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1. INTRODUCTION.

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

A cursory reading of the ancient authorities for the early imperial period certainly shows that considerable attention was paid to the role of the "auxilii" in military contexts. Their importance became increasingly apparent\(^2\).

The standard work on the subject dates from 1914 - Cheesman's "The auxilii of the Roman Imperial army"\(^3\). It is of the greatest value as the only comprehensive general account. The main emphasis falls upon constructing the organizational framework into which the "auxilii" were fitted.

In 1938 Wagner produced a book entitled "Die Dislokation der römischen Auxiliusformationen in den Provinzen Noricum, Pannonien, Moesien und Dacia von Augustus bis Gallienus"\(^4\). Its scope and limitations are sufficiently defined by the title: in essence it is a list of the regiments stationed along the Danube with a consideration of the evidence relating.....
relating to their garrisons and movements. Kraft's "Der Rekrutierung der Alem und Kohorten an Rhein und Donau" was published in 1951. It is also regional in scope but ranges beyond questions concerning the original composition of, and later recruitment for the regiments concerned to include useful discussions on the extension of citizenship to auxiliaries. It concludes with useful lists containing summarized information on individual auxiliaries as recorded on their epitaphs. Besides these three books it is necessary to consult the very detailed articles by Gichorius entitled "ala" and "cohors" in Pauly-Wissowa's "Realencyclopaedie". They go back to 1593 and 1900 respectively but retain their value as the only complete lists of all the auxiliary regiments in the Roman world that were known at the end of the last century. However, due to the nature of the evidence, which will be discussed below, all these studies have concentrated on the last quarter of the first century and on the second century A.D. The situation before then remains most obscure. As Collis has remarked: "eine eingehendere Untersuchung über das Leben der regulären auxiliarien der frühen Kaiserzeit fehlt". Burn has even gone so far as to say of Chesson's book that it is a "fine work clamouing to be rescued". The position for the end of the republican period is not much better.

In other words, the development from the auxiliaries of the republic, which were essentially allied contingents supplied for a particular campaign, to the permanent regiments of the imperial period has not been systematically studied. This will form the main subject of this thesis.
However such a study is fraught with problems and difficulties caused by the lack of evidence. It will be the aim of the thesis first to investigate these problems, then to attempt to trace the emergence of the professional auxiliary army and finally to consider its subsequent consolidation and extension.

The first problem is to assess the character of the historical record concerning the "auxilia" of the late republic and early empire. The civil war between the Pompeians and the Caesarians that began in 49 B.C. will be taken as the starting point. From this date onwards professional generals were regularly applying lessons which they had learnt in long term provincial commands to lengthy civil wars between armies that were virtually identical in composition and had to range from one end of the empire to the other. It will be convenient to end with the principate of Vespasian (69 - 79 A.D.). The military diplomas, which will be discussed below, and the epitaphs of deceased auxiliaries of that period make it plain that the classic imperial auxiliary system was almost completely operational at that date. In analysing the historical record, an attempt will be made to isolate the regular or professional regiments in the "auxilia". As a starting point, a professional regiment will be regarded as one that shares the characteristics of those known from the diplomas. In most cases these had a number, and a distinctive name added to the generic title "ala" or "cohors" (usually the name of a people in the genitive case, as in "ala I Hispanorum"). Normally such regiments were stationed in provinces other than those where they were first raised. The soldiers serving in them were
receiving pay and were apparently required to complete at least twenty
five years of service before being entitled to discharge. Their commanders
were Roman citizens, usually at the commencement of their military careers.
It should be noted, however, that this was the fully developed form of
the end of the period set, and that earlier regular regiments are not
well documented. Accordingly it will be necessary to reconsider the
definition of "professional" in the light of different contexts and to pay
particular attention to regimental titulatures.

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

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

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

The most useful epigraphical evidence\(^1\) is found on the military diplomas\(^2\). These were bronze documents issued to auxiliaries recording grants of citizenship and other privileges after at least twenty-five years of active service. The diploma normally contained, besides the name of the recipient, the regiment in which he served, its commander, and a list of the regiments in the same provincial command containing soldiers receiving the same privileges. The exact date is always stated. Unfortunately, although the first known example can be dated to the last year of the principate of

\[/\text{Claudius}, \ldots\]
Claudius, the diploma do not become common until the later Flavian period.

The second major type of insessional evidence is numerically more numerous, the epitaphs of deceased auxiliaries. These tend to conform to fixed sets of forms, but are usually very brief. The custom of erecting tombstones inscribed in Latin was not common before the middle of the first century A.D.

Thirdly, the commanders of auxiliary regiments often had their auxiliary commands mentioned on their tombstones or on other monuments erected in their honour. These, and other less frequent types of auxiliary inscription, all suffer from the disadvantage that it is usually almost impossible to date them except in the broadest terms.

Given this sort of evidence, an attempt will be made to investigate the questions raised earlier in this introduction. The general conclusions found in earlier treatments of the "auxilia" will not be reconsidered except in so far as they throw light upon the problems raised in this inquiry or to the extent that they need modification in the light of what emerges.

What follows then may be regarded as "prolegomena" to a history of the early development of the professional Roman auxiliary army. The method adopted will be to review the statements of the literary authorities on the auxiliaries within their historical context, so as to lay bare the main thread of the historical development as far as possible. Epigraphical evidence will be used for this purpose only when it is definitely dated. Then the epigraphical evidence will be investigated in an attempt to establish what it can contribute to an account of the historical development.

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

1. In what follows all (and its plural form) will be treated as English words (i.e. will not be enclosed in quotation marks), so as to correspond to "cohort" and "cohorts".

2. Cf. Ender, "S.K." 1955, 252 f. The remarks by Sykes may be quoted: "The Roman 'auxilia', it is true, can be more important for tactics, and also for strategy, than the legions" ("S.K." XLI, 1959, 32) and "To neglect the 'auxilia' is elementary and superficial" (ibid. LII, 1962, 89).

3. The work will be cited simply as "Sheezean" in what follows.

4. To be cited simply as "Ender".

5. "Kraft", followed by a numeral, will refer to the individual auxiliaries listed at the end of his work.

6. Chiorius, "S.K." I, 1893, 1224 ff.; IV, 1900, 231 ff.: to be cited as "Chiorius", the page number making it clear whether vol. I or vol. IV is being referred to. To avoid the unnecessary multiplication of references, the ancient evidence for a particular regiment will not normally be given if it is available in Chiorius. Hence if a regiment is mentioned without references, it can be assumed that it is recorded in one or the other of Chiorius' articles. Most questions on legionary matters will be referred to Saller's article "logic" in "S.K." XII, 1924, 1211 ff. (to be quoted simply as "Saller" in what follows).


8. Burn, "S.K." 1966, 377 (in a review of "H.1.B."). This thesis is of course in no sense a reworking of Sheezean's book, which ranges far beyond the limits set for investigation.

10. The somewhat stricter definition in Kraft, p. 99, may be compared.

11. Cf. Syme's remark ('Hist.' IV, 1965, 361): "Now the Roman army functions as a channel of social advancement in patent - natives to the Roman franchise, soldiers to centurions, centurions to equestrian status, knights to eligibility for the upper order".

12. There is scant pre-Alexian psychological evidence.


14. Most of this thesis was written in South Africa, where the libraries do not contain all the material relevant to Roman provincial studies. In particular many major epigraphical and archaeological publications are unavailable. However standard references have been given wherever possible.
II. THE "AUXILIA" OF THE PERIOD OF THE CIVIL WARS
AT THE END OF THE REPUBLIC.

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

Τὰς συμμετοχὰς τῶν ἀνδρῶν τοῦ ἂντικίτου τῆς ἐλλάτοριας καὶ ἡττήματος αὐτῶν ἐπανέλθουσαν ὅσα ἐκ τῆς ἐμβολοσφάγος ἡμῶν ἔχει διάταγμα καὶ ἐπισκόπησις πλέον ἐπί. 

The situation has not altered greatly in modern times: as Inshimura² remarks, "es fehlt bis jetzt eine eingehende Untersuchung der Hilfsstreitkräfte in der Bürgerkriegszeit". The difficulties involved in reconstructing the military history of the late republic are great, and the non-Roman forces, if mentioned at all, most frequently appear simply as the "auxilia", "equites", "equitatus" or "levis armatura". There are, however, sufficient references, especially in the account of the Civil war of 49 - 45 by Caesar and his continuators and in Appian, to provide the basis for an attempt to discover the character of the auxiliary forces from 49 to 31 B.C.³ when Caesar arrived in Italy in 49 B.C., rumour⁴ had it that the greater part of his army consisted of barbarians. Cicero⁵ referred to his "auxilia gallorum". Appian⁶ gives the strength of the army which accompanied him to Ravenna as 500 infantry and 300 cavalry. This number probably indicates auxiliary cavalry, since the normal legionary cavalry was not mentioned separately as a rule. 22 cohorts, presumably legionaries, and 300 cavalry from the king of Noricum reached Caesar just before ......
before the siege of Corfiniun (Peusina)². We learn of a garrison of "equites calli atque hispani" whom Caesar had stationed in Thurii and whom Milo² attempted to bribe in 48 B.C.

Caesar drafted recruits from his old "provincia" into formations that were closer to legionary than auxiliary units. Such were the "milites Glanici qui sub axillo fuerunt". Glanum (Gouges-du-Phône)²² was a small enough town to provide sufficient soldiers to serve under a tribune and centurion, i.e., to form a cohort. Presumably the contingent represents a special effort on the part of the community for Caesar's mobilization of forces for the civil war. The names of the tribune, C. Licinius Caesar, and of the "optio", Cn. Roscius Servutus, who erected the monument on which the inscription recording the contingent occurs, obviously derive from a Licinius, servant and a Roscius. They, and the use of "tribunus", "centuriones", "milites", "auxilia", point to a close identification with Roman military methods and suggest that Caesar was content to allow them to approximate to a legionary cohort. This recalls the legion described by Suetonius²² as "ex Transalpinis conscipiant, vocabulo quoque Gallico - Alius unus appellabatur -, quass disciplina cultuque Romano institutae et ornata postea universa ciuitate donavit". This legion was presumably enlisted in 51 B.C. of Gauls who at the time did not possess Roman citizenship.

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

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

In describing the Spanish campaigns of 48 B.C. Caesar details the auxiliary forces available to the Pompeians before the battle of Ilerda. The text of the passage is corrupt: "acutae ceterioris provinciae at castratae ulterioris hispaniae cunctae circiter LXX\. equitumque utrimque provinciae circiter Media\". The number of auxiliary cohorts, 84, is far too large: it is best, with García y Bellido, to read 34. A further difficulty arises from the shields carried by the "auxilia": in a later passage it is the troops of Hispania Ulterior that are "castrati". "Castrati" are mentioned at a later stage, but not in such a way as to throw light on the problem. But, as Freyner-Nosman-Keusel point out, it is not necessary to assume that all the soldiers supplied by Hispania Ulterior were "acutati". The tribes who supplied recruits are given as the Baeticans, the Celtiberians, the Cantabrians and all the barbarians "qui ad Oceanum pertinent", later, reference is made to the "levis armatura" of the Baeticans.

