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Abstract

Knowing the recruitment patterns and the areas of service for the auxilia, the auxiliary units of the Roman Imperial Army, helps us better understand overall developments in Roman strategic thinking. In this regard the establishment of auxiliary units from the provinces of Asia Minor is of interest in pointing to Roman military thought and practice with regard to the Eastern provinces as a whole. This paper examines the history of those auxiliary units raised from Asia Minor in the light of these matters. It shows that until the emperor Trajan made heavy demands on this region for new units in connection with his Parthian War, the provinces concerned contributed very few locally raised units of Roman auxilia, and explains why this might be so.

THE ROMAN AUXILIA

It will be convenient to begin with a summary account of the Roman auxilia, a subject that may be unfamiliar to some readers of this journal. Originating as ad hoc units supplied to Rome as ‘contributions’ from her ‘friends and allies’ for specific campaigns in the Republican period, the process of recruiting and using such units was transformed by Augustus (28 BC-AD 14), who created a series of permanent auxiliary formations of 500 or so men. These took one of three forms: as infantry units, the cohortes peditatae; as units of combined infantry and cavalry, the cohortes equitatae; or as cavalry squadrons, the alae. The reform itself can be associated with the advice allegedly given in 29 BC to Octavian (as Augustus was then known) by Maecenas, one of his main counsellors, that a standing army should be formed for the defence of the Roman Empire using ‘the citizens, the subject nations, and the allies’ of Rome. Whatever the truth of this story it seems that regular auxiliary units formed among the ‘subject nations’ and ‘allies’ of Rome were in existence before Augustus died in 14, formations of this type, for example, being part of the army that Varus took into Germania in the year 9.

These new regular auxiliary units were presumably formed initially around a cadre of experienced officers and men drawn from existing formations, the raw recruits for the initial complement being in most cases probably obtained through the dilectus, a military
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levy carried out on a localised and territorial basis: and – as will be shown – the dilectus probably accounted for most of the auxiliary regiments raised in Anatolia. However, on occasion, the pre-existing militias in certain of the poleis in the Greek-speaking east were reconstituted as regular auxiliary units when their home region was annexed by Rome, and such was the case at one poleis in Anatolia, namely Trapezus.

Sometime around 66, changes in tactical thinking and field operations that are still not fully understood led to the creation of several ‘double-size’ auxiliary units, these being given the suffix milliaria to denote a complement of (nominally) 1,000 men and so distinguish them from any like-numbered and named formations of the usual 500-man type, these being at times designated as quingenaria. Units of all types continued to be raised and existing units reinforced by means of the dilectus until at least the time of Hadrian (117-139), and perhaps also under Antoninus Pius (138-160), although either Trajan (98-117) or Hadrian created a new type of supplementary formation, the national numeri, using recruits from the frontier regions of the Roman Empire. It seems that these national numeri were mainly used to relieve the regular auxilia of the more mundane tasks of internal and external security.

The usual practice was to name the auxiliary units in the nominative singular and in sequential number for the source of the founding complement, whether a community, such as an ethnos or polis, or a region. However, a few units of auxilia have a ‘Kaiserbeiname’ derived from an imperial nomen preceding their proper name. Such ‘Kaiserbeinamen’ are generally believed to indicate that the emperor in question was personally responsible for the unit’s original creation, as opposed to it having been raised by a provincial governor on behalf of the reigning emperor. This certainly seems to be the case with, for example, many of those alae and cohortes named Aelia, the shared nomen of the emperors Hadrian and Antoninus Pius, but most of them being raised under the former. Naturally, there are exceptions to test this rule, and it follows that an imperial nomen might be assigned to a unit on other occasions, as when it was reorganised and so changed in its nature and/or composition. Furthermore, a unit might be given an imperial name as a ‘battle’ or other service honour, although it seems that
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when this was the case, the imperial *nomen* appears after the unit’s normal name.\(^{15}\) Even so, there are yet other cases that are more difficult to explain.\(^{16}\) That said, whatever the origin of an individual unit’s ‘Kaiserbeiname’, it was fairly often omitted from private or unofficial texts, such as funerary and honorary monuments. But such private inscriptions usually abbreviated a unit’s name in any case, as brevity saved money, in which case the omission of a ‘Kaiserbeiname’ from the title of the described unit on private inscriptions has no real significance.

It is thought that in their early years at least, most if not all of the newly formed auxiliary *cohortes* and *alae* were maintained at strength with fresh recruits taken from the same named place of origin.\(^{17}\) Firm evidence is rare, but it is clear that over time the primary ethnic or regional quota in any auxiliary unit was inevitably gradually diluted. It was a natural result after most of these units began to be located in places far distant from their ‘home’ region, and so began to rely on recruits from where they were based rather than from their ‘origin’. The practice was certainly underway by the time of Tiberius,\(^{18}\) and it would seem that by the 2nd century AD, a significant number of auxiliary soldiers served in locations far from their own place of origin and often in ‘foreign’ regiments originally raised from another place altogether.\(^{19}\) Yet despite this progressive dilution in the nature of their complement, as far as it can be seen, all of Rome’s auxiliary units kept their original national or other name into at least the later 3rd century.\(^{20}\)

Inscriptions on stone, such as funerary monuments, but especially those recording the *cursus honorum* or service career of men who served as officers in the *auxilia*, provide us with a significant source of information about these units. However, our principal source of data for their origins and their deployment is supplied by those epigraphic documents referred to today as *diplomata*. The *diplomata* are bronze ‘booklets’, each of two ‘pages’ on average 16 x 12 cm., representing the personal certified copies of those imperial constitutions ‘posted’ at Rome with the names of soldiers recently retired or about to retire from military service with an honourable discharge, along with certain specific benefits they were now awarded. The majority of *diplomata* are for auxiliary men, and they first appear during the reign of Claudius, at which time, it seems, auxiliary men first began to serve a specified term of about 25 years, receiving
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\(^{16}\) Consider the *cohors I Flavia Hispanorum*: although so-named on most records of its existence, it later took the emperor Trajan’s *nomen* of *Ulpia* before its national name, becoming the *cohors I Flavia Ulpia Hispanorum*: Spaul 2000, 118-119.
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\(^{20}\) Several are to be found listed in the *Notitia Dignitatum*, a tedious bureaucratic document originally compiled c. 395 cataloguing the administrative organisation from the imperial court down to the provincial level of the eastern and western provinces of the Roman Empire.
Roman citizenship on discharge.\(^{21}\) In addition to the citizenship, the *diplomata* specify that those named in these documents also received the rights to a legal marriage after leaving military service, and – until AD 140\(^{22}\) – the extension of Roman citizenship to any children born before the relevant constitution was issued. The first ‘page’ in a complete *diploma* starts with the full title of the reigning emperor and the number of times he held tribunician power, so indicating his regnal year. It continues with phrasing along the lines of ‘To the cavalrymen and infantrymen serving in X number *alae* and Y number *cohortes* named ZZZ’. After the list of units comes the name of the province in which they were stationed along with the name of the governor; the calendar date and names of the consuls in power at the time the original constitution was ‘posted’; and the name of the individual to whom the personal *diploma* belonged, along with details of his unit, and any existing family members.

