus) / [
- 5) --i Bassus, *Phryx*, (?)*miles*, *liburna* “*Virtute*”, *Classis Praetoria Misensis*: Seleucia Pieria = AE 1905.126 = IGLS 3.1162.
[D(is)] M(anibus) / [3]i Bassi mil(itis) / [cl(assis)] praet(oriae) Mis(en)ensis / [nat(ione) P]hryx(!) lib(urna) Vir(tute) / [vixit an]nos XXX mil(itavit) / [ann(os) 3] Sossius / [3] III(triere) Tauro / [3] C<e=F>ianus / [3] her(edes) b(onoris) c(ausa)

Classis Ravennatis

- 6) L. Boionius Zeno, *Phryx*, (?)*miles*, *veteranus*, *triere* “*Nauta*”: Brundisium = ILS 9218 = AE 1900.185¹¹².
L(ucius) Boionius Zeno / veteranus de Phryge / triere nauta v(ixit) a(nnos) XCV / b(ic) s(itus)

Classis Syriaca

- 7) Iulius Hilarius, (?*Asianus*), *trierarchus*, *liburna* “*Grypi*”: Ephesus = CIL 3.434 = ILS 2923 = IK 16.2274¹¹³.

¹¹¹ Issued 22 December 68 A.D. Tacitus, in describing the events at Rome surrounding the death of Galba on 15 January 69 A.D., reports that one of the legions there at the time had been raised from “the fleet” (Tacitus Hist.1.31), presumably the *Classis Misensis* as this was the nearest to Rome, and refers to the same unit as the *classicorum legio* (Tacitus Hist. 1.36), the “legion from the fleet”. This legion is that subsequently given the title of *legio I Adiutrix*, and so Diomedes had originally probably served with the Misene fleet, an idea strengthened by his *diploma* being found at Stabia, directly across the Bay of Naples from Misenum.

¹¹² Located on the east coast of Italy, Brundisium would be within the area controlled from Ravenna, and so it is probable that Zeno belonged to the *classis Ravennatis*. As indicated in Part I above, what is of especial note regarding this inscription is that it is the only epigraphic text referring to a member of the Imperial Roman Fleet as a “sailor”.

¹¹³ As Hilarius is named together with his wife on the inscription, it is likely he originated from Ephesus.

Haec ara C(ai) Iuli / Hilari trierarchi / cla(s)sis Syriacae / liburna Grypi / et Domitiae / Graptae uxoris / eius coniugis carissimae

- 8) ???, (*Asianus*), (?*navarchus*, *classis Syriacae*: Teos = CIL 3.421 = IK 59.48¹¹⁴.
 ... *Dis Manibus [3] / [3] Quir(ina) [3]/corus [3] / classis Syriacae [3]f/ecit / ...*

Cappadocia

Classis Misenensis

- 9) Afranius Zoilus, *Cappadox, miles, Classis Praetoria Misenensis*: Misenum = FERR. 150 = CIL 6.3092.
D(is) M(anibus) / Afranius / Zoilus / mil(es) cl(assis) pr(aetoriae) Mis(enensis) / nat(io) Cappadox / vix(it) ann(os) XXX / mil(itavit) ann(os) XIII / b(eres) f(aciendum) c(uravit)

Cilicia

Classis Misenensis

- 10) Cn. Antonius Gnaeus, Tuae *filius, Selinunto ex Cilicia, ex gregale, Classis Praetoria Misenensis*: ?Turkey = RMD 3.171¹¹⁵.
 ... *qui militaverunt in classes praetoria Misensi ... XXVI (sex et viginti) stipendis ... ex gregale Cn. Antonio, Tuae f(ilio), Cnaeae Selinunt(o) ex Cilicia et Antoniae Talli filiae Nani uxor(i) eius Selinu(n)t(o) et Saturnino f(ilio) ius et Capitoni f(ilio) eius ...*
- 11) L. Antonius Leo *qui et Neon, Zoili filius, Cilix, miles, triere "Asclepio" Classis Praetoria Misenensis*: Misenum = FERR. 165 = CIL 10.3377 = ILS 2839.
Dis Manib(us) / L(ucius) Antonius Leo q(ui) / et Neon Zoili f(ilius) / natio(ne) Cilix mil(es) cl(assis) / pr(aetoriae) Mis(enensis) \ (centuria) III(triere) Asclepio / vixit annos XXVII / militavit an(nos) VIII / C(aius) Iulius Paulus be/res cur(am) egit
- 12) Aurelius Marullus, *Cilix, naufylax, triere "Victoria"*: Misenum = FERR. 069 = CIL 10.3445.
D(is) M(anibus) / Aurelio Marullo / nauf(ylaci) III(triere) Vict(oria) nat(ione) Cilix vix(it) ann(os) XLV / m(enses) VI d(ies) VII mil(itavit) ann(os) / XXV Antonia Elpidia / coniunx et beres / marito ben(e) mer(enti) / fec(it)
- 13) M. Cassius Diogenes, *Cilix, (?miles, veteranus*: Misenum = FERR. 198 = CIL 10.3558.
D(is) M(anibus) / M(arco) Casio Diogeni / veter(ano) nat(ione) Cilix <v=B>ixit / ann(os) LXX M(arcus) Casius / Bitali(s!) et Casia Ianu/aria patri dulcis(s)imo / b(ene) m(erenti) f(ecit)
- 14) M. Didius Heliodorus, *Hellanici filius, Pompeiopolis ex Cilicia, centurio, classis praeetoria Misenensis Antoniniana*: ?Turkey = RMD 1.74¹¹⁶.