The statement regarding Caesar's auxiliary forces also contains a textual problem: "auxilia passitus ex millis, quae omnibus superioribus bellis habuerat, et perem ex millis numerum, quae ipse paruerat nominatis ex omnibus ciuitatibus nobiliissimo at fortissimo quaque excitato; humanum generalis nominis ex Aquitanis cantanisque, qui ex militium provinciis attingunt, ... adicerat". There is no sure means
of restoring the number concealed by "nulla"; 10,000 and 16,000 have been proposed. It seems most natural to take "pares ... avexurum" as a reference to the 3000 original cavalry rather than to the infantry auxiliaries preceding them. The capacity in which the Aquitanians and the "montani" served is not stated. However, the arrival of Gallic cavalry and "sagittarii ex Kut-nia" is noted at a later stage, with the subsequent loss of 200 "sagittarii". This contingent of cavalry and the archers are distinguished from a motley crowd of about 600 with their slaves and children who arrived at the same time: "causus generis hominum milia circiter VI onseris literisque". By comparison they appear ready for immediate fighting and can accordingly be regarded as part of the specially recruited cavalry and of the "optimi generis hominum ex Aquitanis montanisque"; the contrast in quality is immediately apparent.

The Rutenians come from the district of Noves and can be classified as "montani". In fact the connection of the Aquitanians and the "montani" with the infantry and the type of Gallic cavalry mentioned beforehand is not clear; the lacuna in the text is only tentatively filled by "adiscorat". There is a further reference to Caesar's cavalry, archers and slingers and also to light-armed Germans. The first is too vague for further discussion, but the Germans can be regarded as part of the original auxiliaries of Caesar, since they are mentioned in the "Gallic war."

The 300 cavalry that accompanied Caesar as a personal bodyguard obviously formed no part of the forces discussed so far. During the course of the campaign certain of the Spaniards supporting the Pompeians deserted to Caesar - ...
Caesar - a "cohors illuretavonensis" from a people on the Ebro in Hispania Citerior and others referred to as "castrati auxiliaresque".

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

The major concentration of forces in 48 B.C. occurred at Carrachium and Pharsalus. There are two main lists of the auxiliaries which Pompey had at his disposal, one in Caesar, the other in Appian.

The Caesarian inventory is as follows:

3,000 archers from Crete, Macedon, Pontus, Cyzicus and other states;
1,200 slingers (described as "nullius ex cohortis secundarias II")
7,000 cavalry of these

600 were "Gallic" supplied by Deiotarus;
300 by Ariobarzanes of Cappadocia;
500 by Cotys of Thrace accompanied by his son Bades;
200 by Phasycrites of Macedon;
300 were "Cabinet" Gauls and Germans;
800 had been drafted from Pompey's own slaves and shepherds;
300 were sent by Tarremandarius Sabinus and Valens of Gallograecia;
200 by Antiochus of Commagene in Syria, mostly "hippotoxotae".
The rest were Thessalians, Bessan, Macedonians, Thessalians and members of other tribes and communities.

The "Sallii" of Scipio and the "Gallograeci" of Tarsandarius Custor and Donnibus are more commonly known as Gaetulians. The contingent sent by Pharnabazus was probably Thracian, although technically despatched from Macedonia. As Caesar himself explains, the "Gabinian" Gauls and Germans were troops "quos illi (i.e. Alexandrines) A. Gabinus praesidii causa apud regem Ptolemaeum reliquerat". They were part of the army left by Gabinus in 55 B.C. in support of Eutolmus Aulete.

The "hippotormata" were mounted archers such as had made the Parthians so effective in desert warfare.

Appian prefaced his list by stating that Pompey had brought five legions from Italy and "the cavalry attached to them". The contingent drafted from Pompey's slaves and shepherds, mentioned by Caesar, and the Gauls, mentioned by Appian, must have belonged to this category. When Appian turns to Pompey's complete forces, he confirms Caesar's total of 7,000 cavalry in all. This figure is given by Plutarch too. Appian does not break this figure down into detail, but specifies the origin of most of the contingents. He does not specify Scipio and Tarsandarius Custor or Donnibus in this passage, merely referring to eastern Gaetulians. Scipio's, however, is mentioned by name in the list of allies at the battle of Tharsalium and his assistance is confirmed by Cicero.

The "Gaetulians" are recorded, but not as Gauls or Germans. Cappadocian horse is also mentioned by Appian, but without the name of Arriobarzanes.
in the Thessalian list his brother Arisrades is named as the contributor from Cappadocia. Appian records the assistance of Antiochus of Commagene, without reference to the mounted archers. Thracian cavalry is not specifically recorded, although Thracians appear in the general Thessalian list. Dio mentions BADEIA twice. Appian records Macedonian assistance, but does not refer to the Sardians, Bessans or Thessalians.

He does, however, refer to Cilician cavalry, which is not listed by Caesar.

When the two authors' accounts of the infantry auxiliaries are compared, Caesar's Cretan archers are confirmed, but the Macedonians appear first as general Peloponnesian auxiliaries, later as Laconians (in the Thessalian list). The Pontic contingent is not formed of archers, but javelin-throwers. Syria appears generally only in the Thessalian list.

Caesar does not give the nationality of the slingers in his catalogue, but Appian says that Romey had Thracian slingers. There may, of course, have been others.

Peoples not listed by Caesar, but in Appian, are

Ionians,
Peloponnesians (who are distinguished from the Laconians in the Thessalian list),
Lesser Armenians,
Lemphylians,
Lycians.

In the Thessalian list other peoples and countries are named:

Athenians, .....
Athenians, Hellespont, Elymnians, Thrygians, Lydian, Phoenician, Jewish, Aramean, Cypriciotes, Khodians, and the greater Armenians. Other statements on Pompey's "auxilia" occur in the Caesarian corpus. At Uricum (Arles) he had a "praesidium marthinorum", the Marthinians being a local Illyrian tribe. Juba had sent a large force from north Africa. The German and Gallic cavalry, which Labienus was able to use in the African campaigns, came from Pompey's forces at Tharsilion: presumably it was part of the cavalry originally brought from Italy.

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

Far less has survived on the composition of Caesar's "auxilia"
for the Balkan campaigns. Appian\(^56\) gives the impossible figure of 10,000 for his cavalry, and calls them all Gauls. This is far greater than Pompey's total of 7,000 and contradicts Caesar's\(^59\) statement just noted concerning Pompey's superiority in cavalry. Flutarch\(^60\), on the other hand, gives a figure of 1,000. Caesar\(^51\) himself states that he crossed from Brundisium with 500; Appian\(^62\) and Flutarch\(^63\) give 600 instead. Caesar\(^64\) had among his cavalry a contingent of Allobroges under the command of two brothers, Mucilus and Aquila. The brothers and some of their adherents defected to Pompey. No figures are given, but the tone of the incident suggests that the contingent was comparatively large. Appian\(^65\) mentions Macedonians who got drunk at Comphi (Paleo-Philippi) in Thessaly; these probably included cavalry. In the Thessalian list of auxiliaries he mentions cavalry from both Transalpine and Disalpine Gaul. Vio\(^67\) mentions Spanish "auxilia"; presumably cavalry were included. Gabinius had attempted to bring 3,000 horse to Caesar through Illyricum with 15 cohorts of legionaries; most of these, however, were destroyed\(^68\). Antony brought 800 horse to Dyrrachium, sending back to Italy for more\(^69\). How many, if any, came, is not known. Taking the 300 - or 600 - which Caesar brought and the 300 of Antony, 1300 or 1400 are known to have reached Caesar. Possibly more were still expected from Italy. If the 300 of Gabinius be added, it may be assumed that Caesar was working to a figure of 4,000 to 5,000 cavalry. Due to the losses of Gabinius and of Caesar himself at Dyrrachium, when 200 cavalry fell\(^70\), the figure of 1,000 cavalry at Thessalus does not seem far wrong\(^71\).
At the end of 48 B.C. Caesar became involved in the Alexandrine war, which occupied him till the beginning of 47, when he went to Asia Minor to deal with Pharnaces. He took 800 cavalry to Alexandria. After the outbreak of the war he summoned Cretan archers and cavalry from the Nabataean Arabs under Balchus to his assistance. Other unspecified "auxilia" are mentioned. During the fighting, light armed troops and Gallic cavalry are mentioned; presumably the latter were part of the 5,000 that had accompanied him at the outset. Some of his cavalry were Germans. Meanwhile Mithridates of Pergamus brought him reinforcements from Syria and Cilicia. Antipater got further assistance from Syria and Arabia, and sent Caesar a force of heavy infantry.

Appian states that Pharnaces had been encouraged to resist Caesar by the Pompeians after Pharsalus. Pharnaces, however, claimed that he had not sent "auxilia" to Pompey. In the first stage of the war, Domitius Calvinus, Caesar's legate, was supported by Caelius, who had joined the Caesarian cause after the defeat of Pompey. He provided two legions "quae illa discipline atque eratura nostra compluris annos constitutas habebat" as well as 100 cavalry; Ariobarzanes of Cappadocia also supplied 100 cavalry. "Auxilia" were also summoned from Cilicia. Domitius Calvinus was further supported by a "legio pontica" described as follows "quae ex tumultuariis militibus in Parto confecta erat". The greater part of this legion and Caelius' forces were killed in the ensuing engagement with Pharnaces. When Caesar arrived at the scene of operations, he ordered Caelius to bring his legion "quae ex gerens ciuils
suorum Deiotarum armatura disciplinaque nostra constitutam habebat" obviously what remained of his earlier two legions - and all his cavalry.

at the end of 47 B.C. Caesar was in Africa when he narrowly avoided defeat at the engagement of Isusina. In 46, however, he emerged the victor at the battle of Thapsus. Before considering the "auxilia" involved in Caesar's "African war", the African campaign of Curio in 49 can be noticed. Curio arrived in Africa from Sicily with 300 cavalry and light-armed troops. Later he sent to Sicily for further cavalry.

The auxiliaries comprised Gauls and presumably Germans, since these were later incorporated in the army of Labienus. The Gauls included Allobroges.

The only "auxilia" of L. Atius Varus that are recorded are those supplied by Juba, the king of Numidia. These included 600 Numidian cavalry and 4,000 infantry, and 200 Gallic and Spanish cavalry from the king's personal bodyguard.