Thus, the individual *diplomata* list *inter alia* all those auxiliary regiments in a province that had men who were listed on the constitution issued at Rome on the particular date. In this way they provide a ‘snapshot’ of the auxiliary regiments garrisoning a province for the specific day and year the constitution was ‘posted’. However, this is not necessarily a complete list of all the auxiliary units in that province at that time as not all of them would necessarily have men who had already been discharged or who were eligible for discharge at the time the constitution was ‘posted’.\(^{23}\) So, the absence of a unit’s name from any given *diploma* is not decisive evidence that the unit was not in that province at the time. Moreover, for reasons that remain unknown, two imperial constitutions might be issued on exactly the same day for the same province but with different unit listings, these ‘split’ *diplomata* contain complementary lists for that province’s garrison.\(^{24}\) Even so, the *diplomata* allow us to trace the movements of those individual units that were redeployed from one province to another over their lifetime. Moreover, the *diplomata* also provide a plausible *terminus ante quem* for a specific unit’s initial creation: all those regiments listed on a particular *diploma* should have, in theory, been in existence at least 25 years earlier. However, this is not necessarily the case, as on its initial commission, each new unit would contain serving soldiers transferred from another existing unit to form its founding cadre.\(^{25}\)

Unfortunately, *diplomata* effectively ceased to be issued after AD 165, perhaps because by which time, or so it seems, many auxiliary units contained men who already held Roman citizenship. This also means that any entirely new units formed after then are unlikely to be recorded on these documents.\(^{26}\) That apart, there is also a very uneven
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\(^{23}\) Cf. Holder 2003, 101. Compare for example Eck and Pangerl 2005a, reporting a *diploma* for Galatia-Cappadocia issued in 100 which lists exactly two of the approximately 16 or 18 auxiliary regiments known to have been stationed in the province at the time from *diplomata* issued in 94 and 101, as is reported in Pferdehirt 2004, 18.
\(^{24}\) E.g., CIL 16.44 and 45 for Moesia Inferior, both dated 14-viii-99, the first listing three *alae* and six *cohortes*, the second with another quite different three *alae* and seven *cohortes*.
pattern province-wise with regard to the issuing of diplomata. For example, there are some 50 diplomata for the province of Raetia, yet only one or two for Mauretania Caesariensis, even though both regions had auxiliary garrison of a more or less equal strength, at least in the early 2nd century. A similar disparity holds for those provinces that had a single auxiliary unit in garrison: while Lycia-Pamphylia has produced a total of four diplomata referencing two of the five auxiliary units known to have been deployed there in succession, the province of Alpes Maritimae has yet to produce a single diploma for any of the five units known to have been stationed there at one time or another. Furthermore, while some units well attested from the diplomata have left scant evidence for their existence in any other written medium, others certified from epigraphic and/or papyrological sources are nowhere mentioned in any of the diplomata recovered to date. Last of all, as will be seen, very few diplomata exist for the units formed in the provinces of Asia Minor. As it is, the great majority of the recorded diplomata were issued to men who originated from the Balkan or Central European provinces or from Mauretania Tingitana. Given that other epigraphic evidence reveals how auxiliarymen were recruited from throughout the Roman Empire, this suggests that while time-served soldiers recruited from these regions were especially desirous of having their military service and subsequent privileges documented on bronze tablets, those from other regions were content to have such documentation in the form of a written and certified papyrus scroll or wax tablet. As it is, analysis has shown that more than half of the surviving diplomata were issued to cavalrymen from the alae and the cohortes equitatae, men who were in any case better paid than the auxiliary infantrymen, supporting the conclusion that the bronze diplomata were privately purchased by those who wished to have a permanent and relatively luxurious record of their status and the privileges they received as honourably discharged auxiliarymen.

Let us now go from the general to the particular, namely the evidence for those auxiliary units that were raised from the provinces of Asia Minor, beginning with the alae and proceeding to the cohortes, each section being in alphabetical order by unit name.

The Alae

The ala Augusta Gemina Colonorum

The title of this unit needs some deconstruction. The ‘Kaiserbeiname’ Augusta indicates a unit that had its origin in the Augustan period, while the suffix Colonorum reveals that it was formed using coloni, that is, men who had received land in return for
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military service. As the unit clearly had close connections with Pisidian Antioch, a colony certainly founded by Augustus, and also Iconium (Konya), another Augustan foundation whose official name may have been Colonia Julia Augusta Equestris, it has been speculated that these coloni were the sons of retired legionaries settled in Galatia by Augustus after its annexation in 25 BC.\(^{32}\) In other words, the ala I Augusta Gemina Colonorum may be only the second example that we know of for a cavalry unit created from a levy amongst citizens, and so analogous to the citizen cohorts formed by Augustus in response to the Pannonian revolt of AD 6.\(^{33}\) Alternatively, they may have all been peregrines, non-Roman citizens, granted Roman citizenship and perhaps some land, after serving a probationary period of service with the unit.\(^{34}\) However, the epithet Gemina, or ‘twin’, indicates that the unit as we know it was formed by amalgamating two earlier units, a practice that became commonplace only after AD 69.\(^{35}\) This indicates that the ala I Augusta Gemina Colonorum as such was probably formed in the Flavian period from two pre-existing units of alae originally constituted in Galatia under Augustus.

We can go further and suggest that these two original units were also formed in connection with the Pannonian revolt. This is because insofar as it is known, when Galatia was annexed in 25 BC, the garrison consisted of one legion, the legio VII, and at least three auxiliary regiments, the ala Augusta Germanica, the cohors I Apula and the cohors I Hispanorum equitata, although it has been suggested that the three cohortes Augustae Cyrenaicae may have also formed a part of the original garrison.\(^{36}\) Certainly, this possible number of six auxiliary units numbering some 3,500 men would come close to the manpower of the one legion in the province, a near equalising of the numbers of auxiliaries and legionaries implied by Tacitus for at least the Tiberian period.\(^{37}\) Whatever, the original garrison of Galatia seems to have been strong enough to deal with the various minor and major episodes of warfare we know of in the province under Augustus, and in particular the Homonadensian War, which took place sometime between 6 BC and AD 4, although it is possible that the three cohortes Augustae Cyrenaicae were only deployed to Galatia at this time.\(^{38}\) But in AD 7, the legio VII left Galatia to help suppress the much more serious rebellion in Pannonia,\(^{39}\) and so we might speculate that two units of alae were initially raised from the sons of the original Galatian coloni and/or the indigenous population to help make up the loss of the province’s single legion, these being amalgamated to form the single ala I Augusta Gemina Colonorum in the Flavian period.

\(^{32}\) Cf. Mitchell 1979, 414, n. 38; Ramsay 1939, 205.
\(^{33}\) The only certainly identified citizen ala is the ala I Civium Romanorum: Spaul 1994, 85-86. For the citizen cohortes, see Brunt 1974b, passim.
\(^{34}\) Cf., CIL 16.38, of 13-vii-93, confirming the grant of citizenship after a probationary period of service to those peregrines who had been enlisted or been conscripted into the cohors VIII Voluntariorum.
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\(^{37}\) Tac. Ann. 4.5.
\(^{38}\) Mitchell 1993a, 77-78, for the Homonadensian War; Bennett 2009, 118, and for the possible deployment of the cohortes Augustae Cyrenaicae to Galatia at this time.
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Such speculation aside, the earliest record we have for this unit is on a dedicatory inscription at Saurae (Sour), in the Hauran in Syria, which appears to be internally dated to the 20th year of the reign of the ‘Great King Agrippa’: this has to be M. Julius Agrippa II, then ruler of the Chalcis, and so the year is 68. As the *ala I Augusta Gemina Colonorum* does not appear on any of the known *diplomata* issued for Syria in the period before 94, when – as we will see – the unit certainly formed part of the garrison of Galatia-Cappadocia, then it was presumably at Saurae on secondment from another province in connection with the First Jewish Rebellion of 66-73, when Agrippa took the side of Rome against his co-religionists. Indeed, it is likely that the unit’s ‘home’ province at the time was most probably Cappadocia, for Vespasian’s field force for the Jewish rebellion included units previously assembled in that territory by Corbulo for his Armenian campaigns of 56-68. In which case it is not impossible that the unit formed part of the original garrison of Cappadocia after Tiberius provincialised that territory in 17.