¹¹⁴ This fragmentary funerary text is preceded by a Greek inscription indicating that the man concerned was honored by the local *demos*, and it ends with another Greek text reporting that it was erected by a father to his son, so suggesting strongly a local origin. As a Roman citizen, as indicated by his membership in the Quirina *tribus*, then he must have ranked at least as a *navarchus*.

¹¹⁵ Issued 6 February 158. The *cognomen* and filiation of the recipient and his wife seem to be direct transliterations of Cilician personal names; cf. Hanel 1985, with Zgusta 1964, 236, 483, and 520.

¹¹⁶ Issued 30 August 212. Pompeiopolis, originally known as Soli, was refounded by Pompey in 67 B.C. for the pirates he defeated in his campaign against these men, and so Heliodorus may well have been one of their later descendants.

... qui militarverunt in classe praetoria Anton(in)iana Misenensi ... octonis et vicensis stipendis ... ex centurione M.Didio Hellanici fil(io) Heliodoro, Pompeiopol(i) ex Cilic(ia) et Didiae Tryphene ux(ori) eius, Nicensi ex Bithynia ...

- 15) T. Domitius Domitianus, Tumeli filius, Claudiopolis ex Cilicia, vicus Vindemi, ex gregale Classis Praetoria Severiana Pia Vindex Misenensis: ??? = RMD 2.133¹¹⁷.

... qui militaverunt in classes praetoria Severiana p(ia) v(indice) Miseneni ... octonis et vicensis stipendis ... ex gregale T.Domitio Tumeli fil(io) Domitiano, Claudiopoli ex Cilicia, vico Vindemi, et Aureliae Maiae uxor eius Afrae et C.Domitio Diodoto et C.Domitio Carico et C.Domitio Putiolano filis eius ...

- 16) L. Germanus Asclepiadis, Cilix, miles, Classis Praetoria Misenensis: Rome = FERR. 227 = CIL 6.3113 = CIL 6.4846.

D(is) M(anibus) / L(uci) Germani / Asclepiadis / mil(itis) class(is) pr(aetoriae) / Misen(ensis) natio(ne) / Cilix v(ixit) a(nnos) XXX / mil(itavit) a(nnos) IX b(eres) b(ene) m(erenti) f(ecit)

- 17) M. Herrenius Pasocrates, Pappaionis filius, Isauro, vico Calloso, ex principale, Classis Praetoria Antoniniana Misenensis: ??? = RMD 2.131¹¹⁸.

... qui militaverunt in classe praetoria Antoniniana Misensi ... octonis et vicensis stipendis ... ex principale M.Herennio Pappaionis fil(io) Pasicrate, n(atione) Isaur<o> vico Calloso et Herreniae Nestoris fil(iae) Immae uxor(i) eius civitat(ate) Isaur(a) vico s(upra) s(cripto) ...

- 18) Iulius Antiochus, Cilix, faber, duplicarius: Misenum = FERR. 115 = CIL 10.3424.

D(is) M(anibus) Iuli Antiochi / fabri dupliciari(i) na/tione Cilix vixit ann(os) LX / milit(avit) ann(os) XXV Iulia / Ulpiane patri b(ene) m(erenti) f(ecit)

- 19) C. Iulius Celer, (?Cilix), veteranus ex centurione, Classis Praetoria Misenensis: Selinus = CIL 3.225 = AE 2003, +1769 = AE 2006, +1553¹¹⁹.

C(aius) Iulius Celer veter(anus) ex centur(ione) / class(is) pr(aetoriae) Mis(enensis) vi<v=B>us sibi et Iuliae / Primillae co(n)iugi b(ene) m(erenti) fecit pos/terisque suis tantum

- 20) Iulius Polionus, Cilix Corycaeus, gubernator, triere “Parthico”: Misenum = AE 1972.80¹²⁰.

D(is) M(anibus) / Iulii Polioni gub(ernatoris) / ex III (triere) Parthico nat(ione) / Cilix Coryc(aeus?) mil(itavit) / annis XVII Ta/tias coniugi / suo b(ene) m(erenti) f(ecit)

- 21) G. Lucilius Lucianus, Cilix (?)miles, triere “Salute”: Misenum = FERR. 673 = CIL 10.3402.

D(is) M(anibus) / C(aio) Lucilio Luciano III(triere) Sa/lute n(atione) Cilix vixit ann(os) / XXXV milit(avit) ann(os) X / C(aius) Helvius Iulianus arm(orum) / ex eadem secund(us) her(es) b(ene) m(erenti) f(ecit)

¹¹⁷ Issued 27 November 229. This is the earliest known *diploma* to include the title *Pia Vindex* in the naming of any of the Italian fleets. Domitianus' wife is from Africa, raising the possibility that he met her there while on service. Two of their sons have geographical *cognomina* – Caricus for Caria and Putiolanus for Puteoli – suggesting other places of importance for one or other of the parents.

¹¹⁸ Issued 27 November 214. Pasocrates' father's name, Pappaion, is Isaurian, as is Imma, his wife's *cognomen*; cf. Zgusta 1964, 197, and 406-415. The *vicus Calloso* is not otherwise recorded.

¹¹⁹ Given how Celer is a veteran and many veterans are believed to have retired to their home town, then since many Cilicians served in the *Classis Praetoria Misenensis*, it is highly probable that he is from Selinus.

¹²⁰ Corycaeum. The wife's name, Tatias, may be the Latinized feminine version of a male name found in Pamphylia; cf. Zgusta 1964, 504.