The author of the "Bellum Africum" assigns Labienus a speech in which he lists his auxiliaries. These comprise Numidian cavalry and light-armed troops; German and Gallic cavalry; conscripts from "híbrid", freedmen and slaves; royal "auxilia"; 120 elephants; innumerable cavalry;
12,000 men in legions conscripted "ex culuis exsenti generis";

Then Labienus is credited with having:

1600 gallic and German cavalry;

8000 Numidian cavalry;

1000 cavalry brought by M. Petreius;

4 times as many infantry and light-armed troops;

archers;

slingers;

several "hippotoxotae".

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

The difficulty is increased by textual uncertainties. The Numidian cavalry number 8000 in a variant reading. Some of the German and Gallic cavalry had come from Tharsius; others were taken over from the defeated forces of Auric. It is not clear whether the "hibridi" were half-Hellenic, half-native, or half-free, half-slave. These, together with the slaves and freedmen, had been trained as ortho-arched cavalry. The royal "auxilia" recall the 4 "royal legions" mentioned in the first chapter of the work, and the 12 elephants and "innumerable cavalry" are recorded in the same place. The "innumerble cavalry", therefore, do not conceal a separate entry. The 12 legionaries of all sorts of men would have formed 2 complete legions. In chapter 1 sec. 10 has 14 legions.

Presumably the 12,000 were not actual legionaries in the sense of Roman citizens, but provincials trained in legionary formation. M. Petreius is earlier credited with bringing 1100 (or 500 in a variant version).
select Numidian cavalry and infantry of the same people. He was accom-
panied by On. Vima who earlier had 3,000 "Mauri". The latter appear to
have been part of Juba's forces. As the phrase stands, the "four times
as many infantry and light-armed troops" would naturally refer to the
16,000 cavalry of Viminus; it may be intended to balance the 12,000
"legionaries of all sorts" above. Or it may refer to the novel tactic
adopted by Labienus of interspersing light-armed infantry and archers with
his cavalry and be an attempt to give the proportion involved.

On his arrival in Africa Hannibal had scarcely 500 cavalry, but it
was not long before he had up to 2,000. Some of these, if not all, were
Gauls, to judge from the statement that 30 Gallic horse routed 2,000
of the "Mauri". His archers are also mentioned.

The forces of the Tarentines were consolidated in the succeeding months.
Scipio had 3,000 cavalry and 5,000 elephants supplied by Juba. His
forces included Numidians and Maetuliens. Attius Varus made use of
Maetuliens as rowers and marines. Considius Longus protected himself
with a mercenary band of Numidians and Maetuliens, later arming his slaves
and some gladiators too. Appian states that, at the battle of Thapsus,
Scipio had 14,000 cavalry, the majority of whom were presumably
Numidians. Earlier, Labienus was credited with 11,000 (or 12,000)
cavalry together with an unmentioned number of cavalry from "tribrides" and
servile sources. Scipio's 3,000 would bring the total to 14,000 (or
13,000).

Added to these were the forces of Juba, given by Appian as 30,000

/infantry, ...
infantry, 20,000 Numidian cavalry and 60 elephants, besides "many" pikemen. The figures in the "Bellum Africum"\textsuperscript{115} are 3 legions (i.e. up to 18,000 men), a "large number" of light-armed troops (presumably included in Appian's "infantry"), 50 elephants, 800 cavalry with bridles and a "large number" of Numidian cavalry without bridles. Suetonius\textsuperscript{116} makes Caesar exaggerate these figures deliberately for the psychological effect on his troops and so cannot serve as a check.

Cato's forces were used for the defence of Utica. He had brought cavalry\textsuperscript{117} to Africa from the aftermath of the battle of Thapsacus. At Utica he held invies of freedmen, "Afri", slaves and men "cuiquosodi generis"\textsuperscript{118}.

On the other side, Caesar's forces continued to grow from supplements from Sicily and by desertions from the Samnites\textsuperscript{119}. At his camp outside Modinum Caesar armed his Celtic and Edonian auxiliaries\textsuperscript{120}. His cavalry included Gauls, Spaniards, and, by desertion, Casellians\textsuperscript{121}. His archers came from Numidia and Syria, among other unnamed places\textsuperscript{122}. He had elephants brought from Italy, dams for fighting purposes, than to accustom his men and their horses to them\textsuperscript{123}. In a raid he acquired 22 of Sulla's caesals\textsuperscript{124}. By the battle of Thapsacus Caesar had at least 2000 archers and slingers, 4000 to 5000 cavalry, light-armed troops and deserters. He was assisted by Sittius\textsuperscript{125}, a Roman who had taken service under Scipio\textsuperscript{126}. of Numantia with a band of Italian and Spanish followers who had accompanied him to Africa after he had been compromised.
in the Catilinarian conspiracy. He was not present at Pharsalus, but was of
great service, since he prevented Juba from opposing Caesar with all his
forces by attacking him in the rear.

Prior to the battle of Munda in 45 B.C. the sons of Pompey the
Great had been organizing resistance to Caesar in Spain. Of the legions
available to the elder, Gna. Pompeius, the author of the "Bellum Hispaniense"
says that "duae fuerunt uernaculae, quae a Trebonio transfugeraunt; una
flecte ex colonis quae fuerant in his regionibus; ... reliquae ex
fugituis auxiliares consistebant" (thus the Oxford Classical Text).

Whether the above reading or that of Hommen "uernacula et li," 126 be
accepted it is clear that Gna. Pompeius was being forced to use non-citizens
in his legionary formations. That this was not surprising, for, as
the passage states, he had other "legions" consisting of runaway slaves and
auxiliaries (accepting the emendation "auxiliarium"). The legion from
the colonies, however, would have comprised Roman citizens. 127 The auxili-
arium proper were drawn from the Spaniards and the Celtiberians according
to Appian 128. Lusitanians, however, also participated and were prepared to
continue resistance to Caesar even after Munda. 129 Gna. Pompeius also had
some Allobrogues that Juba had given to him from the captives taken after
the defeat of Curio; these later deserted to Caesar. 130 According to
Dio 131, the Pompeians were supported by Bocchus, who sent his 
and his sons to them. At the battle of Munda their auxiliary forces are
said to have totalled 6000 light-armed and the same number of "auxiliaria",
preumably mainly cavalry.

Aesear's
Caesar's auxiliaries included Sauls; he was later joined by Curius's Allobroges, as mentioned above. He had hoped for Spanish cavalry prior to his arrival, but this did not materialize. Later a Spanish chieftain - "rex nomine Indor" - joined him. He received report from Bogus of Mauretania. By the final engagement his cavalry was said to number four.

Little can be recovered concerning the non-civil war during the dictatorship of Caesar. When Vatinium was sent to Illyricum in 47 B.C., he was given 3 legions and a large force of cavalry. For Caesar's projected expedition against the Belgae and the Punic army, 10,000 cavalry were assembled in Italy for transport across the Adriatic. Archers and light-armed troops were also gathered. Meanwhile Caelius Pansa had turned against Caesar in Syria. Antipater in Judea sent the Caesarian assistance, while Aesopus gained the support of Achaedamus, an Arab, as well as of the Parthians. The incident dragged on after the death of Caesar.
NOTES

1. "B.C." 11, 1v, 7, 289.
3. Dio XLI, 8, 6.
   Parker, 1928, 210 f.
7. "B.C." 1, 16, 5.
8. III, 22, 3.
10. "R.E." 1954, 143; 1964, 146 f. For a discussion of the date,
12. "Jul." 24, 2 and vary ad loc. for the date.
17. For a discussion of the figures involved cf. Neele, 1923,
    vol. III, 388 ff., and for the Spanish "auxilia" cf. Garcia y Bellido,
    "Liser." 1963, 220 ff. For "castrati" cf. von Dommowski, "R.E."
    III, 1897, 1322 f.
20. 1, 55, 1; 71, 4; 75, 2; 76, 1.
21. ad 1, 46, 7.
23. 1, 48, 7.
24. 1, 39, 2.
25. 1, 51, 1; 3.
26. 1, 21, 2.
28. 1, 83, 2.
29. II, 101 36.  
30. "B.C." 1, 41, 1.  
31. I, 60, 4.  
32. 1, 78, 1 - 2: it can be assumed from 2 that the deserters were not confined to the legionaries.  
33. I, 34, 4; 56.  
34. I, 57, 3.  
36. I, 56, 3; 57, 4.  
37. III, 4, 3 - 6.  
38. Appian catalogues Romsey's "auxilia" in two separate places, "B.C." II, 8, 44, 202, before the battle of Byrrhacium; and II, 10, 70, 292 ff., before the battle of Pharsalus.  
41. Khasycopolis was more commonly known as Khaecuporis; cf. Kahrstedt, "K.G." IA, 1914, 255 f.  
44. Lassen, "B.M." VIII, 1915, 1425 ff. refers only to the pre-Roman period; for the Roman period cf. Fiebig, ibid., II, 191, 1744.  
45. "Flut. comp." 64, 1: "Scaen." 42, 2. Plutarch's description of the cavalry is as follows: δυπάνε σφίγγαν καὶ διέλθησαν ἑπεξερχομένος τὰ χρυσά, διακοσμηθέν τίνα καὶ κτιτορική φιλοτέχνειαν. Romans and Italians, however, could have formed only a small part of the cavalry.  
47. ILI, 51, 2; 63, 1.

48. Caesar does, however, mention a fleet and a legion from Sicilia ("B.C." III, 3, 1; 4, 1).

49. From the list of edicts quoted by Josephus ("A.J." XIV, 14, 13, 228; 234; 14, 14, 232; 16, 16, 234; 19, 19, 240) regarding Caesar's exemption of Jews from military service it is clear that, in particular, there had been recruiting in Ephesus and Sardis. A similar decree exists for Delos ("A.J." XIV, 14, 14, 231 - 2).

50. Caesar mentions Asia, which would include Appian's Ionia, Pamphylia, Hellespont, Lydia, Athens, Bithynia, Phoenicia and Rhodes ("B.C." III, 3, 1, 5, 3), only in connection with the fleet.


52. "B. Alex." 51, 1.

53. Rüdiger, "R.S." All, 1924, 260 ff. (no. 6).

54. "B. Afr." 19, 3, reading "Butyroto".

55. All, 34, 2; 44, 1.


57. "B.C." III, 43, 3; 86, 4; 44, 6.


59. Cf. n. 57 above.


62. "B.C." 11, 8, 54, 221.


64. "B.C." III, 59 ff.

65. "B.C." 11, 10, 64, 268.