The unit’s name can be restored with a high degree of certainty on a fragmentary *diploma* for Galatia-Cappadocia issued in 94, and it is certainly on a *diploma* for the same province issued in 101, the existence of these *diplomata* indicating that by the turn of the 1st century, the unit contained *peregrini* who had completed 25 years of service with the *auxilia*. The joint province of Galatia-Cappadocia was dissolved between AD 110-114, and the unit is next reported among the forces assembled by Flavius Arrianus, governor of Cappadocia, for his excursus against the Caucasian Alans in c. 134. At this time it may well have been stationed in the vicinity of or even at Iconium, as it is referred to on two funerary texts recording former members of the unit found near there with orthographic and other details suggesting a 2nd century date. On the other hand, these men may well have been natives of Iconium who retired to their home-region after completing military service. Either way, the unit seems to have remained in Cappadocia for the remainder of its existence, being reported in the *Notitia Dignitatum* as one of the units commanded by the *Dux Armeniae*, in charge of a military region formed between 293 and 371 (perhaps by Valens in 364) from the Pontus and eastern Cappadocia, the unit then being based at Chiaca (Morhamam) on the Euphrates.

Several commanders of the unit are known by name, the earliest we know of being a Herod, son of Amos, who is recorded on the inscription from Saurae dated to 68 already referred to. Herod is dignified thereon as στρατοπεδαρχής Ἰππέων Κολονειτῶν καὶ στρατιωτῶν καὶ στρατηγήσας, that is, ‘stratopedarches of the cavalrymen and soldiers of
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the (ala) Colonorum’, and the text goes on to indicate that he was appointed to this position by Agrippa himself. The rank of stratopedarches is otherwise attested once only in the epigraphic record of the Roman army, on a bilingual text from Amastris (Amasra) in the Pontus, where it is used as the Greek equivalent for the legionary rank of praefectus castrorum, or ‘camp commander’. It is, however, found in written Greek-language sources of the late 1st century BC and early 1st century AD, where it has the implied meaning of a military commander equivalent in rank to a senior centurion. On the other hand, by the 4th century, and so possibly earlier, the word stratepedon seems to have been used to refer to an imperial campaign headquarters, allowing for a stratopedarches to be an officer serving on the personal staff of an emperor or a task-force commander: which might explain why we have in this case a man with a Jewish name ostensibly in charge of a Roman auxiliary unit.

The next two known commanders of the unit have the regular title of praefectus and can all be dated to the Hadrianic period. One was M. Sentius Proculus, a native of Berytus (Beirut), in charge of the ala Gemina Colonorum (sic) during a career that saw him eventually elevated to the Senate, his cursus honorum being provided by an inscription from his hometown. His command of the unit can be dated to the early Hadrianic period, as the inscription shows that he assumed charge of it subsequent to service in Trajan’s Parthian War of 114-11. Proculus was followed as praefectus but probably not immediately after by Sex. Cornelius Dexter, a native of Saldae (Bejaia) in Mauretania Caesariensis. Like Proculus he also went on to a distinguished career, becoming praefectus of the Classis Syriaca, the Roman fleet patrolling the Levantine and Anatolian coasts, a post he held when awarded military decorations by Hadrian for his service in the Second Jewish Rebellion of 132-136.

Texts with epigraphic characteristics of the Antonine period provide the names of two other commanders of the unit. Two honouring L. Egnatius Quartus, apparently from Phrygian Acmonia (Uşak) reveal that after serving as praefectus of the cohors II Claudia, he was appointed as ‘ἐπιμελητής εἰλῆς Σεβαστῆς Διόμου’, or ‘epimelete’ of the ala Augusta Gemina (Colonorum), before going on to command an ala Augusta. The expression ‘epimelete’ may be broadly defined as meaning ‘the person in care of’, and as such, would be equivalent to the Latin ‘curator propraefecto’, or ‘temporary commander’, a substantive military rank expressed more usually in Latin as praepositus. The other apparently Antonine-period period commander of the ala I Augusta Gemina Colonorum is M. Claudius Rutilius Varus, who is described as its ‘praefectus equitum’ on an inscription from Perge. Varus and his cousin, L. Claudius Propincianus Apellinus, set

49 IGR 3.1432.
50 E.g., BGU 1822.13, and Dion. Hal. Rd. 10.36.6.
52 AÉ 1926.150 = AE 1992.1689, also PME S.25.
53 CIL 8.8934 = ILS 1400, also PME C.234.
54 IGR 4.642 = AE 1902.97, and AE 1896.80.
55 Cf. IGR 4.1213.
56 IGR 3.797.
up this inscription to honour their grandmother, and as Apellinus was then serving with the legio II Traiana Fortis, a legion established by the emperor Trajan in connection with the Second Dacian War of 104-106, the text can be no earlier than that.

The names of a mere two rankers of the *ala I Augusta Gemina Colonorum* are known, these being G. Apponius Firmus, who had served as a *decurion*; and a kinsman of his, G. Aponianus Sopatrus, who also held the rank of *decurion*. The use of the regular Roman *tria nomina* by both men and their membership of the gens *Aponia*, a gens well attested at Rome and in parts of Italy, allows for both of them being descended from some of the original Augustan colonists in Galatia. That apart, the general style of both texts, along with the names of the deceased being given in the nominative, indicates that they are most probably of 2nd century date.

**The *ala (VII) Phrygum***

A series of epigraphic references to an *ala Phrygum* and another series naming an *ala VII Phrygum* convinced earlier scholars that these were two separate regiments. However, it now seems likely that they are one and the same, the original *ala Phrygum* having been redeployed by Vespasian to Judaea after the First Jewish Rebellion, becoming the seventh auxiliary unit stationed there and so being assigned the numeral ‘VII’.

That matter apart, the lack of a number before the unit’s title on several early texts indicates that it was probably raised before the Flavian period. Indeed, this notion finds some support from the first appearance of the *ala Phrygum (sic)* in the epigraphic record on a *diploma* for Syria issued on 13-v-86: if the man or men in the unit covered by the relevant constitution had served all 25 years in the regiment, then this would suggest it was already in existence c. 60/61, under Nero. The unit is again listed in the same numberless fashion for the same province on four parallel *diplomata* for 7-xi-88, presumably issued for men recruited for Corbulo’s Armenian campaigns, 25 years earlier; and on a *diploma* issued between 1-i/13-ix-90. It next appears in Syria Palaestina, as the province of Judaea was re-named by Hadrian after the Second Jewish Revolt, where it is named as the *ala VII Phrygum* on a series of *diplomata* issued between 136/137 and 160, the latest of these providing the last record for its existence, unless, that is, it was
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57 AÊ 1907.57; and AÊ 1930.108.
58 Schulze 1904, 66, indicates that the gentilicum Aponius is widespread in Italy, and Mitchell 1993a, 151, reports instances at other locations in central Anatolia. Note that the name of those Aponii in Galatia is less likely to have been taken from M. Aponius Saturninus, *suffect consul* under Nero, and *proconsul* of Asia under Vespasian: PIR 938.
59 Spaul 1994, 183-84; also Kennedy 1997a.
60 Kennedy 1997a, 302, with Holder 2002, 292.
61 Cf. Kennedy 1997a, 301.
62 CIL 16.33 (for 86); RMD 1.3, 5.329 and 5.330 (for 78); and RMD 5.332 (for 90).
63 RMD 3.160 (for 136/137); CIL 16.87 (for 139); CIL 16.103 (for 134/146; cf. RMD 3, p.246); Pferdehirt 2004, no. 29 (for 15-i-142); RMD 5.421 (for 157/158); Eck and Pangerl 2007 (for 6.ii-158); Eck and Pangerl 2006 (for March 158); and RMD 3.173 and Pferdehirt 2004, no. 41, (for 7-iii-160).
eventually reformed as a cohort, the *cohors IV Frygum* recorded in Palaestina Tertia in the *Notitia Dignitatum*, with the number being erroneously cited in that document.  