- 22) L. Marius Hermogenus, *Cilix, miles, Classis Praetoria Misenensis*: CIL 10.3604.
D(is) M(anibus) / L(uci) Mari Helrmo]genis n(atione) C[il(ix) m(iles) c(lassis) p(raetoriae)] / Mis(enensis) Flavi[a Fo]rtunata c[on]iugo(!)
- 23) C. Marius Montanus, *Cilix, miles, quadriere “Venera”, Classis Praetoria Misenensis*: Misenum = FERR. 265 = CIL 10.3605.
D(is) M(anibus) / C(aius) Marius Montan(us) / miles classis prae(toriae) / Mise(nensis) IIII(quadriere) Venere na/tione Cilix vixit an(nos) / XXXX mil(itavit) an(nos) XX C(aius?) Iu[li]us(?)
- 24) C. Mucius Valens, *Cilix, (?)miles, triere “Iside”, Classis Praetoria Misenensis*: Rome = FERR. 274 = CIL 6.3123 = AE 2008 +201.
D(is) M(anibus) / C(ai) Muci / Valentis / mil(itis) cl(assis) pr(aetoriae) Mis(enensis) / III(triere) Iside / n(atione) Cilix / v(ixit) a(nnos) XXXVIII / mil(itavit) a(nnos) XVI
- 25) C. Numidius Quadratus, *Cilix, miles, Classis Praetoria Misenensis*: Tibur = CIL 14.3627¹²¹.
C(aius) Numidius Qua/dratus n(atione) Cilix / mil(es) cl(assis) pr(aetoriae) Mi/sen(atium) militavit / annis XX vixit / ann(is) XXXX M(arcus) Pos/tumius Secundus b(ene) m(erenti)
- 26) C. Octavius Fronto, *Cilix, quondam medicus, duplicarius, triere “Tigri”*: Misenum = CIL 10.3443 = ILS 2899¹²².
C(aius) Octavius Fro[n]to / quondam medicus / duplicar(ius) ex III(triere) Tigr(i) / natione Cilix C(aius) Iuli/us Favianus manip(ularis) / fratri suo b(ene) m(erenti) fec(it)
- 27) Publicius Messoris, *Cilix, miles, triere “Minervae”, Classis Praetoria Misenensis*: Rome = FERR. 291 = CIL 6.3129.
D(is) M(anibus) / Publici / Messoris / mil(itis) cl(assis) p(raetoriae) Mis(enensis) / III(triere) Minervae / natione Cilix / v(ixit) a(nnos) XXXXV / mil(itavit) a(nnos) XVIII / b(eres) b(ene) m(erenti) f(ecit)
- 28) C. Rufius Cassianus, *Cilix, miles, triere “Minerva”*: Misenum = CIL 10.3619.
D(is) M(anibus) / C(aius) Rufius Cassia/nus III(triere) Miner<v=B>a / n(atione) C(ilix) m(ilitavit) a(nnos) VI <v=B>(ixit) a(nnos) XXX / Domitius Crispus / b(ene) m(erenti) f(ecit)
- 29) C. Sempronius Maximus, *Cilix, (?)miles, triere “Athenonice”*: Misenum = FERR. 678 = CIL 10.3623.
C(aius) Sempronius Maxi/mus III(triere) Athenonice / nat(ione) Cilix vixit ann(os) / XLV mil(itavit) XXV Iulia / Marcia coniug(i) b(ene) m(erenti) f(ecit)
- 30) Q. Servilius Iasonis, *Cilix, naufylax, quadriere “Vesta”*: Misenum = FERR. 074 = CIL 10.3454.
D(is) M(anibus) / Q(uinti) Servili Iaso/nis nauf(ylacis) IIII(quadriere) Vesta / nat(ione) Cilix mil(itavit) ann(os) XXII / C(aius) Iul(ius) Ianuar(ius) nauf(ylax) III(triere) Parthib(o) / tutor Aurel(i) Iasonis fil(ii) et here{di}s / eius b(ene) m(erenti) f(ecit)

¹²¹ A sailor buried at Tibur is likely to have been serving at the Imperial Palace built there by Hadrian.

¹²² Although C. Julius Favianus, the *manipularis* who set up the memorial describes himself as the “brother” of Octavius Fronto, this might mean simply a “brother soldier” rather than a blood relative.

- 31) M. Suttis Valens, *Cilix, centurio, quadriere* “Vesta”: Misenum = FERR. 053 = CIL 10.3372.
D(is) M(anibus) / M(arcus) Suttis Valens / natione Cilix cen/tur(io) ex IIII(quadriere) Vesta vixit / annis XXXV milita(vit) / annis XIII at II
- 32) C. Valerius Longinus, *Cilix, (?)miles, liburna* “Aesculapio”: Misenum = FERR. 325 = CIL 10.3651.
D(is) M(anibus) / C(aio) Valerio Longi/no lib(urna) Aesculapio / stip(endiorum) XV n(atione) Cilix vix(it) / ann(os) XXX Valeri/us Apollinaris / heres lib(urna) Aescul(apio) / b(ene) m(erenti) f(ecit)
- 33) Valerius Neon, (*?Cilix*), *miles, triere* “Minerva”, *Classis Praetoria Misenensis*: Rome = CIL 6.3140¹²³.
D(is) [M(anibus)] / [3 Valleri Neo[3] / [mil(itis)] cl(assis) pr(aetoriae) Mis(enensis) / [III(triere) Mi]nerva n(atione) C[3] / [vix(it) a(nnos)] XXXII mil(itavit) a(nnos) [3] / b(eres) b(ene) m(erenti) f(ecit)
- 34) Veratius Umber, *Cilix, manipularis, triere* “Athenonice”: Misenum = FERR. 346 = CIL 10.3662.
Veratio Umbro / [ma]nipulari III(triere) Atheno/[nic]e natione Cilix vi/xit annis XXXV militau(it) annis XIII C(aius) Antonius / Saturnius III(triere) At(h)enonice / b(e)res b(ene) m(erenti)
- 35) (---), *Cilix, manipularis, liburna* “Armata”: Rome = FERR. 365 = CIL 10.3668¹²⁴.
] / manip(ularis) lib(urna) Armat(a) / nat(ione) Cilix vixit / ann(os) XXXXV milit(avit) ann(os) XXVIII b(eres) b(ene) m(erenti) f(ecit)