66. II, 14, 70, 291: "Cisalpine" depends upon a reasonable emendation.

67. All, 59, 2.


/71, .....
That Caesar was inadequately supplied with cavalry at
the battle is shown by his use of "antesignani" with the horsemen
(84, 1). Appian ("B.C." II, 1, 76, 289) also gives a figure of
1200 for the actual battle. Plutarch's figure of 1000 ("Cæs." 42, 2)
must refer to the battle itself only.

Fluss, "K. A." AIV, 1920, 857 f. (no. 3).
"B. Alex." 1, 1.
17, 3.
29, 4.
26, 1; Jos. "A. V." AIV, 6, 1, 126. For Sathridates, cf. Geyer,
"R. W." XIV, 1932, 2255 (no. 15).
Jos. "B.C." I, 4, 3, 187; cf. "A. J." AIV, 8, 1, 128 - 9; 8, 2, 1391
give 3000. In 10, 3, 193, however, 1500 is the figure. For
"B. C." II, 12, 87.
"B. Alex." 69, 3; cf. Dio XXXI, 25, 3.
Münzer, "K. A." IV, 1903, 1419 ff. (no. 43).
"B. Alex." 54; cf. Dio XXXI, 90, 2. Rice Holmes (1923, vol. III,
596) objects to the figure of 1000 cavalry supplied by each of the
kings. It sounds small, but may have been determined by what was
then available rather than by what was necessary.
"B. Alex." 54, 5.
40, 4.
56, 2.
40, 4.
66, 11a, 1921, 247 ff. (no. 11).
App. "B.C." II, 7, 46, 1A.
Dio XLI, 30, 3.
App. "B.C." II, 7, 44, 1751; Dio XLI, 41, 3. For Duka, cf. Lassen a u,
"K. A." II, 1916, 2381 ff. (no. 1) and above, p. 18.
Other references to Latinius' cavalry do not give figures or nationalities: 13, 1; 16 - 19; 61, 2 (the latter, since "freneti", probably of "hibridi" and of servile origin).

97. Cf. pp. 8; 21 above.

98. "B. Afr." 1, 4: "equitatus infinitus" as compared with "equitatus innumerabilis" (which should be ablative) in 19, 3.


102. Cf. "B. Afr." 6, 1 - 3, where the "Pauri" are part of Juba's forces.

103. 13, 1.

104. In 38 B.C. his governor in Bithynia again, Caesius Longinus (cf. Münzer, "Röm." III, 1897, 1743 ff. (no. 74)) had been ordered to collect "auxilia" for an attack on Juba. He is known to have had at least 3000 cavalry ("B. Alex." 50, 4; 57, 3).

105. "B. Afr." 1, 1; cf. 1, 5; 2, 1.

106. 6, 3. Cf. above, p. 82.


108. 20, 2.

109. 25, 3.

110. 52, 3; cf. 61, 2.

111. 62, 1.

112. 43 (reading "atipendii"?); 93, 1. For Considius Longus cf. Münzer, "Röm." IV, 1741 ff. (no. 6).


114. Ibid.


119. Cf. the useful discussion in Nice Holmes, 1923, vol. III, 534 ff., whose figures are used below.

120. "B. Afr." 24, 1.

121. 34, 1; cf. 27, 1, for fraternization between Caesar's cavalry and Labienus' Gauls and Germans: 34, 2; 56, 3; Dio XIII, 4, 2.


123. 72, 3; Dio XIII, 4, 1.


125. 48, 1; cf. 25, 2; 36, 4; 93, 3; 95, 2; 96; App. "B.C." IV, 7, 54, 230 - 3; Dio XIII, 3, 1 - 4. For Attius, cf. Münzer, "A. R." IIIA, 1927, 409 ff. (no. 3).


127. "B. hisp." 7, 4 - 5.

128. Ishihara, "Ann. Lat. Class. Sueor" 1965/6, 105, n. 1, prefers the reading of Mommaen that gives only one "legio vernacula": Garcia y Bellido, "Lar." 1936, 222, accepts two "legiones vernaculae". The number is not of such consequence here, although there is no reason to assume that because Caesar ("B.C." II, 26, 4) mentions only a single "vernacula" under Verre, that there was not a second by this date. There were slaves in these legions ("B. hisp." 12, 1; for other slaves in legions cf. 34, 2. App. "B.C." II, 15, 13, 437, where their training is said to have lasted for four years; cf. 12, 87, 366).

129. Cf. the "equites Romani partia ex urbe partia ex provinciis ad milia III" who fell at Munda ("B. hisp." 31, 9).


133. Asia, 36, 1. Klebe (l. c. n. 126 above); Nice Holmes (1923, vol. III, 543, n. 1) and Mommaen (1959, 137, n. 1) deny this, but sudden changes of slaves in such wars are not unknown. It may be noted that in an internal dispute in Africa, Probus (Klebe, "Afr." III, 1897, /608 f. ......
608 f. (no. 2), who had rendered Cassius assistance in 47 B.C. ("B. Alex." 58 - 9) and Arabin (Alab. "R. S." 14, 1895, 363), whose men had been trained by the sons of Tose [p. 116, 32], and supported Sextius, the Caesarian governor of Numidia.

135. 32, 2.
136. 2, 2 - 3.
137. 14, 3.
139. "B. Asp." 36, 1.
142. III, 3, 24, 92.
143. Minzer, "R. S." Ill, 1897, 1190 f. (no. 56).
III. THE "CIVILIA" OF THE LATE REPUBLICAN PERIOD:

E. THE SECOND TRIUMVIRATE:

Cicero\(^1\) was able to castigate Antony for surrounding himself with a bodyguard of Italianans, even in the senate.

The first large concentration of troops after the death of Caesar was made at the battle of Mutina in 43 B.C. in a speech put in his mouth by Sic\(^2\), Cicero accused Antony of using barbarian troops against Italy. Similar charges occur in Cicero\(^3\) himself. Once there is a concrete reference to Gauls and Germans\(^4\). Antony was able to escape from Mutina with 300 cavalry, many of them unarmed\(^5\). He proceeded to recruit men by opening slave barracks on country estates and taking "some genus hominum"\(^6\). Later Decimus Brutus' auxiliaries defected to him\(^7\). After joining Cassius in Gaul, Antony was able to return to Italy with 16,000 cavalry\(^8\).

Sic\(^9\) informs us that, at an early stage of the hostilities, Cicero\(^1\) adds that armours were also involved. Decimus Brutus had a great number of "auxilia equitatae"\(^10\). Some of his "auxilia cavalry" remained true to him even after he was forced to flee, serving as his bodyguard\(^11\). He had also trained a large number of gladiators\(^12\).

Events next transferred to the East, where the triumvirs accused Marcus Brutus and Cassius of seeking the assistance of barbarians\(^13\).

Appian\(^14\) lists the auxiliary forces of Brutus as follows:

---

\(^{1}\) Cicero
\(^{2}\) Sis
\(^{3}\) Cicero
\(^{4}\) Cicero
\(^{5}\) Cicero
\(^{6}\) Cicero
\(^{7}\) Cicero
\(^{8}\) Cicero
\(^{9}\) Cicero
\(^{10}\) Cicero
\(^{11}\) Cicero
\(^{12}\) Cicero
\(^{13}\) Appian
\(^{14}\) Appian
\(^{15}\) Appian
Gallic and
Lusitanian cavalry;

3500 Thracian;
Ilyrian;
Parthian " and
Thessalian cavalry.

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

Cassius was assigned the following by Appian:

2000 Spanish and
Gallic cavalry;

4000 "hippotoxotae" - Arabs,
Bedes and
Parthians,

5000 cavalry from the client kings of Mesalitis;

a large force of infantry from the same source.

Earlier he had mentioned the support of Ammopogona of Thrace, who had 5000 cavalry and from Dio we learn that he acquired some of Doloabella's cavalry in Syria together with Silician and Galatian support. The extent of the Parthian assistance given to Cassius is difficult to determine.

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

Cassius himself had received some Parthian troops, but they had not stayed long enough to render him effective aid. A certain number of Parthian cavalry..."
"hippotoxotus" had joined Cassius when he defeated Lolabella, apparently on an unofficial basis. Appian\(^9\) says that they were attracted to him because of the reputation he had gained as Crassus' quaestor before the battle of Carrhae. These Cassius sent back to the king of Elydia, with a request for a larger force of auxiliaries. However, these arrived too late\(^10\). Their non-participation is confirmed in Appian's\(^12\) account of Brutus and Cassius after their final defeat. Yet he\(^18\) ascribes them a total of 20,000 cavalry, which can only be derived from the figures given earlier if the 4000 "hippotoxotus" are included. Presumably only "non-official" Elydian "hippotoxotus" were included in the 2000. It would appear that the Elydians were not as yet prepared to commit themselves to open assistance of a Roman general, according to Josephus\(^19\) Cassius decided to give military support to Herod in return to the hope of receiving great assistance from him in return when he was more securely in control of the kingdom. But actually placed him in command of a Roman force of infantry and cavalry, and anointed him tribune, presumably as military experts.

Such fame is known about the auxiliaries assisting the tribunes at Philippi. The Elydian and Lycian were said to have been friendly to them. This is not surprising, in view of the harsh treatment meted out to them by Brutus and Cassius, but no actual aid on their part is recorded. Octavian had the support of some 20,000 Macedonians\(^31\), Macecupolin's brother, and joint-ruler of Thrace, Rhonas, decided to support Antony rather than the Republicans and gave him 300,000 drachmas\(^32\). In all, Octavian
and Antony were credited with 13,000 cavalry.

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

Though the contest between Sextus Pompeius and the triumvirs which ended at the battle of Naulochus in 36 B.C. was largely naval, both sides collected supporting squadrons which participated in the action. Many of Sextus' recruits were of servile or freedman status, and were drawn from Italy. While still in Spain in 45 B.C., he had been joined by consular, a Lisaus, a force raised from mercenaries, which had succeeded in returning to Africa from where it was detached for training in S. Africa in Spain. But he again changed allegiance, supporting the Caesarian governor of Africa, whether he later decided to render assistance to Pompeius or not, is not known. Pompeius was able to deploy light-armed Numidian troops in Sicily, but their origin is not stated. Reference is also made to 500 auxilia who joined him at an early stage, and to cavalry which he used in Italy and Sicily.