Several commanders of the unit are known by name, the earliest known to us being M. Valerius Propinquus Grattius Cerialis, whose career is provided by an inscription found at Tarraco (Tarragona) in Hispania Citerior, presumably his home town. His military career certainly began in the early or mid Flavian period as the text honouring him refers to his service with the *legio V Macedonica* while this was in the undivided province of Moesia, that is, before the province was divided by Domitian between 84 and 86, after which he assumed command of the *ala Phrygum* at a time when – the text informs us – this was in Syria. He was succeeded as commander of the *ala Phrygum* sometime later in the Flavian or early Trajanic period by M. Helenius Priscus, who is named as *praefectus* of the unit on the *diploma* for 7-xi-88, Priscus being succeeded in turn by C. Nascennius Marcellus, probably from Italy, who after completing his military career is known to have held civil office at Ostia in 111. Two other commanders can also perhaps be dated to the Flavian-early Trajanic period as the inscriptions honouring them all name the *ala Phrygum*, namely: Ti. Claudius Agrippinus from Patara in Lycia; and Ti. Claudius Pius, from Pergamom (Bergama) in Asia.

Inscriptions internally dated to the middle years of Trajan’s reign and others of early Hadrianic date, all of which give the unit’s name with the number, as the *ala VII Phrygum*, provide us with two commanders of the early 2nd century, namely C. Julius Demosthenes, a native of Oinoanda in Lycia-Pamphylia, whose command of the *ala VII Phrygum* can be dated to the period after 102 but before 116, as the inscription honouring him names Trajan as Dacicus but not Parthicus; and A. Atinius Paternus, from Rome, who commanded the unit immediately after service in Trajan’s Parthian War, for which he received military decorations.

For later periods we know of only one *praefectus* of the unit whose period of command can be certainly dated, namely Roscius Capitolinus, named on the *diplomata* of 158. Two other of the unit’s *praefecti* can only be broadly assigned to the later 1st or 2nd century from the naming of the unit on the inscriptions commemorating them as commanders of the *ala VII Phrygum* These were: C. Iulius Serenus, from Lugudunum
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64 ND. Or. 34.41; cf. Kennedy 1997a, 300. Note also Kennedy 1997b, where it is shown that the name of the *ala VII Phrygum* was not included on the mid-Antonine *cursus honorum* of M. Valerius Lollianus, as previously believed.

65 CIL 2.4251 = ILS 2711.

66 Priscus: RMD 1.3, also PME H.3; Marcellus: CIL 14.171, also PME N.6 (where he is confused with the homonym named on CIL 14.171 = ILS 1429, an inscription dated to 184: the error is followed by Kennedy 1997a, 303), and Holder 2002, 287-289.

67 Agrippinus: IGR 3.670, 3.671 and 3.672, also PME C.116; Pius: AÉ 1933.270, also PME C.168, where he is dated to the Severan period. Kennedy 1997a, 303, also names a Ti. Claudius Helvius Secundus as a commander of the *ala Phrygum* under Trajan, but the reference he gives for this man’s career (AÉ 1925.44), does not name the unit.

68 Demosthenes: IGR 3.487 with 3.600, also PME I.55; Paternus: CIL 6.1838 (p 3225, 3818) = CIL 03.*263,02 = ILS.2727, also PME A.182.

69 Eck and Pangerl 2006 and 2007.
Converarumo (Saint-Bertrand-de-Comminges) in Gallia Aquitania; and an *ignotus* from Sagalassos.\(^{70}\)

There are only four references in the epigraphic record to junior members of the unit. The earliest known of these was Dassius, son of Dasentis, a Pannonian by origin, who is named on the *diploma* of 7-xi-88.\(^{71}\) Two more members are the unit are referenced by the *diplomata* of 158, one being a man whose name is lost but who was the son of a Densala, a Thracian name; and Alutralis, son of Rebocthenus, whose origin is uncertain.\(^{72}\) As both of these men joined the *auxilia* in c. 133 they are likely to have been recruited or conscripted in response to the outbreak of the Second Jewish Rebellion 25 years earlier in 132.\(^{73}\) The fourth known ranker with the unit is L. Antonius Valens, recorded on a funerary text in Latin from Hefa, in Syria Palaestina, which describes him as an *eques* or cavalryman with the *‘al(a)e septu(omnia) [P]hrgu[mm]*:\(^{74}\) given the inscription’s provenance and the spelling out in full of the soldier’s name it is probably of mid or late 2nd century date.

**The Cohortes**

**The *cohors* (I) Cilicum equitata (sagittaria milliaria)**\(^{75}\)

The *cohors* (I) Cilicum, whose equitate status is indicated by two inscriptions (see below), was certainly in existence by the late Augustan period, as is shown by the *cursus honorum* of one of its former commanders, M. Magius Antiquus, naming the unit without the number ‘I’ before its title.\(^{76}\) It is registered in the same way on four parallel *diplomata* issued for the province of Moesia on 24-iv-75, and likewise on three parallel *diplomata* for that province on 7-ii-78.\(^{77}\) Sometime between 84 and 86, Domitian divided Moesia to form two provinces, and the unit, which is henceforth always listed with the number ‘I’ before its title, is next reported in Moesia Superior on two parallel *diplomata* issued 16 ix-94; one of 12-vii-96; and two more of 8-v-100.\(^{78}\) It was then probably stationed at Naissus (Nis), as the tombstone of a serving soldier of the unit has been found there.\(^{79}\)

---


\(^{71}\) RMD 1.3.

\(^{72}\) Eck and Pangerl 2006 and 2007.

\(^{73}\) Cf. the 126 recruits or conscripts from the province of Asia sent in 117 to fill the ranks of the *cohors* I *Augusta Lusitanorum*, evidently to replace losses incurred during the Jewish revolt in Egypt of 116-117: RMR no. 74.

\(^{74}\) AÉ 1905.55. The spelling out of the unit’s number is not common in military inscriptions written in Latin, although the practice is frequently found on those written in Greek.

\(^{75}\) Spaul 2000, 397-398; also Devijver 1982, 176-83 = Devijver 1989, 212-219.

\(^{76}\) Equitate status: cf. AÉ 1957.193; for the career of Antiquus, see PME M.9, with Devijver 1982, 213-14.

\(^{77}\) RMD 1.2, Pierdehirt 2004, 3-8, and Eck and Pangerl 2009, 505 (for 24-iv-75: the fourth is as yet unpublished); CIL 16.22, RMD 4.208, and Eck and Pangerl 2010 (for 7-ii-78).