Classis Ravennatis

- 36) M. Vitelus Titianus, *na(tione) Cilix (?)miles, quadriere* “Pado”: Ravenna = FERR. 480 = CIL 11.110.
M(arcus) Vitelu(s) / Titianus / na(tione) Cilix vi(xit) / an(nos) XXXVIII m(ilitavit) / a(nnos) XI IIII(quadriere) Pad(o) / Mindius / Titianus / frater / p(osuit) / in fr(onte) p(edes) VI / in ag(ro) p(edes) VIII

Classis incerta

- 37) L. Domitius Valentinus, *Valentini filius, Selinunto ex Cilicia, ex gregale*: “İzmir” = RMD 1.44¹²⁵.
... ex gregale L. Domitio Valentinis f(ilio) Valentini Selinunto ex Cilicia et Domitiae Neius fi(lia), Caesare ux(ore) ei(us), Suedrae, et Valentini f(eius) ...
- 38) ???, *filius, Cilix, Titiopolitano, (ex gregale)*: ? = ZPE 193, 2015, 249-252¹²⁶.
... ex gregale ---] f(ilio) Cilici Titiopolit(ano) [et --- ux]ori eius Cilici [et --- f(ilio) eius et --- fil(iae) eius...

¹²³ As so few men from Corsica, Cappadocia, Crete, or Cyrenaica served with the Misenene fleet, a Cilician origin for Neon is likely, especially given how the name is commonly found in the Anatolian provinces.

¹²⁴ Although the name of his fleet is not given, on balance, given the relative numbers of Cilicians in either fleet, he is more likely to have belonged to the *Classis Misenensis* than that at Ravenna.

¹²⁵ Issued 16 October 145.

¹²⁶ Issued 17 January 131.

Galatia

Classis Misenensis

- 39) T. Aquilius Alexander, *ex Galata, miles, Classis Praetoria Misenensis*: Seleucia Pieria = Seyrig 1939, no. 9.

D(is) M(anibus) / T. Aquilius / Alexand(er) / mil(es) ex class(e) / cl(assis) pr(aetoria) M[i]s(enensi) / nati(oue) Gal(ata) [vix(it) a]n[n]is / XXX [mil(itavit) a]n[n]is X / >(centuria) Bri[---]n / Aemil[---] / Sem[---] / b(eredes) [p(osuerunt)

Lycia and Pamphylia

Classis Misenensis

- 40) M. Flavius Capito, *Pamphylus, armorum custos, liburna "Virtute"*: Misenum = FERR. 617 = CIL 10.3400.

D(is) M(anibus) / M(arcus) Fl(avius) Capito / armor(um) cust(os) / lib(urna) Virtute n(atione) Pam/phylus vix(it) ann(os) L / mil(itavit) an(nos) XXIII Deccia / Fortunata co(n)iugi b(ene) m(erenti)

- 41) M. Lollius Neonius, Lolli *filius, Laerta ex Pamphylia, ex gregale, Classis Praetoria Misenensis*: "Dardanelles" = RMD 1.38¹²⁷.

... qui mil(itaverunt) in class(e) pr(aetoria) Misen(ensi) ... senis et vicen(sis) stip(endis) ... ex gregale M. Lollio, Lolli f(ilius), Neoni, Laerta ex Pamphylia ...

- 42) S. Memmius Mannes, Clearchi *filius, Oinando ex Lycia, ex gregale, Classis Praetoria Misenium*: ??? = CIL 16.177¹²⁸.

... qui militaverunt in classe praetoria Misenensi ... sex et viginti stipendis ... ex gregale Sex(to) Memmio Clearchi f(ilio) Manni Oniando ex Lycia ...

Pontus and Bithynia

Classis Misenensis

- 43) T. Amydius Severus, *Ponticus, miles, triere "Concordia", classis Paetoria Misenensis*: Rome = FERR. 153 = CIL 6.3094 = AE 2001.+00892.

D(is) M(anibus) / T(iti) Amydi / Severi mil(itis) / cl(assis) pr(aetoriae) Mis(enensis) III(triere) / Concordia / n(atione) Ponticus / v(ixit) a(nnos) L mil(itavit) a(nnos) XXV / Staius Qua/dratus b(O) III(triere) / Salvia curante / M(arco) Helvio / Alexandro

- 44) M. Antonius Longus, *Ponticus, optio, triere "Venere", Classis Praetoria Misenensis*: Misenum = FERR. 76 = CIL 10.3461.