Octavian, on the other hand, managed to gather 20,000 cavalry and more than 5000 light-armed troops in Sicily. The light-armed
troops were partly acquired from those brought to him when Pompeius'
admiral, Menorix, deserted to him. 1000 others were with him when
he first landed in Sicily. On that occasion he was accompanied by
500 cavalry, and 2000 auxilia included. Those must be men who volunteered for or were drafted from colonies in
Italy, but not enrolled in octavian's legions. The auxiliaries included
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reference has already been made to the fact that, before the battle of Philippi, Cassius had sent his Parthian troops back to the Parthian king, with a request for a larger force. Appian reports that when this force arrived after the battle, it ravaged Syria and other nearby areas. He does not make clear how an ostensibly allied force turned into enemies and caused extensive damage. The Parthians, however, can hardly be other than those who accompanied Labienus into Syria and Asia Minor in the winter of 41/40 B.C. What Labienus' precise position was, and what his relationship to the Parthians was, is most obscure, but the assistance rendered to him by the Parthians was far removed from the traditional pattern of the auxilia of the losses. The Parthians had not been prepared to assault Rome, or even look in any substantial way, and were now intervening, as their example. This was the situation which faced Antony when he assumed responsibility for the eastern parts of the Roman empire.

Some indications survive concerning the role of the "auxilia" in his Parthian expeditions. As, or rather, the Parthians, operating against the Parthians on his behalf in the early stages, decided to support Herod of Judaea with Roman troops, as Cassius had done. In 39, an army of troops that comprised at least five auxilia comprised at least five auxilia. These auxilia, if not of full Roman legionary status, were presumably at least legubally trained and drawn up in legionary cohort formation. In 37, Herod received two legions and a thousand cavalry. The cavalry must have been auxiliares, and Josephus later says of five "cohorts" that they had recently been recruited in Syria and did not contain the normal stiffening of seasoned
In 37 the Romans supported Herod with "cavalry and infantry" again, elsewhere specified as two legions and a considerable force of Syrian auxiliaries, whether this distinction is meant to imply that the "legions" in this case were not comprised of Syrian recruits cannot be definitely decided. It must have been numbers rather than quality or nationality that counted.

Such were the military measures taken to secure one area of strategic importance in a confrontation with Parthia. Antony settled the affairs of other client kingdoms in the Eastern world, but no such details concerning military arrangements survive. At the end of 37 he profited from an internal Parthian dimension which resulted in several Parthian nobles and their followers joining him, but no their chief figure was later allowed to return to Parthia, it is not known whether any Parthian soldiers remained in Antony's forces. Plutarch mentions some of the auxiliaries whom he had in Armenia in 36. These included 10,000 Spanish and Gallic cavalry, described as

and distinguished from 50,000 cavalry and light-armed troops of other *koina*. In a later passage javelin-throwers and slingers are named. Antony was supported by many allied kings, one of whom was Roman of Antun; the most important however was Ardashar of Armenia (who however later left him in the lurch) who brought 6000 cavalry and 7000 infantry. These contingents of the allied kings are presumably to be regarded as forming part of the figure of

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

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

In the absence of Appian, Plutarch is our main source for the forces gathered for action in 31 B.C. We had happened to Pompey before Corinth, where we laid upon the western element in Antony's army. 

Karnutsen puts this in a striking light: "we assembled the kings of the Hellenes and others under their own leaders; we assembled Antony under the kings of the oriental kingdoms as such as the kings summoned him." Fern has shown that the character of Antony's army remained basically Italian.

Plutarch gives the following names of those who either came to Antony or sent him auxiliaries:

- Bocchus of Libya (a mistake for Bocchus of Mauretania),
- Herconius (the alienized form of Hercondamus) of Sicilia,
- Arceadius of Capadocia,
- Philadelphus of Pamphylia,
- Mithridates of Commagene,
- Medam of Thrace,
- Policren of Pontus,
Halanus of Arabia,
herod of Judaea,
Amyntas of Lycaonia and Galatia,
the Bades.

He also states that assistance had been promised by Bocome of the Etae,71 and that Antony had 12,000 cavalry72 and was able to put 20,000 archers73 on board for the naval engagement. Dio74 adds the names of other allies: Isablicusa, an Arab, who was tortured for suspected treachery, and the Syrians, who deserted to Octavian75, and mentions a force of gladiators76 at Cyzicus that remained loyal to the end.

Further items of information can be gathered concerning some of these allies. Philadelphus of Caphlagonia went over to Octavian,77 Antony hoped to enlist other Thracians besides those that came with Sadala; according to Dio78 he sent to Thrace and Macedonia for mercenaries. At first sight it may appear strange to put Macedonia in the East, but it is so classified in Plutarch79 in the passage referred to above, where the East, which is given as Antony's sphere of influence, is made to reach Illyria. The contribution of Herod of Judaea was small, and was diverted to Arabia.80 Amyntas and Valterius defected with their Galatians to Octavian.81 The Bades were presumably those for whom Antony had exchanged Roman soldiers with the Median king in 33 B.C.82

In the above list there is no mention of western auxiliaries, especially Gallic and Spanish cavalry. As noted above,83 Antony had /10,000 ....
10,000 of these on his Parthian expedition in 36 B.C., in which he lost a total of 4,000 cavalry. This means that at least 6,000 of the Gauls and Spaniards were still available. After the death of Cleopatra, Octavian gave Herod 400 Gauls who had served as her bodyguard, which is another indication that Gauls were available to Antony. Horace's reference to the defection of “Galli” to Octavian at the battle of Actium:

“at huc frequenter urterunt bis mille equos

Galli canentes Caesaris”

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

Reference has already been made to the defections of auxiliaries from Antony to Octavian. Octavian had some eastern supporters of his own, such as Nurecles the Spartan. The role of the Dacian Cotiso is not clear. According to Dio, the Dacians had approached Octavian, but failing in their requests, had gone over to Antony, without however rendering him any real assistance. Suetonius retails an item of Antonine propaganda against Octavian, that he had betrothed his daughter Julia to Cotiso, “Catarum rex”. These references to Dacians and Octans,
as well as the hoped-for assistance from Sicomes already referred to,
make it likely that both Antony and Octavian felt it necessary to secure,
if not the active co-operation, at least the neutrality or favour of this
area on the lower Danube as part of their over-all strategy. It is
unlikely that the negotiations resulted in the actual dispatch of
auxiliaries. Nothing more can be recovered about Octavian’s “auxilia”,
except that Plutarch\(^2\) credits him with about the same number of cavalry
as Antony had, which was 12,000.
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Tiberius. Since in the next sentence here he refers to an action of
Tiberius in Spain, it is not clear whether the remark should be taken of
the Tiberian period, or whether it can be made to refer to the time of
the end of the Spanish war under Augustus. Strabo does not specify
the capacity in which the Cantabrians fought for Rome: Dio⁶ says that
they were good javelin throwers.

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

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

The long German war of the principate of Augustus started with
the expedition of Drusus across the Rhine in 12 B.C. A few items con-
cerning the "auxilii" in this sphere survive. In 12 B.C. Drusus was
supported by Aesarian infantry, and in 14 by Norians led by the tribal
commanders Chrestinotus and Victorius, called "tribuni" by the epitomator
of Livy⁷. The Varian disaster of 9 B.C. brings the next notice. Just
before.....
before the outbreak of the revolt, Varus was waiting for assistance from leaders of the Cheruscan tribe who were at that stage still ostensibly loyal. From the fact that the leader of the rebellion, Arminius, ordered the arrest of the chief of the Cheruscan tribe during the revolt, it is probable that the Romans had received auxiliary assistance from that tribe as well.

Velleius Paterculus describes the troops slain as follows: "tris legiones totidemque alae et sex cohortes" (Suetonius merely says "tribus legionibus ... et auxilia omnibus caesina"). This amounts to three cavalry and six infantry auxiliary regiments involved in the battle itself. It is presumably these to which Dio refers in his enumeration of the losses:

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

Prior to his change of front against the Romans, Arminius had been granted Roman citizenship and equestrian status for military services rendered as leader of a Cheruscan contingent. Tacitus merely says of him "in castris romanis duxerit,..." but Velleius calls him "adstitutio...."
"additum militiae nostra prioris consilii". If the term "militia nostra prior" could be definitely interpreted, it would be possible to discover where Armius had served with his Germanic soldiers. Velleius is known to have served in Greece, Armenia, Germany, and Hannibal. The approach has been to regard Armius as a regular "prefectus alae" in the Roman sense who can be associated with suitable stages of Velleius' career.

This would imply he had seen professional service in the empire as if he had been a native Roman of equesrian status. But in view of the possibility of understanding "militia" in the sense of "expedition", it seems preferable to take the phrase in the sense of Velleius' former expedition or campaign, i.e., and reasonably, von Retzbach. As, however, takes as Velleius' starting point his last campaign under Germanicus and refers the joint service of Velleius and Armius to the Germanic campaigns of Germanicus. But in the context immediately preceding the remark about Armius, Velleius had regularly been minister of the service under Germanicus, first in Germany, then in Phoenicia (44-45, 47-48, respectively). It seems unfair to return to the older view and relate Armius' Roman services to Velleius' campaigns in 44-45 a.D. The Velleian passage cannot be taken as evidence for the service of Armius, let alone of a Germanic contingent, outside Germany.

The consequences of the Varian disaster should be noted. Augustus felt that the Gauls and Germans in his bodyguard now posed a threat to security and sent them away from Rome to an island. He had been using German "corporis candidens" since the battle of Actium, when they had...
replace a "Manus Calaparritanorum" (from Calaforra in Spain). Augustus
was continuing the use of foreign bodyguards that had been a feature of
the late republic. 25 To deal with the critical shortage of suitable
recruits for the army at this juncture, he resorted for the second time to
another late republican device, the enlistment of freedmen. These were
kept apart from the citizen soldiers and armed differently. 26

The Sannician Revolt of 63 B.C. sheds some information
concerning "auxilia" but earlier fighting in the Sannician area had led
to a series of alliances and connections that should be noted first.
Licinius Crassus was engaged in warfare there in 29 B.C., at one stage he
was assisted by Olex, a Dacian chief. As a result of these services which
he rendered, Olex was later recognized by Augustus as a friend and ally
of the Roman people. 27 The Sannician tribe of the Iazydians was spared
when the rest of the Iazydians were punished for not having remained
"friendly" to the Romans. 28 It is more than likely that they had supplied
the Romans with auxiliares on a scale of their friendliness.

In the course of his campaigns against the Sarmatians in 12 B.C.,
Vitellius was able to use the "Sarmatian auxilia" - auxilia, as Dio 29 says,
because they were1jiniinaries to the Romans and had the same methods
of fighting.

In 5 B.C., when Vitellius was preparing his great offensive
against Sarmatian, the Iazydians were ordered to supply what Dio 30
calls "valerianum." To the army that the Iazydians of Iazydians,
valerianum ...
Valerius Messallinus, was collecting for Tiberius. When they assembled, they realized their strength, and revolted. The assembling of the troops must have taken place without Roman supervision. They must have formed a contingent of "socii" under native control and direction. Presumably other tribes in the area had also been required to contribute men. One thinks of the Pannonians, who, according to Velleius, had a knowledge of Roman discipline which they could only have gained from extensive co-operation with the Romans as auxiliaries. The rebels had available about 20,000 infantry and 900 cavalry.