\(^{78}\) CIL 16.39 and RMD 5.335 (for 12-vii-96); RMD 1.6 (for 12-vii-96); and CIL 16.46, and Eck and Pangerl 2009 (for 8-v-100). There is no satisfactory explanation as to why the unit was regularly listed without the number ‘I’ in its title until the mid-Flavian period or why it was regularly used thereafter. It cannot be a copyist’s mistake on the early Flavian diplomata as these list a series of other units by ethnic only. Generally speaking, the absence of the number ‘I’
As the unit is absent from a diploma for Moesia Superior issued between 103/107, then it may have been seconded for service in one or both of Trajan’s Dacian Wars. If so, it had returned to Moesia Superior sometime before May-August 115, when it is listed on a diploma for that province as ‘translatis in expeditione’, that is, it was ‘absent [from the province] on expedition’ at the time the constitution was ‘posted’. This absence is evidently in connection with Trajan’s Parthian War, and an honorary inscription from Beirut already referred to above reveals that during that campaign a part of the unit served in a brigaded force of auxiliaries operating under the command of M. Sentius Proculus, then serving as praefectus of the cohors I Thracum Syriaca, and later to become praefectus of the ala I Augusta Gemina Colonomorum.

Following Trajan’s death and the end of his Parthian War in 117, his successor, Hadrian, evidently redeployed many of the European-based units that had been detached for the Parthian campaign, some of them returning to their original provinces, and others not. One of those that did not was the cohors I Cilicum, which is next reported on a diploma issued on 2-iv-134 for Moesia Inferior. It is again recorded in the same province on a series of diplomata issued between i/v-134 and 157, and on an altar intrinsically dated to 147 from Montana (Mihailovgrad) in the same province. At that time this altar was inscribed, the unit was serving in a brigaded force together with detachments drawn from the legiones I Italica and XI Claudia, and also from the Classis Flavia Moesia, the Moesian fleet, presumably in connection with one of the attested campaigns under Antoninus Pius against the transdanubian Germans.

At some point after its arrival in Moesia Inferior, however, the unit seems to have been reformed to include a large contingent of archers, for it is named on the diploma of 145 as the cohors I Cilicum sagittariorum, having the same designation on those diplomata issued after that date (the epithet is absent from the altar of 147 from Montana, but this has no real significance). It may even have been ‘doubled’ in size to form a milliary unit, as the Montana altar and a later inscription of 177/179 from Tropaeum Traiani (Adamklissi) reveal the unit’s commander as being ranked as a tribunus, the normal title for a person in charge of a milliary unit.

---

79 Plato: CIL 3.8250; Valens and Julius: CIL 3.13751b.
80 CIL 16.54
81 Eck and Pangerl 2005b, 64.
82 AÉ 1926.150 = AÉ 1992.1689.
83 Eck and Pangerl 2005b, 63.
84 CIL 16.78.
85 RMD 3.165 and Eck and Pangerl 2009, 548 (for i/v-145); RMD 4.270 (for 146); RMD 5.412 (for 148/154); RMD 5.414 (for c. 155); AÉ 2007.1236 and Eck and Pangerl 2009, 557 (for 156); and RMD 1.50 (for 157).
86 AÉ 1987.867.
87 Cf. HA. Pius 5.4-6.1.
88 RMD 3.165.
commander of the *cohors I Cilicum* cannot have been due to the distinction between a *praefectus* (the normal rank of a man commanding a quingenary unit) and a tribune having become obsolete as an inscription from Sacidava (Musait-Dunareni) in Moesia Superior, where the unit was based by the mid-3rd century, refers to a man who was serving as acting commander of the *cohors I Cilicum* with the substantive rank of *tribunus* while he was holding the official rank of *praefectus* of the *cohors I Aquitanorum.*

While in Moesia Inferior the unit evidently sent out detachments for service in the ‘free’ Hellenic colonies around the Black Sea, as is shown by an inscription from Chersonesus Taurica (Kherson). Continued service in Moesia Inferior after the last reported *diploma* for that province issued in 157 is indicated by an inscription intrinsically dated to 177/9 from Tropaeum Traiani recording the marking of the border between *civitas Ausdecensium* and a Dacian community. A tombstone set up by a member of the unit for his wife at Tomi (Constanta) suggests the unit may have been stationed there, while another text from the same place, a dedication to an unknown deity, was set up by a member of the unit at time when it was formally named the *cohors I Cilicum Philippianae,* in honour of Philip I (244-249). However, it seems to have returned to Moesia Superior at a later date in that emperor’s reign, as is shown by inscriptions from Sacidava, one of them set up to honour M. Julius Philippus, son of the emperor Philip I, in which the son is described as *nobilissimus Caesar,* the title he bore between 244-246. Indeed, Sacidava may be the *Castellum Cilicum* referenced by Procopius writing in the early 6th century: if so then the unit must have left a long-lasting memory, as it is not reported in the *Notitia Dignitatum* of c. 395. That apart, it seems that while back in Moesia Superior the unit continued to send out detachments for service in the ‘free’ Hellenic colonies around the Black Sea, as is shown by an inscription from Pontic Olbia (Olvia) that can be dated to the reign of Decius (249-251), as the unit’s title on this text has his name as a suffix, thus *cohors I Cilicum Decianae.*

No less than eight and possibly nine commanders of the unit have been recorded. The earliest known of these was M. Magius Antiquus, a native of Uxama Argeala (Soria) in Hispania Citerior whose *cursus honorum* indicates that he commanded the *cohors Cilicum* (*sic*) in the Augustan period. A later successor was P. Seppienus Aelianus,
noted on the diploma for 7-ii-78. Other commanders whose period of service can be dated were M. Claudius Regulus, reported on the diploma for 16-ix-94; Q. Castricius Manilianus, a native of Carthage in Africa Proconsularis, reported on the diploma for 148/154; Ti. Claudius Ulpianus, who is recorded on the altar from Montana dated to 147; and Anternius Antoninus, named on the boundary stone from Adamklissi set up between 177/179. Commanders whose period of service can only be broadly dated were Titus Antonius Claudius Alfenus Arginotus, a native of Thyatira (Akhisar) in Asia province who evidently commanded the unit sometime in the late 2nd century as he was later appointed by Severus to a special command to hunt down the supporters of Pescennius Niger in the mid 190’s; and a Priscus, who had temporary command of the unit while it was at Sacidava, and so during the mid-3rd century. Sacidava has also produced a funerary monument set up for the servant of a Julius Faustinus, who gives his rank as tribunus, indicating that he probably also commanded the cohors I Cilicum.

We also have several records of the junior officers and rankers of the unit. Among the former were a Valens, who set up a tombstone for his wife at Tomi, the location of the text suggesting a date between the 2nd and the early 3rd century: he describes himself as an eques, or cavalryman, indicating the unit was equitate, and gives his rank as vexillarius, a junior officer who carried the unit’s vexillum or flag. A junior officer of a later date was Julius Julianus, recorded on a text from Sacidava, and so dating to the mid-3rd century or later: he gives his rank as summus curator, the junior officer responsible for maintaining the accounts for the supply of hay for the horses in an ala or a cohors equitata, further confirming the equitate nature of this unit. Three of the unit’s rankers are known from diplomata, namely a Perasis, son of Publius, on the diploma of 16-ix-78, whose place of origin recording is abbreviated to AEG, and so either Aegissus in Moesia (near Tulcea), the province where the unit was serving, or more probably, given his Hellenic name, Cilician Aegae (Yumurtalık: Aegea in Armenia Minor and Aegae in the Aeolis are less likely); L. Titius, son of Lucius, on the diploma of 16-ix-94, who came from a Philadelphia, perhaps that in Asia province (Alaşehir); and Valerius Longus, son of Longus, the recipient of the diploma of 148/153, who is described as an Isaurian. Three other named rankers were: C. Julius Plato, recorded on a funerary monument at Naisus (Niš) in Moesia Superior, and so pre-Hadrianic; a Cornelius Valentinus, recorded with his daughter on a dedication from Tomi, intrinsically dated to the reign of Philip I; and an Aurelius Valens and an Aelius Julius, who are commemorated on a funerary monument.