D(is) M(anibus) / M(arcus) Antonius Lo/ngus ex classe / praet(oria) Misen(ense) optio / III(triere) Vener(e) nat(ione) Pontic(us) / milit(avit) ann(os) XXII vix(it) ann(os) / XXXX Antonia Victori/[na] patrono bene me/renti fecit

¹²⁷ Issued 13 February 139. The name Neon and its variants are well attested at Laertes; cf. Bean - Mitford 1970, 103.

¹²⁸ Issued 26 November 140. The father's name, Mannes, is common to Phrygia (and is traditionally the name of the first Phrygian king), although found elsewhere in Anatolia including Lycia and Pamphylia; cf. Zgusta 1964, 287-292.

- 45) C. Arrius Montanus, *Niceans(is), veteranus, cornicularius, duplicarius, classis Misenensis*: Misenum = FERR. 125 = CIL 10.3416 = ILS 2896.
D(is) M(anibus) / C(aio) Arrio Montano / vet(e)rano cornici(ni) du/pliciaro ex classe / Misen(ensi) natio(ne) Nicaens(is) / Valeria Doris natio(ne) Grae(ca) / co(n)iugi optimo b(ene) m(erenti) / tit(u)lum posuit // D(is) M(anibus) / [3]arontio Monta/no vet(e)rano cornici(ni) / Valeria Doris / co(n)iugi dupliciar(io) / b(ene) m(erenti) f(ecit)
- 46) M. Aurelius Iettis, I(---) *filius, Ponticus, armorum custos, liburna "Virtute"*: Misenum = FERR. 95 = CIL 10.3397¹²⁹.
D(is) M(anibus) / M(arcus) Aurelius I(!) Iettis armorum custos / N(!) natione Pontic(us) lib(urna) Virtute stip(endiorum) XVI / <q=O>(ui) v(ixit) ann(os) XXXVIII m(enses) II d(ies) XV Pesta/nia Sozusa uxor bene merenti fecit
- 47) M. Calventius Priscus, *Bithynus (?) miles, triere "Danuvio"*: Misenum = FERR. 647 = CIL 10.3553.
Dis Manibus / M(arcus) Calventius / Priscus / Bithynus vixit / annis XXXXV / militavit annis / XXII ex III(triere) Danuvio / T(itus) Suillus Albanus / bene merenti
- 48) T. Flavius Maximus, *Ponticus, miles, Classis Praetoria Misenensis*: Athens = AE 1999.1486.
D(is) M(anibus) / T(itus) Flavius Maximus / mil(es) cl(assis) pr(aetoriae) Misen(ensis) / milit(avit) annis X vix(it) / annis XXX / natione / Ponticus
- 49) C. Iulius Diodorus, *Bithynus, miles, quadriere "Dacico", Classis Praetoria Misenensis*: Misenum = FERR. 242 = CIL 10.3490 = CIL 11.*250.2c.
D(is) M(anibus) / C(aio) Iulio Diodoro / mil(iti) class(is) pr(aetoriae) Misen(ensis) / IIII(quadriere) Dacico nat(ione) Bithyn(us) / vix(it) ann(os) XLV mil(itavit) ann(os) XXII / Ti(berius) Claudius Paternus / scriba heres
- 50) C. Iulius Ponticus, *Ponticus, faber, duplicarius, Classis Praetoria Misenensis*: Misenum = FERR. 116 = CIL 10.3425.
D(is) M(anibus) / C(ai) Iuli Pontici [fal]bri dupl(icarii) cl(assis) pr(aetoriae) Mis(enensis) / nat(ione) Pontic(us) vixit / ann(os) XLIII mil(itavit) ann(os) / XXII Iulius Ponticus / filius et Antonia Cal[l]lityche coniunx b(eredes) b(ene) m(erenti) f(ecerunt)
- 51) C. Iulius Silvanus *qui et Diophanes, Diophani filius, Bithynus, manipularius, liburna "Iustitia"*: Misenum = FERR. 254 = CIL 10.3492 = ILS 2887.
C(aio) Iulio Silvano / man(ipulari) ex lib(urna) Iustit(ia) / natione Bithyno / qui et Diophanes(!) / Diophani(!) militavit an(nos) XIX / vixit an(nos) XL bene merenti Q(uintus) / Naevius Propincus scrib(a) et / Nonnius Sura
- 52) Iulius [---], *Ponticus, (miles), triere "M[---]"*: Misenum = FERR. 231 = CIL 10.3581.
D(is) [M(anibus)] / Iulius 3] / ex III(triere) M[3 nat(ione)] / Pont(icus) [vix(it)] / ann(os) X [mil(itavit)] / ann(os) VII [3]/nus b[eres(?)
- 53) T. Laelius Crispus, *Bithynus, miles, triere "Libertate", Classis Praetoria Misenensis*: Misenum = FERR. 671 = CIL 10.3597.

¹²⁹ The wife's name, given as Sozusa, would appear to be the Latinized version of one found in Phrygia and Galatia; cf. Zgusta 1964, 473-475.

D(is) M(anibus) / T(ito) Laelio Crispo / milit(i) cl(assis) pr(aetoriae) Misenen(sis) / III(triere) Libertat(e) nat(ione) Bithynus / vix(it) ann(os) XL mil(itavit) ann(os) XVI / L(ucius) Sossius Dionysius III(triere) Capr(icornio) / heres b(ene) m(erenti)

- 54) P. Paconius Nigro, *Nicaensis, faber, Classis Praetoria Misensis*: Misenum = FERR. 117 = CIL 10.3419 = ILS 2868.