Velleius refers to concentrations of Roman troops comprising auxiliaries on three occasions. The first two report a disaster in which the Romans were surrounded: "pars ... circumfusa quinque legionibus nostris auxiliaribusque et equitatui regio (quippe magnus Thracae manus ... chosetalces, Thraciae rex, in adiutorium eius bellius secus trahetabat) ... clades intulit" (where it is clear that "auxiliares" are kept distinct from the allied Thracian cavalry): "deventae regione equestria actae, fugatas aliae, concurrens cohortae sunt, apud signa quaque legionum trapidatae." The royal cavalry are distinguished from the "auxiliares", who comprise units of cavalry, "alae", and infantry, "cohorsae". On the third occasion, Velleius supplies Tiberius' total forces: "decem cohortibus, quaarque legionibus, quinquaginta equitibus, militibus et pluribus quas decem veteranorum milibus, ad hoc magni voluntariiimus musae frequentius equitae regio". Besides the legionaries and the veterans, there is the same/
distinction between the Thracian cavalry and the units of auxiliary cavalry and infantry, with the number specified in each case. The "Voluntarii"²⁹ were freedmen whom Augustus had drafted to help meet the emergency. The distinctions made by Velleius do not appear in Sestonius, who merely refers to "Legiones parvae auxiliares copias"²⁹.

Unfortunately Velleius does not name the alae and cohorts involved. However from Dio³⁰ we know of a certain *Pomponius* who distinguished himself. Probably he was serving in a Gallic ala. From the long service which Flavius, Arminius' brother, had given to the Romans, Garthausen³¹ has argued that he was among the auxiliaries used in the Cimbric revolt. It is not clear what rank he held³² in the Roman service: he may not have been a commander of a tribal contingent like his brother, whose service in this capacity was probably confined to Germany. This passage is insufficient evidence for his having served in the Cimbric revolt. Tacitus³³ describes a Thracian mutiny in the following terms: "exul quondam at Tiberiu, cum Thracicum bellum conficeret, hæud inglorius auxiliator eoque ciuitate Romana donatus". He had however later returned to Parthia where he found favour with the king again. Presumably he had had a following when he served Tiberius in the Cimbric revolt, it would therefore not be safe to regard him as a leader of a member of an ala, but rather as assisting on a less formal basis like the rest.

The record of the east and Africa under Augustus is even less satisfactory. ....
satisfactory. When Scipio Africanus set out on his Arabian expedition in 23 B.C., he was accompanied by about 1,000 infantry, whom Strabo describes as Romans from Egypt, who were presumably mainly legionaries, and their allies. The latter comprised 10,000 Sabataeans and 200 Jews. Josephus states that the 100 Jews were picked men from Herod's bodyguard.

When Petronius, as prefect of Egypt, repelled an Ethiopian attack on Egypt by invading Ethiopia herself in 24 B.C., he took less than 10,000 infantry and 600 cavalry against a force alleged to number 30,000. Strabo gives the total forces of Egypt as 3 legions, and 9 cohorts - three of which were established in Swayne (Sawan) near the Ethiopian border. It was these 3 cohorts that had been attacked by the Ethiopians. There were also 3 units of cavalry - at different points of the province. The cavalry of the province were clearly auxiliares, but the character of the cohorts cannot be easily established. That Strabo calls them "of Roman" may mean that they consisted of non-local soldiers drafted away from their homes, not necessarily that they were composed of Roman citizens.

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

Auxiliares in the east are next heard of in Josephus' accounts of the troubles that broke out in 4 B.C. when the Jewish Archelaus succeeded his father Herod in Judaea. Archelaus is said to have sent
a "tribune with a cohort" into a rioting mob in Jerusalem to restore order, but in spite of the Roman-sounding terms employed, the reference must be to the royal Jewish troops. When the imperial procurator of Syria, Labiunus, attempted to gain possession of Herod's treasure against the orders of Varus, then governor of Syria, he armed some of his own slaves to supplement the legion which Varus had given him. In the fighting which broke out in the temple between the Jews and Labiunus' forces, the skill of the Jewish slingers and the presence of Jewish archers is noted. When revolts spread throughout Judaea, certain elements of the royal Jewish army remained loyal to the Romans. These included "the most warlike element", the Sebastians, i.e., Samaritans, since Samaria was known as Sebaste at this period, and archers from Trachonitis.

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

Finally, there are general references to auxiliaries in Tacitus, Suetonius and Dio. Tacitus states that Augustus left a document behind at his death which mentioned "quantum cavius soriorumque in araela". The passage refers only to auxiliaries as contrasted with legionaries:
whether the "eocii" included "ad hoc" troops supplied by the "regna" that are mentioned in the next phrase cannot be decided from the context. The fact that the number of the "eocii" could be stated suggests, however, that the "eocii in urbe" were on a basis secure enough for meaningful record keeping. Suetonius' statement that "ex militaris copiis legiones et auxilia provinciis distribuit" takes us no further. Dnae has argued that certain "cohortes" who were punished by decimation and by being given rations in barley were auxiliaries. The previous sentence gives milder punishments to legions: hence these were auxiliaries. But the use of "cohortes" in the sense of auxiliary infantry regiments so soon after the term legion does not seem natural. The difference is more likely to be found in the offence: the "cohortes" were being so punished for yielding their position in battle: the legions had merely shown inability. "Cohortes" then refers to the tactical division of the legion, not to the auxiliary unit. Suetonius also refers to auxiliary commanders. He says that Augustus allowed the sons of senators to start their careers not only with legionary tribunates but also with cavalry commands ("praefecturas alarum"). Sometimes 2 such "laticlavius" were placed in command of one ala ("binos plerumque laticlavius praeposuit singulis alis"). Dio's statement is also general, with a disclaimer that he is not able to supply figures.
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V. TACITUS.

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

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

Under 19 A.D. Tacitus² refers to actions taken against observers of Egyptian and Jewish religious rites. These included the sending of 4000 freedmen of the noct involved to Sardinia, where they were to put down brigandage (or else perish because of the bad climate). Since Tacitus uses the singular for the religion involved ("as superstitions"), it is not clear from his whether the freedmen were Egyptians or Jews. However the parallel account in Josephus³ makes it plain that the freedmen involved were Jews. That kind of military unit was formed
out of these Jews is not known. Cassius describes the incident as follows: "Iudaeorum iuuentutes per speciem sacratam in provincias gravioris coeli distribuit". The reference to the harshness of the climate must mean that Cardinia was involved. "juventias" represents Tacitus' "qua idoneas actas (eg. salutem). But the "form of the military oath" is not found in Tacitus: something analogous to an auxiliary unit or a "cohors urbana" or a "cohors vigilisa", as at aene, must be implied.

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

The Romans were taunted with having nothing of value in their forces except what was foreign - "nihil veridum in exercitibus nisi quod externum". This may refer to legionaries of non-Italian origin, although at this date they were proportionately few in number. More likely the auxiliaries are meant. Even when the exaggeration in the rhetorical taunt is discounted, it is significant that this aspect of the Roman army could
be stressed with some degree of plausibility. The actual non- legionary
units that are mentioned by Tacitus are as follows. The cohort "qua
Londini presidium agitabat" was an urban cohort, technically part of the
city forces of Rome and therefore not an auxiliary regiment.\textsuperscript{10} Gallic
chieftains rendered assistance ("auxilia") : this probably included men,
as well as supplies and money, who would have been under local control
rather than professional auxiliaries. But the "ala equitata qua conscripta
et Suetonis militia disciplinaque contra habetatum" must have been a regular
regiment; the reference to conscription and Roman military discipline
makes this clear.\textsuperscript{11} Julius Ausone, a proconsular legate leader, was
entrusted with a particular mission "cum electa manu" : this force is
later described as "una ala treverorum".\textsuperscript{12} This must have been a second
regular auxiliary unit. When Q. Silius, legate in upper Germany, approached
the scene of the rebellion with two legions, he sent an ahead a force
described as an "auxilia munia". This is referred to, deliberately
disparagingly, by Silius himself as "paucae ... turasse", which implies that
the force consisted of at least one, if not more, auxilia\textsuperscript{13}.

Tacitus' account of the mutiny on the Rhine and Germanicus'
successive campaigns against the Germans (14 - 16 A.D.) at the outset of
Tiberius' principate provides a certain amount of material on the
auxiliaries in the Rhine area. The number of auxiliaries available to
Germanicus on the Rhine is said to have been a factor in Tiberius' fear of
his adopted son: he had in his power "tot legiones, immensa sociorum
auxilia".\textsuperscript{14} The phrase is obviously rhetorical, and cannot be assessed as
if it were precise terminology, a plan put forward during the mutiny was
to arm the "auxilia et socii" against the rebellious legions. Furseaux is inclined to distinguish the terms, understanding "socii" as those who were still to be enrolled. This is possible, but, as in the previous phrase, the wording cannot be pressed. Germanicus makes a reference to an offer by the Belgians to protect the Roman empire from the Germans in the place of the legions - but this occurs in a highly sentiment context intended to shame the senate. The "praetorium auxiliarum" however, that was assigned to one of the ambassadors from the senate whom the rebels rejected, was obviously a regular unit or part of one.

For the first German campaign, late in 14 A.D., Germanicus prepared a force of "armis classum sociis" where auxiliaries are clearly distinguished from the legions (here "armis") by the old term "sociis". Actual details of the land force are given later: "Germanicus was accompanied by "duodecim milia legiones, et viginti socias cohortes, ceto equitum alsas". The detachments from the legions amounted to the equivalent of 2 normal legions. This makes the number of auxiliary cohorts appear very large, in spite of their loyalty which Tacitus goes on to stress. If the cohorts and auxes were going away, the number of auxiliaries totalled 15,000 infantry and 2,000 cavalry. The auxes are later referred to as "equites", the infantry auxiliaries as "auxiliariae cohortes" and "other socias". Some, if not all, the cohorts were lightly armed ("expedite cohortes", "laeae cohortes").

The forces for the campaigns of 15 A.D. are characterized as
"pedes, eques, classis", a phrase obviously parallel to the "armis classibus annis" of the year before, except that "pedes" must have included both the auxiliary and the legionary infantry. At the outset the army was divided into two. Germanicus gave Cascina, the legate of the army in Lower Germany, 4 legions and 2,000 "auxiliares": the latter presumably included cavalry and infantry. He also had "tusculianae catervae legionæ cis Rhenus coentium": these would have been drafted for the occasion, no doubt from the Obians and neighbouring tribes on the Rhine. From the point of view of nomenclature, it is interesting, to note that the units of free Germans across the Rhine who were supporting Germanus are also called "catervae": the term here is intended to be derogatory. Germanicus' forces consisted of "totides legiones, duplices sociorum numerum", i.e., 4 legions and 10,000 auxiliaries. The proportion of cavalry to infantry is not stated. But the total of the auxiliaries of Cascina and Germanicus, excluding the ciesianae German bands, was 17,000, compared with the less certain figure of 17,000 for the expedition of the previous year. During the battles of 15 A.D., Cascina's 4 legions are referred to as "quadraginta cohortes Romanæ", which is merely a stylistic variation. The Chaucana supplied "auxilia". A reference to "subsiduarias cohortes" can only mean auxiliary cohorts, since the legions are mentioned as supporting them in the next phrase.