98 CIL 16.22, also PME S.26.
100 Arginotus: IGR 4.1213, also PME A.132; Antiquus: ILS 8968, also PME M.9; Priscus: Scorpan 1981, 98 = AÉ 1981.741 = AÉ 1982.850, also PME P.131b.
102 AÉ 1957.193.
104 Perasis: CIL 16.22; Titius: CIL 16.39; Longus: RMD 5.412 (as Longus’ origin is given as the ethnic ‘ISAVRVS’ he may have been conscripted from what was still effectively a frontier region: cf. Mann 1986).
from Chersonesus Taurica (Kherson), a free Hellenic polis on the north coast of the Black Sea. These two died at exactly the same age after exactly one year service, although their cause of death is not noted on this text.

The cohors I Flavia Cilicum equitata

The presence of the ‘Kaiserbeiname’ Flavia in this unit’s title indicates that it was raised by one of the Flavian emperors. Some 14 units are known with this imperial nomen, and their creation has often been attributed to Vespasian. This could indeed be the case here, as Vespasian provincialised the former client state of Cilicia Tracheia in 74. However, the majority if not all are more likely to have been formed under Domitian in connection with his Danubian campaigns, when he needed to replace those units transferred to that region from other parts of the Empire. That said, this particular unit first appears in the epigraphic record on a diploma for Egypt issued on 8-vi-83, indicating that a man or men in the unit must have enlisted in about 58. This can be explained by the cohors I Flavia Cilicum having been formed around a cadre of experienced men transferred from other regiments for the purpose and who were now eligible for discharge.

It seems likely that at least a part of the unit was initially stationed at or near Wadi Hammamat in the Egyptian eastern desert on the road between Koptos (Qift) and Myos Hormos (Quseir al-Quadim), where a funerary inscription recording a serving member of the unit has been found. The unit may still have been at that place when it is reported in Egypt on a diplomata for that province under Trajan, one issued between 98 and 105, the other on 24-ix-105. However, it or a part thereof was certainly stationed at the Imperial granite quarries at Mons Claudianus by the early Hadrianic period, being recorded there on two inscriptions, one, a building inscription, intrinsically dated to 23-iv-118, also indicating that it was a cohors equitata. In 124, the unit’s prefect acted as a judge in a court case at Arsinoite nome, but by 140, the unit had been redeployed to Syene, presumably to help supervise the Imperial quarries at that place. It remained at Syene throughout the Antonine period, as is shown by a series of dateable inscriptions from there, one of them, naming Antoninus Pius (138-160), recording the building of a basilica, the others being a dedication to Verus (160-166) precisely dated to 162; and dedication of two obelisks in honour of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus, and so dateable to between

---

107 E.g., Spaul 2000, 506, who lists 14 units with ‘Flavia’ in their title.
108 Suet. Vesp. 8.4.
109 CIL 16.29; for other cases of men who transferred from one auxiliary regiment to another see below.
110 SB 5.8587: Maxfield 2000, 429, suggests that the unit’s main base at this time was Thebes.
111 RMD 3.341 and 1.9.
112 SB 8324 = CIG 3.4713f (intrinsically dated to 118: the work was supervised by a centurion, suggesting that perhaps only a part of the unit was there – but see below, for legionary centurions who commanded the unit at times); and AÉ 1956.84.
113 Arsinoite: CPR. 1.18; Syene: CIL 3.14147,3 = ILS 8910 = AÉ 1896.41.
It is also mentioned as being among the garrison of Egypt on a diploma dated between 156-161. However, while based at Syene it evidently saw a brief period of detached service at Alexandria, where it is recorded on a building dedication of 158, perhaps having been seconded there during one of the Moorish Wars of the Antonine period. It remained in Egypt for the remainder of its known existence, being recorded there on a diploma of 23-iii-179, and on a dedication to the emperor Macrinus (217/218) from Elephantine, presumably its base at the time.

Nine commanders of the unit are known to us, four with the regular rank of praefectus, as was usual for a quingenary cohors equitata. The earliest known of these is Blaesius Marianus, in charge of the unit in 124; and a Celer, who can be dated to 148/149. Ti. Julius Alexander, is recorded on the inscription from Alexandria, internally dated to 158, and a Balbianus, is named on a papyrus letter from Oxyrhynchus of 2nd century date as being a former praefectus of the unit, described therein as the επίσης πρώτης Φλαυας ἡπτάκρης, that is, the cohors prima Flavia equitata. However, while at Syene and later at Elephantine, legionary centurions seconded on a temporary basis from the legio II Traiana Fortis regularly commanded the unit. With regard to this practice at Syene, this was apparently because the powers-that-be were content to have the regular praefectus of one of the three auxiliary units regularly stationed there serving as the overall station commander for all three. Either way, the known legionary centurions who commanded the unit at Syene were: T. Aridius Marcellinus, Statilius Taurus, Valerius Cordus, and T. Aurelius Restitutus, the one at Elephantine being Furnius Diabus.

We also have the names of a few rankers who served with the unit, two of them recorded on the Domitianic period funerary text at Wadi Hammamat, namely G. Benius Celer, the deceased, who belonged to the century of Julius. Another junior officer, Aunitus, is named on a dedication set up at Mons Claudianus, and the same place has produced a funerary text for C. Luconius, an eques or cavalryman, who served in the turma or troop commanded by the decurion Scaevius, the text ending with the formulae H.S./E.S./T.L., for h(ic) s(itus) e(st) s(it) t(erra) l(evis), or ‘He lies here: may the earth lie lightly on you’, a formula commonly used in the 1st century and into the very early years of the 2nd. These men apart, a papyrus dated to August 155 refers to a

115 CIL 16.184.
116 RMD 3.185; ILS 8919 = AÉ 1905.54. Elephantine has also produced a papyrus active strength report of 213-216 for an unknown unit, quite possibly the cohors I Flavia Cilicum equitata, the only auxiliary unit known to have been stationed there, which lists camel-riders as being included among the unit’s mounted element – but whether for patrol or transport use is uncertain: cf. Maxfield 2000, 412-13.
118 Alexander: IGR 1.1044, also PME I.16; Balbianus: P. Oxy. 41.2978, also PME B.36.
119 Marcellinus: CIL 3.14147.3 = ILS 8910 = AÉ 1896.41; Taurus: CIL 3.6025 = ILS 2625; Cordus: CIL 3.14147.4 = AÉ 1896.42; Restitutus: AÉ 1974.664; Diabus: ILS 8919 = AÉ 1905.4.
120 Aunitus: SB 8324; Luconius: AÉ 1956.4.
Maevius Margellus, who had enlisted in the *auxilia* in 136, and was serving in the century of Candidus in the *cohors I Flavia Cilicum* until his transfer, in 155, to the *cohors I Augusta Lusitanorum*, another unit stationed in Egypt. Finally, mention must be made of a veteran who is recorded on a papyrus from Philadelphia dated to 161.