Dis Manib(us) / P(ublio) Paconio Nigro / faber ex classe / pr(aetoria) Misense(!) / nation(e) Nicaens(is) / vix(it) ann(is) L militavit / annis XXVIII / P(ublius) Paconius Graptus / patrono bene merent(i)

- 55) T. Suillius Albanus *qui et Timotheus, Menisci filius, Nicaensis, armorum custos, liburna "Virtute"*: Misenum = FERR. 102 = CIL 10.3406 = ILS 2886.

T(ito) Suillio Albano / qui et Timotheus / Menisci f(ilius) natione / Nicaens(is) arm(orum) custod(i) / lib(urna) Virtut(e) mil(itavit) a(nnos) XXV / vixit ann(os) X / Anto[ni]us Quadratus / et Aemil(ius) Quadratus / [a]rm(orum) cus[us] ex IIII(quadriere) Minerv(a) / beredes et Suillia / Eugenia lib(erta) ben(e) mer(enti) / fecerunt

- 56) C. Ulpus Licinianus, (*?Ponticus*), *armorum custos, quadriere "Vesta"*: Misenum = CIL 10.3495 = ILS.2884¹³⁰.

D(is) M(anibus) // C(aius) Ulpus Licinian(us) armor(um) IIII(quadriere) Ves<t=I>(a) / n(atione) P(onticus?) Fl(avius) Iuc(undus) Marcel(lianus) / strig(O) ex ead(em) et Ael(ius) / Exorat(us) stri<g=O>(O) IIII(quadriere) Ann(ona) / munici(pi) b(ene) m(erenti) f(ecerunt) d(e) s(uo)

- 57) C. Veratius Maximus, *Ponticus, miles, triere "Hercule", Classis Praetoria Misensis*: Rome = FERR. 345 = CIL 6.3143.

D(is) M(anibus) / C(aius) Veratius / Maximus / mil(es) cl(assis) pr(aetoriae) Mis(enensis) / III(triere) Hercule / n(atione) Ponticus / vix(it) an(nos) L / m(ilitavit) an(nos) XXX

Classis Ravennatis

- 58) Q. Crispus Heraclides, *Bithynus, civitas Plusiada, (miles), triere "Marte"*: Ravenna = FERR. 433 = CIL 11.52¹³¹.

D(is) M(anibus) / Q(uinti) Crispi / Heraclid(is) / III(triere) Marte / nat(ione) Bithyn(us) / civit(ate) Plusiada / vix(it) an(nos) XL / mil(itavit) an(nos) XXII / ber(es) Q(uintus) Crispi / us Maximus / filius et / Iulia Maxima / coniunx / b(ene) m(erenti) p(osuerunt)

- 59) Q. Laelius Alexander, *Bithynus, (miles), quadriere "Pado"*: Ravenna = FERR. 448 = CIL 11.70.

D(is) M(anibus) / Q(uintus) Laelius Alexander / IIII(quadriere) Pado nat(ione) Bithynus / vix(it) ann(os) XXXV mil(itavit) ann(os) X / M(arcus) Aemilius Amandus / et Karminia Aphrodisia / b(eredes) p(onendum) c(uraverunt)

¹³⁰ Although the text gives simply "*N(atione) P.*" as Licinianus' origin, so allowing this to be either Pontus or Pannonia, the great majority of Pannonians served with the Ravennate fleet, making it more probable that he was of Pontic origin.

¹³¹ For "Plusiada" read "Prusiada".

?*Classis Pontica*

- 60) C. Numisius Primus, Spuri *filius*, *Quirina*, (?*Ponticus*) *navarchus* (?*classis Pontica*): Sinope = CIL 3.6980 = IK 64.100¹³².

C(aio) Numisio S(p(uri) f(ilio)) / Qui(rina) Primo na/uarcho sacerdoti / Imp(eratoris) Caesaris Aug(usti) / aed(ili) Ilvir(o) iter(um) Ilvir(o) / quinq(uennali) Numisia / Paulla filia eius

Classis Syriacus

- 61) [---]cius, Rufi *filius*, *Nicaens(is)*, *ex gregale*, *classis Syriacus*: ??? = RMD 5.354¹³³.

[...qui militaver(unt) <i>n classes Syr(i)aca] ... [s]enis et vicenis pluribusque stipendis] ... [ex g]regale [---]ci f(ilio) Rufo, Nicaens(i) [et ---] f(ilio) eius...

¹³² The naming formula, including the *tribus* Quirina, indicates that Spurius was a Roman citizen, probably by birth. Since this honorary text, erected by his daughter, records Spurius as a priest of the Imperial Cult and *duumvir* twice over (once as *duumvir quinquennalis*), this strongly suggests that Sinope was his hometown, in which case origin there and service with the *Classis Pontica* seems likely.

¹³³ Issued 14-31 December 119, this is the only known *diploma* for the *classis Syriaca*. It is unusual in being one of a scant few fleet *diplomata* that includes the phrase "*pluribusque stipendis*" after the stated official years of service, in this case 26. This indicates that the recipient had for one or other reason been retained in service after his expected discharge date.