The "classis, legiones ad modum" (under whom are subsumed the "eques" in the collective singular) appear in the expedition of 16 A.D. "et jussu". Welcome detail occurs in Tacitus' description of the marching order. .....
order of Germanicus before the battle of Idissavice. *monter exercitus
sic incescit: auxiliares Galli Germanique in fronte, post quos pedites
pragitarii; dein quattuor legiones et duas praetorianas cohortibus
as delecto equite semper, existantibus aliae legiones et levis armatura
cut equitatae septemque auxiliarum cohortes*'31. Other passages
permit further discussion. The 8 legions and 2 praetorian cohorts need
not detain. The "Galli Germanique auxiliarum" or even the "ceterae ... auxiliarum cohortes" would have included the "ceterorum vindicitorumque et
Gallicae cohortes" mentioned in the next chapter31. The form of the word
"Gallicae" gives pause, since normally the adjective indicates the area in
which the regiment served, rather than its composition32. Here, however,
it seems best to take it as an example of Tacitean "Variatio" for "cullorum"
and regard the cohorts as composed of Gauls rather than of other provin-
cials stationed in Gaul before the expedition. One of the grounds Liberius
is said to have had for opposing further campaigns on the part of
Germanicus was Gallic weariness with supplying horses: "ferme Gallian
ministrandis equis"33. It may be that riders were also sent, but these
would probably not have received organization as formal cohorts yet. Of
German auxiliaries, Batavians, Slaves, and Sacaces are recorded. The skill
of the Batavians in swimming is mentioned at the landing at the river
Axis (ars) before the major engagement at Idissavice. Their "dux"
Chariovalaida took them across the river Visurgis (the Sever) prior to the
crossing of the rest of the army. In this operation they formed part of
the "equites", and Chariovalaida had his horse killed under him. Hence the
Batavians must be included among the cavalry auxiliaries34. Reference
was made in the last chapter to Arminius' famous interview with his pro-
Roman brother, Flavus. Since Roman leaders were normally accompanied by
a band of followers, the "comitatus" as Tacitus calls it, it is likely that
Flavus had some of his fellow tribesmen (i.e., Cheruscan) with him in
Germanicus' auxiliary forces. When the interview had degenerated to
insult, and the brothers were on the point of having recourse to arms,
Flavus called for his weapons and horse, which makes it likely that he
normally fought among the cavalry. The Cheruscan had joined the Roman army
only the year before; it is hardly likely that they were among the German
auxiliaries in the van, but were probably grouped in the rear.

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

with...
with the "levis armatura".

In the middle of the line Germanicus was accompanied by "delecto equite". Neither Furneaux nor Kuestermann comments on this phrase, which suggests the later "equites singulares". When Fizetius' men, the younger Drusus, was sent to deal with the mutiny in the Hannanian legions in 14, he was accompanied by 2 enlarged praetorian cohorts, "additur magna pars praetoriani equitum at robora Germanororum, qui tue custodes imperatoris erunt"\(^1\) — that is, he was also accompanied by cavalry of the praetorian guard and members of the "cortesia custodes" or the emperor's bodyguard. The phrase here "cum duabus praetoriiis cohortibus ac delecto equite Caesar" seems parallel. On the other hand, since Drusus was not in command of the Hannanian legions, his Roman force may have been made larger than that of Germanicus. A second possibility should be considered. As noted above, when the Angriovarians defected, light armed troops participated in avenging their treachery. The full phrase is "simus ilico Stertinius cum equite et armaturae leui"\(^2\). In 15 Stertinius had been sent against the Brucetans "expedita cum manu"\(^3\). In 16, "Stertinius at e musco pristiplerius semilius" commanded the cavalry at the crossing of the Vindula, and when Schariova defied, "equites cum Stertinio semiliique"\(^4\) came to the rescue of his men. At the outset of the battle of Idiavitia, Germanicus gave orders for the swiftest cavalry to attack the Cerascan flank, and for Stertinius to go round and attack their rear ("nullidiremos equitum incurrere latus, Stertinius cum ceteris turcis circumgressi tergoque inuaderi"\(^5\)). If the identification of Semilius with the "Semilius semilius"...
of 111 B.C. 2686 can be accepted, he was in all probability a "praefectus
aequitas" at this stage. Stertorius must have been much superior; in
fact Hirtling-Stein catalogues him among the "Unterlegaten", i.e., the
"legati" and "comites" of Germanicus. The troops entrusted to him must have
been of special quality, since he was used for special missions of great
importance. Sometimes the "levia armaura" was included; but the cavalry
must have been the best of the auxiliaries, the most "professional" among
them. They could well be the "delectus eques" of Germanicus.

The auxiliaries of Germanicus in 16 fall into various categories.
The professional element was represented by the "egitarii" and some of
the "levia armaura" and the cavalry entrusted to Stertorius, a Roman, not
a native commander. It may have included elements from provinces other
than Gaul or Germany. Whether the Batavian, Vindelician and Gaetic cohorts
were of long standing or not cannot be determined from this context, but
it appears likely that they were. The Batavian contingents were still
under a native leader, but were entirely reliable and must be considered
as more permanent and professional than the Chaunian auxiliaries. The
status of the "ceterus ... sociorus cohortes" cannot be definitely deter-
mined. Tacitus may be using the word "cohortes" here in a purely tactical
sense. If so, it would refer to "ad noc" levies \(^{46}\). On the other hand it
may be used in the technical auxiliary sense, in which case "socii" is
merely in archaism.

The next event recorded by Tacitus in Germany was the Frisian
revolt in 20 A.D. The Romans employed legionary detachments and select
auxiliaries, ...
auxiliaries, described as "peditus et equitus auxiliarum delectus", against the rebels. A special function was assigned to an "alae Canninefates et quod peditus inter nostros merebant". The Canninefates were a neighbouring tribe, closely associated with the Batavians. The term "alae" suggests that their organization had been formalized: they are referred to in the next clause as "turmas sociales", where "turmas" is again a technical Roman term. It is difficult to know what weight should be given to the fact that the Derman infantry were "receiving pay"; on the face of it it would appear that they too were organized, presumably in cohorts. As the battle proceeded "tres leges cohortes se rursus duce, dein ... alarius agenda" were sent into the attack. This force can only be regarded as 3 infantry cohorts and an unspecified number of cavalry alae; the auxiliaries are later referred to simply as "cohortis alaeque" and the deaths of many "praefecti" are noted. 13th "nomana" perished in the uprising. Since the brunt of the fighting had been borne by the auxiliaries, it would be interesting to know whether their casualties are included in this figure or whether the term "nomana" refers only to legionaries.

A disaster occurred in a farmhouse belonging to a certain Drupotix, described as a former soldier in Roman employ - "quondam stipendiarius". He could hardly have been other than a Frisian. The term "stipendiarius" then implies the prior existence of a Frisian contingent in the Roman "auxilia". Tacitus' account of this engagement implies a well-developed auxiliary force. It was obviously intended that they should be able to decide the issue: the legions were only brought in when things went wrong.

auxiliaries ......
Auxiliaries on the Danubian front are mentioned only in connection with the Thracian troubles of 21 and 26 B.C. In the first disturbances, the governor of Pannonia sent "salarios equites ac levis cohortium" against the dissidents. The rather unusual phrase for the infantry auxiliaries is contrasted with the "robur peditum", meaning the legionaries.

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

When the fighting spread, the Romans were assisted by loyal Thracians, by archers and by a Sarmatian cohort, to name those known to us. The first were under the command of their own king - "rex Thracum et auxilia populi specialium". The second group - "delectus sagittariorum".
sagittariorum" is mentioned because it was used against a rebel force entrenched in a hill-fort and hence initially secure against normal cavalry or infantry attack. However, the rebels nearly succeeded in destroying them in a sudden sally, but they were saved by "subsidia sagambrarum cohortes", described as "promptas ad pericula nec mir a cantuam et armorum tumultu truces". It is clear that the Sagambrians, a German tribe, although retaining features of their native methods of fighting, had already come under the conditions of service feared by the Thracian rebels.

Various operations involving the army in Syria are recorded. One of the charges brought against Vercingetorix, after he had fallen out with Germanicus, was that his wife had been present at army manoeuvres: "sed exercito equitum, decurribus cohortum intercessit". When the matter came up in the Senate, the words used were "praesidio super feminas exercitio cohortium, decursu legiones". From this it is clear that, in the first passage, the cohorts were legionary, while in the second the cohorts, now corresponding to "equites", must represent auxiliaries in general. These then were joint exercises of legions and "auxilia". When Vercingetorix, the exiled Arvernian king, attempted to escape from the place of refuge assigned to him by the Romans, he was arrested by a cavalry commander ("praefecto equitum") - a natural use of a mounted auxiliary unit to capture someone trying to get away on horseback. After the death of Germanicus in 19 A.D., Vercingetorix also attempted to regain control of the province, from which Germanicus had expelled him, by force. His supporters consisted of deserters from the legions, camp followers, slaves belonging to himself and his wife and /"auxilia"......
"auxilia" supplied by "legati Cilici". These proved ineffective on account of their lack of training and their "rustic" weapons, as Tacitus calls them. They included a detachment of raw recruits for the Syrian legions. Also formed them "in numerus legionis", indicating that he had managed to muster some 5 or 6000 men.

L. Vitellius, governor of Syria at the end of Tiberius' principate, made a show of "rebur legiusm maiorumque" on the bank of the Euphrates in 73 AD during some partisan difficulties. He sent one of his legates against the dissident Gilician tribe of the Chetas in the next year with "quattuor militum legionariorum et delectis auxiliis". In 57 he proceeded to make war on the Nabataean king Aretas. Josephus describes him as setting out with 'such light-armed soldiers and cavalry as fought with the two legions' implies a definitive and regular association of "auxilia" with legions.