**The cohors I Ulpia Galatarum**

The emperor Trajan raised at least 16 auxiliary units bearing the imperial *nomen Ulpia* before their main title, several of these being constituted in connection with his Parthian War, some to act as replacement units, for others taken from Asia Minor and/or Syria for the campaign, and some perhaps for the campaign itself. It would seem likely that the *cohors I Ulpia Galatarum* and its sister regiment, the *cohors II Galatarum*, were among those formed in connection with the Parthian War as both appear for the first time in the epigraphic record on a *diploma* issued for Syria Palaestina in 136 or 137: this suggests they were raised in 112/113, and so during the preparation for the Parthian campaign, planning for which was apparently in progress by the end of 111. The unit is recorded as being in the same province from 139 until 186, but by 238 it was at Aquileia in Italy, at the head of the Adriatic Sea, presumably as part of the *exercitus Aquilensis*.

Exactly two members of the unit are known by name, both former *praefecti*, namely M. Ulpius (Zenonis filius) Tryphon Megas Antoninianus, recorded on a text from Themisonion in Phrygia; and T. Statilius Frontonianus, whose *cursus honorum* is provided by inscriptions found at Heraclea Salbake and the nearby Apollonia Salbake in Caria. Of the two, only the first can be securely dated, as Antoninianus’ *praenomen* and *nomen*, along with the indigenous name of his father, Zenonis, indicates that he himself was a first generation Roman citizen enfranchised under Trajan.

---

123 RMR 64 = CPL 118 = BGU 11.696; the papyrus contains the names of two other men who may also have transferred from the *cohors I Flavia Cilicum*, but the name of their original unit is unfortunately lost. For the *cohors I Augusta Lusitanorum*, see Spaul 2000, 56-58.

124 P. Phil. 16.

125 Spaul 2000, 395.

126 Although the *diploma* is in a fragmentary condition, with only the second ‘a’ of the entry *I et II Galatarum* surviving, what is left of it can be restored with confidence from other *diplomata* for Syria Palaestina: cf. RMD 3.160, n. 3. On the preparations for Trajan’s Parthian War, cf. Bennett 2001, 183-184.

127 CIL 16.87 (for 139, but without the ‘Kaiserbeiname’ Ulpia); Pferdehirt 2004, no. 29 (for [15-i-]142); RMD 1.60 (for 149/160, although the names of the units are restored on this by analogy with other *diplomata* from Syria Palaestina); Eck and Pangerl 2009 (for 158); and RMD 3.173, Pferdehirt 2004, no. 41, and AÉ 2005.1730 (all for 7-iii-160); and RMD 1.69 (for 24/27-xi-186).


129 Antonianus: CIG 3953/1 = IGR 4.882, also PME U.18; Frontonianus: SEG 30.1264, also PME S.65b, with Holtheide 1980.
The cohors II Ulpia Galatarum\textsuperscript{130}

As already indicated, the *cohors II Ulpia Galatarum* was raised in connection with Trajan’s Parthian War, and first appears on a *diploma* issued for Syria Palaestina in 136 or 137,\textsuperscript{131} being listed with its sister regiment on *diplomata* for the same province issued between from 139 until the time of Commodus.\textsuperscript{132}

One praefectus and one ranker of the unit are known from the epigraphic record, both being named on the *diploma* for Syria Palaestina issued 22-xi-39.\textsuperscript{133} Q. Flavius Amantianus, of Capua was the praefectus at the time, his Italian origin suggesting that he commanded the unit at an early date,\textsuperscript{134} the *diploma* having been issued to a Gaius, son of Lucius, from Nicaea (Izmir) in Pontus-Bithynia. Gaius’ date of entry into the auxilia (and probably this unit), in c. 114, allows for him having been recruited or conscripted to help make campaign losses suffered by the *cohors II Ulpia Galatarum* in the Parthian War.\textsuperscript{135}

The cohors I Ulpia Paphlagonum (?equitata)\textsuperscript{136}

As there are two equitate cohorts named *II Ulpia Paphlagonum* and *III Ulpia Paphlagonum* (see the next entries), then logically there was a *cohors I Ulpia Paphlagonum*, perhaps an equitate unit also, and yet no evidence for its existence has come down to us.\textsuperscript{137} It was presumably formed as the first of a series of three Paphlagonian units for Trajan’s Parthian War, but was evidently a short-lived unit, suggesting it may have even be destroyed in that campaign. Alternatively, if we assume that it was stationed in Syria, like its sister regiments, then it may have succumbed during the Second Jewish Rebellion of 132-136.

The cohors II Ulpia Paphlagonum equitata\textsuperscript{138}

This unit is first recorded on a *diploma* for Syria issued in the latter part of 153, and appears again in the same province on a *diploma* of 28-ix-157.\textsuperscript{139} It served in the Mesopotamian campaign of Lucius Verus of 162-166, at which time it formed part of a brigaded force led by M. Valerianus Lollianus during the campaigns of Lucius Verus in

\textsuperscript{130} Spaul 2000, 396.
\textsuperscript{131} Cf. RMD 3.160, n. 3.
\textsuperscript{132} As note 127 above.
\textsuperscript{133} CIL 16.87.
\textsuperscript{134} Cf. Devijver 1989, where it is shown how after the end of the 1st century, increasingly few Italian-born men served as officers in the auxilia.
\textsuperscript{135} Note also CIL 10.3889 from Capua, which names a P. Rapellius Kalendinus who commanded a coh(ors) II Gal(...) (sic), which could be either the *cohors II Ulpia Galatarum* or the *cohors II Gallorum*.
\textsuperscript{136} Spaul 200, 392.
\textsuperscript{137} The unit’s name was restored as […] COH I ULPIA PAPHL|AG on the *cursus honorum* of P. Valerius Priscus when the first part of this was reported (CIL 06, 03654), but discovery of the missing part of this text shows that the unit named here was the *cohors I Apamenorum*: cf. AÉ 1974.226 with AÉ 1977.183.
\textsuperscript{138} Spaul 2000, 393.
\textsuperscript{139} Weiß 2006, 265-289 (for 153); CIL 16.106 (for 28-ix-157).
Parthia in 162-166: as this force was composed of detachments of cavalry supplied by the *alae* and *cohortes equitatae* in Syria, then the unit must have been equitate.

The unit was still in existence in the late 3rd century, as is shown by an altar in the Greek language from Dura-Europos honouring Jupiter Dolichenus, this having been set up by a *vexillation* or detachment of the *II Paphlagonum Volusiana* (sic), the additional ‘Kaiserbeiname’ being taken in honour of the emperor Volusian (251-253). The text also informs us that this vexillation was under the command of a centurion, Ulpius Julianus, with the assistance of a Marinus, whose rank is indecipherable; a Zeno, who was an *optio* or junior staff officer; and a Faustianus, whose rank also cannot be read.

**The cohors III Ulpia Paphlagonum equitata**

The *cohors III Ulpia Paphlagonum equitata* is recorded on exactly three epigraphic texts, one being the *diploma* for Syria of 28-ix-157; the second being the inscription recording the brigaded force led by M. Valerius Lollianus in Verus’ Mesopotamian campaign, revealing that this was also an equitate unit; the third being a dedication from Iol Caesarea (Cherchel), in Mauretania Caesariensis, which preserves part of a former prefect’s name, a Julius, presumably a native of that place.

**The cohors IV Phrygum**

As noted above, a *cohors IV Frygum* (sic) is recorded as being stationed in Palaestina Tertia in the *Notitia Dignitatum*, and it has been suggested that this may represent the re-establishment of the *ala VII Phrygum* as an infantry unit, with the number being erroneously cited in that document – unless, that is, it had become the fourth auxiliary cohort stationed within that province. Otherwise we have to suppose the former existence of at least three other *cohortes* that were raised from Phrygia, none of which have left any evidence for their existence. If such had existed, however, then their absence from the known *diplomata* would indicate that they were raised after the late Antonine period, when these documents effectively ceased to be issued.