Abbreviations and Bibliography

- Alföldy 1996 G. Alföldy, "Spain", in: A. K. Bowman – E. Champlin – A. W. Lintott (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History: The Augustan Empire* (1996) 449-463.
- Bean – Mitford 1970 G. E. Bean – T. B. Mitford, *Journeys in Rough Cilicia, 1964-1968, Ergänzungsbände zu den Tituli Asiae Minoris* 3 (1970).
- Bennett 1996 J. Bennett, *Trajan, Optimus Princeps* (1996).
- Bennett 2010 J. Bennett, "Auxiliary Deployment during Trajan's Parthian War: Some Neglected Evidence from Asia Minor", *Latomus* 323, 2010, 423-445.
- Birley 1981 A. R. Birley, *The Fasti of Roman Britain* (1981).
- Bowman – Thomas – Tomlin 2010 A. K. Bowman – J. D. Thomas – R. S. O. Tomlin, "The Vindolanda Writing-tablets (Tabulae Vindolandenses IV, part 1)", *Britannia* 41 (2010) 187-224.
- Bru 2011 H. Bru, *Le pouvoir impérial dans les provinces syriennes: Représentations et célébrations d'Auguste à Constantin (31 av. J.-C.-337 ap. J.-C.)* (2011).
- Brunt 1974 P. A. Brunt, "Conscription and Volunteering in the Roman Army", *Scripta Classica Israelica* 1, 1974, 90-115 (= P. A. Brunt, *Roman Imperial Themes* [1990] 188-214 with 512-513).
- Campbell 1978 B. Campbell, "The Marriage of Soldiers under the Empire", *JRS* 68, 1978, 153-166.
- Coates – Platis – Shaw 1990 J. F. Coates – S. K. Platis – J. T. Shaw, *The Trireme Trials* (1990).
- D'Amato 2016 R. D'Amato, *Imperial Roman Warships 27 BC-193 AD* (2016).
- Davies 1972 R. W. Davies, "Some More Military Medici", *EpSt* 9, 1972, 1-11.
- Eck – Lieb 1993 W. Eck – H. Lieb, "Ein Diplom für die Classis Ravennas vom 22. November 206", *ZPE* 96, 1993, 75-88.
- Ferrereio 1878 E. Ferrereio, *L'ordinamento delle armate romane ricerche* (1878).
- Ferrereio 1884 E. Ferrereio, *Iscrizioni e ricerche nuove intorno all' ordinamento delle armate dell' impero romano* (1878).
- Ferrereio 1889 E. Ferrereio, *Iscrizioni e ricerche nuove intorno all' ordinamento delle armate dell' impero romano ed indici generali delle iscrizioni classarie* (1899).
- Fitz 1983 J. Fitz, *Honorific Titles of Roman Military Units in the 3rd Century* (1983).
- Fitzhardinge 1951 L. F. Fitzhardinge, "Naval Epitaphs from Misenum in the Nicholson Museum, Sydney", *JRS* 41, 1951, 17-21.
- French 2004 D. H. French, *The Inscriptions of Sinope. Part 1* (= *Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien, Band 64*) (2004).
- Grünewald 2004 T. Grünewald, *Bandits in the Roman Empire: Myth and Reality* (2004).
- Hanel 1985 N. Hanel, "Ein neues Diplom für einen Angehörigen der misenischen Flotte", *Bonner Jahrbücher* 185, 1985, 89-95.
- Hunt – Edgar 1932 A. S. Hunt – C. C. Edgar, *Select Papyri* 1 (1932).
- Hunt – Edgar 1934 A. S. Hunt – C. C. Edgar, *Select Papyri* 2 (1934).
- Keppie 1984 L. Keppie, *The Making of the Roman Army* (1984).
- Mann 1972 J. C. Mann, "The Development of Auxiliary and Fleet Diplomas", *EpSt* 9, 1972, 233-243.

- Mann 2002 J. C. Mann, "Name Forms of Recipients of Diplomas", *ZPE* 139, 2002, 227-234.
- Meyer 1990 E. A. Meyer, "Explaining the Epigraphic Habit in the Roman Empire: The Evidence of Epitaphs", *JRS* 80, 1990, 74-96.
- Mommsen 1881 T. Mommsen, "Schweizer Nachstudien", *Hermes* 16, 1881, 445-494.
- Mommsen 1908 T. Mommsen, *Gesammelte Schriften* 5 (1908).
- Morrison – Coates – Rankov 2000 J. S. Morrison – J. F. Coates – N. B. Rankov, *The Athenian Trireme: The History and Reconstruction of an Ancient Greek Warship*³ (2000).
- Ormerod 1967 H. A. Ormerod, *Piracy in the Ancient World: An Essay in Mediterranean History* (1967).
- Pferdehirt 2002 B. Pferdehirt, *Die Rolle des Militärs für den sozialen Aufstieg in der römischen Kaiserzeit* (2002).
- Reddé 1986 M. Reddé, *Mare Nostrum. Les infrastructures, le dispositif et l'histoire de la marine militaire sous l'Empire romain* (1986).
- Reddé 1995 M. Reddé, "La Rangordnung des marins", in: Y. Le Bohec (ed.), *La hiérarchie (Rangordnung) de l'armée romaine sous le Haut-Empire* (1995) 151-154.
- Reddé 2000 M. Reddé, "Les marins", in: G. Alföldy – B. Dobson – W. Eck (eds.), *Kaiser Heer und Gesellschaft in der römischen Kaiserzeit, Gedenkschrift für Eric Birley* (2000) 179-189.
- Roxan 1986 M. M. Roxan, "Observations on the Reasons for Changes in Formula in Diplomas circa AD 140", in: W. Eck – H. Wolff (eds.), *Heer und Integrationspolitik. Die römischen Militärdiplome als historische Quelle* (1986) 265-292.
- Richardson 1992 L. Richardson, *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* (1992).
- Saddington 2007 D. B. Saddington, "Classes. The Evolution of the Roman Imperial Fleets", in: P. Erdkamp (ed.), *A Companion to the Roman Army* (2007) 201-217.
- Saddington 2009 D. B. Saddington, "Problems in the Nomenclature of the Personnel and the Question of Marines in the Roman Fleets", *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 52, 2009, 123-132.
- Salway 1994 B. Salway, "What's in a Name? A Survey of Roman Onomastic Practice from c. 700 B.C. to A.D. 700", *JRS* 84, 1994, 124-145.
- Sander 1957 E. Sander, "Zur Rangordnung des römischen Heeres: Die Flotten", *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 6, 1957, 347-367.
- Sander 1959 E. Sander, "Zur Rangordnung des römischen Heeres: Der Duplicarius", *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, 8/2, 1959, 239-247.
- Seyrig 1939 H. Seyrig, "Le cimetière des marins à Séleucie de Piérie", in: *Mélanges Syriens offerts à M. René Dussaud* (1939) 451-459.
- Starr 1960 C. G. Starr, *The Roman Imperial Navy: 31 BC-AD 324* (1960).
- Spaul 2002 J. Spaul, *Classes imperii romani: an epigraphic examination of the men of the Imperial Roman navy* (2002).
- Vitelli 1929 G. Vitelli, *Papiri della Societa Italiana*, 9 (1929).
- Watson 1961 G. R. Watson, *The Roman Soldier* (1961).
- Wheeler 2012 E. L. Wheeler, "Roman Fleets in the Black Sea: Mysteries of the 'Classis Pontica'", *Acta Classica* 55, 2012, 119-154.
- Zaninović 1988 M. Zaninović, "Liburnia Militaris", *Opusc. Archeol.* 13, 1988, 43-67.
- Zgusta 1964 L. Zgusta, *Kleinasiatische Personennamen* (1964).