**The ‘cohors Trapezuntiorum’**

The former existence of a unit that was presumably named the *cohors Trapezuntiorum* is indicated by Tacitus, who informs us that a regular auxiliary cohort

---

142 A second altar from Dura was erected by a *cohors II Ulpia* (sic), which may be the *cohors II Ulpia Paphlagonum*, but is perhaps more likely to be the *cohors II Ulpia Equitata*, a unit stationed at Dura in the late 2nd century: cf. Rostovtzeff 1952, 112-114 = AE 1954.266 = Gilliam 1986, 78-80. For the rank of *optio* cf. Breeze 1976, 132, and for the auxiliary career structure, Breeze 1974, 278-286.
143 Spaul 2000, 394.
144 CIL 16.106 (for 28-ix-157); CIL 3.600 = ILS 2724, with Kennedy 1997b; CIL 8.21037, also PME I.7.
145 ND. Or. 34.41; cf. Kennedy 1997a, 300.
was formed out of the royal militia of Trapezus after Pontus Polemoniacus was annexed to Galatia-Cappadocia in 63-64. 146 He adds that the men in this unit received Roman citizenship at the time it was re-constituted as a regular auxiliary unit, and that it ‘carried arms and banners in the Roman fashion’ – but then goes on to imply that it was of little value in military terms as it ‘still retained the indolence and licence of the Greeks’. Whatever, it was destroyed in 69 during a local revolt.

DISCUSSION

If we exclude the anomalous ‘cohors IV Frygum’, this study has identified some ten but initially eleven regular units of auxilia raised from the provinces of Asia Minor, two but originally three of them being alae and the remainder cohortes, of which four were certainly cohortes equitatae, one, the cohors (I) Cilicum equitata, being reformed in the Antonine period as a milliary unit with a complement of archers. Of these units, it seems that three were probably formed under Augustus, namely the two that provided the men for the establishment (probably under a Flavian emperor) of the ala I Gemina Colonorum, and the cohors I Cilicum. The ala (I) Phrygum may also be an Augustan foundation, although the evidence we have allows only for its existence in the Julio-Claudian period. As it is, that same period certainly saw the formation, under Nero, of the short-lived ‘cohors Trapezuntiorum’, while during the Flavian period, not only was the ala I Augusta Gemina Colonorum established, but also the cohors I Flavia Cilicum. The remainder of the auxiliary regiments constituted from among the provinces of Asia Minor, five cohortes in all were clearly raised by Trajan in connection with his Parthian War.

Given the geographical area covered by the provinces of Asia Minor, the region contributed less than its fair share, as it were, of the auxiliary units of the Roman army. Consider, for example, Thrace, which provided some eight alae and perhaps 30 or so cohortes. As it is, the overwhelming majority of the Roman auxiliary regiments were initially raised in the European provinces, with Gallia Narbonensis and Hispania Baetica being notable exceptions to the rule, although the provinces in the Levant and in Africa also made substantial contributions. The reason or reasons for this inequality in the contributions made by the individual provinces to the auxilia are not entirely clear. However, it was noted more than a century ago that those provinces – such as Narbonensis and Baetica – that were already largely urbanised by the end of the 1st century BC, along with those regions and territories that were likewise essentially urbanised at the time of or soon after their annexation as provinces, may have contained greater numbers of men eligible for citizenship, and so service in the better-paid legions. 147 This certainly seems to be the case with Noricum, which had several enfranchised communities, and which contributed large numbers of men to the legions, but only one ala and one cohors.

146 Tac. Hist. 3.47
147 Cheesman 1914, 64-65, where it is also somewhat glibly noted that ‘the Greek of the period was not rated highly as a fighting man’, a reference presumably to Tac. Hist. 3.47.
And it so happens that several men from the provinces of Asia and Galatia are also known to have served in the legions from at the time of Augustus onwards. In other words, it does seem possible that few auxiliary regiments were raised in the provinces of Asia Minor under the early empire simply because many of their menfolk were eligible for service with the legions. This is not to say, however, that men from Asia Minor were not recruited or conscripted for auxiliary service in that timeframe. The Ancyran Lucius Valerius Pudentius, for example, who served with the cohors I Aquitanorum, and is named on a diploma of 20-ix-82, must have joined the auxilia in c. 57, while it is probable that the majority if not all of the men conscripted in Galatia-Cappadocia for Corbulo’s Armenian campaigns – Pudentius among them? – were also destined for the auxilia.149

Alternatively or additionally, it might simply be the case that few auxiliary regiments were raised from the provinces of Asia Minor for two other reasons. That is to say on the one hand, that already by the Augustan period and continuing into Julio-Claudian times, the Roman army was guaranteed of sufficient numbers of recruits from other regions for what was considered the required number of auxiliary regiments; and on the other, that these regions, in particular the northern parts of Gaul and, from the time of Claudius, Thrace, continued to be places where men were prepared to volunteer or be conscripted without fuss for newly formed regiments when the need arose, thus effectively eliminating the need for major province-wide dilecti and the raising of new units in other areas. All that can be said for certain is that although the provinces of Asia Minor were certainly subject to dilecti in cases of emergency or dire need, as with the men conscripted by Corbulo, it was not until the time of Vespasian or – more probably – Domitian that thought was given to raising an entire new unit of auxilia from the region: evidently until then other regions could be relied upon to supply what was needed to bring the number of auxiliary regiments up to the required total.

However, it seems to have been the case that the regular sources of supply for new auxiliary regiments was running dry at the time when Trajan began his preparations for his Parthian War. He was evidently prepared to commit vast military resources to that campaign, using seven or perhaps nine legions at or near full strength, all but two of them drawn from the eastern provinces, with detachments from another eight European legions. Unfortunately, we do not know the number of auxiliary units that took part in the Parthian War. But it is clear that the Eastern provinces must have supplied large numbers, while the European provinces of Moesia Superior and Inferior, Pannonia Inferior and (probably) Thrace certainly provided at least another 13 cavalry and infantry units. But whatever the number of existing auxiliary regiments that Trajan decided was

---

148 Cf., for example, CIL 3.6627 = ILS 2483, an inscription of Augustan date from Koptos recording building works supervised by men from two legions, with 16 of the 36 legionaries named on the text being from Galatia, and six others from Asia province or Pontus-Bithynia.
149 CIL 16.28; Tac. Ann. 13.35.
150 Bennett 2001, 192.
151 Bennett 2010, 424 with 445.
necessary for the campaign and its ancillary logistical operations,\textsuperscript{152} he found himself short of his required number, and so decided upon a \textit{dilectus} in the province of Galatia, allowing him to create five entirely new units, two from Galatia proper, and three from Paphalogonia.
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**ABBREVIATIONS**

AÉ: *L’année épigraphique*  
BGU: *Berliner griechische Urkunden*  
CIL: *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*  
PME: *Prospopographia Militiarum Equestrium quae fuerunt ab Augusto ad Gallienum*  
CPL: *Corpus Papyrorum Latinarum*  
RMD: *Roman Military Diplomas*  
IGR: *Inscriptiones Graecae ad res Romanas pertinentes*  
SB: *Sammelbuch griechischen Urkunden aus Ägypten*  
PME: *Prospopographia Militiarum Equestrium quae fuerunt ab Augusto ad Gallienum*  
SEG: *Supplementum epigraphicum Graecum*  
ZPE: *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*