Özet

“Romalılaşmak”: Roma İmparatorluk Donanması’nda Anadolu lular

Roma Ordusu ve lejyonları ile yardımcı birlikleri hakkında bugüne kadar çok şey yazılmış fakat Roma Donanması’nın yapısı ve rolü hakkında çok daha az şey bilinmekte ve erişilebilmektedir. Bu kuvvette hizmet eden adamların kökenleri ve diğer ilgili hususlar söz konusu olduğunda eksiklik özellikle dikkat çekmekte. Bu çalışma Roma İmparatorluk Donanması’nın kesinlikle veya büyük olasılıkla Anadolu eyaletlerinden alınan üyelerine odaklanarak söz konusu boşluğu bir dereceye kadar doldurmaya çalışılmaktadır. Ancak, bu çalışmayı kontekste oturtabilmek için Birinci Kısım’da Roma İmparatorluk Donanması’nın kökeni ve doğası üzerine genel bilgi verilmiştir. Çünkü okuyucuların bu konuyla fazla tanışık olmadığı kanaatindeyiz. İkinci Kısım’da bu kuvvette hizmet veren, Anadolu eyaletleri kökenlileri hakkında, Üçüncü Kısım’da özetlenen iki ana tipte epigrafik kaynaktan elde edilen bulgulara dayanarak bilgi verilmektedir. Bu kaynaklar ya taş üzerindeki yazıtlar – ki genellikle mezar taşlarıdır – veya Roma filolarında hizmet süresini doldurmuş ve şerefiyle terhis edilmiş eski ordu mensubu olduğuna dair haklarını ve ayrıcalıklarını teyit eden *diplomata* denilen tunç “sertifika”lardır.

Mevcut durumda 61 belge, tahmin edileceği gibi, Roma İmparatorluk Donanması’nın Anadolu mensuplarının büyük çoğunluğunun deniz kıyısındaki eyaletlerden, ve özellikle de Kilikya’dan geldiğini göstermektedir. Geri kalan ise başlıca Asia, Pontus ve Bithynia, ya da Lykia-Pamphylia eyaletlerinden olup Kappadokia ve Galatia’dan ise birer münferit kayıt söz konusudur. Analiz sonucunda görülmüştür ki, genelde, Roma İmparatorluk Donanması’na katılan Anadolu lular, İtalyan filolarının diğer mensupları ile aynı adlandırmaları benimsemişlerdir ve benzer şekilde, deniz kuvvetlerine katılma yaşları da aynıdır. MS 73/74 civarında mecburi hizmet süresi 26 yıl iken bu MS 205’ten sonra 28 yıla çıkartılmıştı ve yine benzer şekilde, bu Anadolu denizcilerin birçoğu hizmet süresini tamamlayamamıştır fakat bir kısmı “müşterek hukuk – evliliği” yapmış ve ölümlerinden önce çocuk sahibi de olabilmiştir. Üstelik, bu “eşlerin” yalnızca çok azının kökeni saptanabilmiş olmasına karşın bazıları Anadolu lular, ve geri kalanları da Afrika ve “Yunanistan” da dahil geniş Roma coğrafyasından gelmiş olsa gerektir.

Çalışmanın sonuç bölümünde, bu analizin, Roma İmparatorluk Donanması’nda görev yapan bu “yabancı”lar hakkında önceki çalışmaların sonuçlarıyla genelde nasıl örtüştüğü vurgulanmaktadır. Ayrıca, İmparator Vespasianus’un donanma reformları sayesinde, Anadolu’nun kırsal alanlarından gelenlerin bilinçli şekilde olmasa da ordunun bu kuvvetine girmeyi nasıl tercih ettikleri de gösterilmektedir. Bu, Roma vatandaşı olmaktan kaynaklanan tüm faydalarıyla birlikte “Romalılaşmak” için hızlı bir yoldu.