Africa under Tiberius was noted for the revolt of Sacarina. In the first clash in 17 AD, the legion stationed in Africa (the III Augusta) and "quod sub signis noioiorum" were brought together against the rebels. "Jocii" is the old term for auxiliaries, but is obviously just a variant for the contemporary terms which appear when the battle line is described: "legio medio, leves cohortes duesque 60m in cornibus locantur". The phrase 'sub signis' may then be understood in the sense of
"in regular formation". In 24 Tacfarinas attacked a "cohortem Romanam" that was holding a fort near a river. The precise import of this phrase is difficult to establish, but the soldiers in it are emphatically called "ales Romanae" and were punished for cowardice by the ancient method of decimation - surely an attempt to establish "Roman" discipline among legionaries. Their behaviour is strongly contrasted with that of a "dux illium veteranorum" that required an attack by Tacfarinas and one of whose sons, "Aulus Helius praetorius ailes", received the "dona militaria" and the rare "cluica corona" - surely a Roman, hence the phrase here must refer to a cohort of the legion. In a later engagement in the same year, the governor sent his son against Tacfarinas "cum equites et cohortibus auxiliariis, quis velocissimus legionum affiderat", but no details can be recovered. In 24... certain "principia aususiorum", whose loyalty was suspect, were executed by the Romans. From this it can be inferred that the Aususians had been rendered assistance by the Romans. Tolomey, the king of Mauretania, was pressed into service; he operated "cum populis". This probably means that he put the royal army at the disposal of the Romans. We are further told that selected Mauretani organized raiding parties: "praedatoriis manus delecti Mauritiorum duxerat", no doubt using local methods to defeat a local enemy. The "inscitiae cohortes alaeque" (the latter arranged in "turre") that spear-headed the final attack on Tacfarinas were obviously regular "auxilia". The troops employed in this long-drawn out war consisted of legionaries, regular auxiliaries and allied contingents with a flexible structure.
The supporters of Tacfarinas are instructive. Tacitus introduces him with the following sentence: "His natione Namica, in castria Romanis auxiliaria stipendia accipit, non deserit, ut praemium et Instruciniis auxilios ad praeclara et magni generis, dein more militiae ecat ille et turmae consociatas, postremo unde tandemque turbas ad insulasam eum habeat." It is clear that he had been a regular auxiliary, but another he was a member of a Numidian contingent as such cannot be firmly deduced from his nationality. He is not likely to have been the sole deserter: in any case he modelled his troops on the Roman pattern of "auxilia et turmae". Furneaux is inclined to regard "auxilia" as synonymous with "turreas", since the strength of the Numidians lay in their cavalry. But it is better with Roestermann to distinguish the termas, making the first refer to units of infantry. Tacfarinas kept these "tectos urarum Romanarum" to himself, improving their discipline and leaving the tribesmen who flocked to his standard to their own commanders. Although admitting that he later licked them into shape, Tacitus stigmatizes his supporters as "vagrants, bandits and an untrained mob". These terms tend to recur in later parts of the narrative, and the word "auxilia" is also used for supplements to his forces. The general picture is that of a properly trained core supported by local material of varying degrees of skill. The strength of the resistance which the north africana provided is an indication of the degree to which the Numian "auxilia" in the province had been trained and disciplined.

Finally, general references may be noted. In book IV of the
in 23 A.D.: "quae tunc Romana copia in urbe, qui acii regna, quanto sit
anxietas imperitatial". Naturally the emphasis falls on the legions which
are listed province by province. The client kings are "dubae Mauritania,
the father of the stolets who fought against Baecarianas: the kings of the
iberians and the Albanians, in the area of the Caucasus, and "other kings",
presumably of the east; Rhodomelacis and the children of Lotys in Thrace.
It is clear that Tacitus regarded the resources of the client kings as an
integral part of imperial defence. Though he does not use the terms alas
and cohorts of their contingents, he does classify them among the "auxilia".
The regular "auxilia" are then listed: "at apud idonea provinciae aequae
triremes alaeque et auxilia cohortus, necque solis sana in illius urbis:
seis parvae: incertum est, cum ex una tempore hic illuc aevent, glicerent
numero et aliquando minuerunt". The "triremes" are the provincial
fleets or river flotillas as contrasted with the Italian fleet stationed at
Hisammon and Maveana. The auxiliaries are compared for strength with the
legions and said to be roughly equivalent. But Tacitus makes it clear that,
in the early years of Tiberius' principate at any rate, they were not as
stationary as the legions and that a fixed total of regiments had not yet
been reached.

Suetonius relates that Tiberius gave the senate a "species
libertas" in several respects. One was "de ..... legiones et auxiliorum
discriptions" which is probably a generalization from the war against
Baecarianas, which took place in a senatorial province. The legio IX Hispana
was .....
was temporarily transferred from Iberna to Africa at that time. From this phrase it appears likely that the transfer of some of the "auxilia" serving with it in Iberna was discussed. This statement of Suetonius confirms that of Tacitus, that the "auxilia" had become a fixed part of the army about which considerable information was available in Rome.

Twice, too, Suetonius ἡ μηδενεμο αλλαορ refers to "praefenti alae" under Tiberius as if they were a normal rank in the army. The auxiliary system must have taken shape by the time of Tiberius, even if it had not crystallized into that known from the diplomas by this date.
NOTES.

5. Josephus (I. i. n. 3) says: οἱ οὖν τετραχιονιάλες
diā τοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ στρατονομοῦ ἔμπορον
since Gardinia was an imperial province at this stage, the inscription of the action to the consulate appears strange, but Antonius ("Tit." 56) refers to Iulinius' involving of the consulate in military matters of this kind.
8. ibid., 40.
9. Cf. Furneaux ad loc. 1 Forini, 1935, 57, n. 1. Konemann's note ad loc. suggests that the reference is to citizenship, but the recedes would have considered Gauls and other western provincials with citizenship serving in the legions as potential sympathizers.
15. I, 30.
16. **ad loc.**, a view accepted by Koestermann (ad loc.).
18. I, 45.
19. 45.
20. 47.
21. 51. Since the "auxiliariae cohortes" formed only part of the Roman marching column (other auxiliaries, called "ceteri sociorum", were in the rear), Furneaux ad loc. regards the suggestion that a number such as 15 has fallen out of the text before "auxiliariae" as probable. However, the phrase can be taken in the sense of "auxiliary cohortes" rather than "the auxiliary cohortes"; in any case the number 15 has no secure basis, and cannot be used to calculate army sizes.
22. 50 - 1. The "auxiliariae cohortes" could refer to legionary cohorts, but the context makes it clear that auxiliaries are meant, for the legions are said to have followed after a short interval.
23. 64; cf. 45.
24. 56; 51; (III, 17 (Schoruncorum ceteruis)). For A. Saccina Severa, cf. "AJIA" C, 1964; Ritterling, 1932, 49; for the Germani cimbrii, cf. A. Saccina Severa, 1934, 4 ff.
29. 11, 8.
30. 16.
31. 17.
32. cf. Dion. 235.
35. 78.
35. 9 - 19. Cf. above, p. 51. For the German "comitatus" cf. "G." 13, and note Arminius' "stipatoribus" here ("Ann." i, 9). If Holocalus' services under Tiberius and Germanicus extended beyond the principate of Augustus (cf. above, p. 51 and below, p. 92), "Germanians" may have to be included here.

36. I, 17: "Aemilia inter auxilia agentibus", against Furneaux (note ad loc. s.v. "sagitarii") who would include the Chaucians among the "auxiliares ... Germanique".

37. The "sagitarii" of II, 17 are to be regarded as the "equites sagittarii" of 16 according to Furneaux ad loc.

38. II, 9.

39. 8.

40. 20. For the "libritores", cf. Bronse, "R.B." lxi, 1926, 139.

41. I, 24. For the German "corporis custodes", cf. above p. 52.

42. It is true that Drusus' praetorian cohorts were "strengthened", but he still had the same number as Germanicus. Hence Levick's remark ("Lit." 1966, 244) that "Drusus seems to have had a special connection with the praetorian guard" is incorrect.

43. II, 11. For L. Stertinius, cf. Stein "A.R." iii 8, 1929, 2451 f. (no. 2); Winterling-Stein, 1932, 123 (no. 6).

44. I, 60.

45. II, 11. For Asellius and his identification with the Fauillius Asellius who was "primo pilo his praefecto equestri" (ibid., 2666) cf. Furneaux and Koestermann ad loc.; "P.I.R." II 2, 520.


47. The possibility entertained by Koestermann ad loc.

48. 14, 73. (The Frisian forces are referred to as a "ciuitis sociorumque manus" in the previous chapter, a phrase recalling Roman republican terminology but here applied to the enemy.)

49. For the "sallinare", cf. Furneaux ad loc., who compares "B.nfr."

50. 1: "cohorsae stipendiarii", holder 1966, 1961, s.v. designates the name Gruptorix as Germanic.
50. The "ala Canninafan" and the German front were supported by "equites legionum", but this does not affect the general picture, as they were few in number (cf. above, p. 37) and assisting a special assignment.


52. IV, 46: "Soliti ... at sitterent auxilia, suoc fere praefecerent nec nimi adversus acoles belligerares. ac tua res in incesserat fore ut dialecti alliasque nationibus permixti disserser in terris praeterentur."


58. Tac. "Ann." II, 78, 84. And Koestermann ad loc. for the significance of "numerus". The legionary troops that opposed Piso are called "Romanae cohortes".


64. III, 28. Nothing can be deduced from the name of its commander, Lecrius ("Ann." 8, 38), who is otherwise unknown.


68. Tac. "Ann." IV, 24. For stoletia, cf. E. Mommsen "R. R." Av., 1928, 176 ff. (no. 62), who proposes the reading "regii" (instead of "regis stoletiae") here, as that stolety may appear as the nominal leader of the expedition, with the army commanding acting ostensibly only as adviser to him (Mommsen compares "consulto" to support his suggestion).


70. IV, 25.

71. II, 52; it is not possible to say what rank Taccionas held in the Roman "auxilia". From the fact that a son of his fell fighting for him in 24 A.D. (IV, 25) it is possible to deduce that he was old enough to have had considerable experience in the "auxilia" before the revolt.

72. Furneaux and Hoensternann ad loc. Mommsen, 1928, 28, supports the latter view in his phrase "organizzato ... in corpi di cavalleria e di fanteria".


74. Cf. "Macedi" (II, 23): "deserto, praeedo, lato" (73); "praedator recto et solius populandi rex carmenfatum" (IV, 23). The dregs of the province joined him: "ipseque e provincia, ut quae fortuna inops, serius turbida promiitum rustam" (ibid).

75. III, 73; IV, 23.

76. IV, 4.


78. IV, 5.

79. "Ib." 3., and, for the import of the phrase, sistra ad loc. cf. note 5 above.


81. "Ib." 30; 41.
The sources for the later Julio-Claudian period remain those parts of Tacitus' "Annales" that have survived, Suetonius and Dio or his epimemoria. Josephus, and even the New Testament, illuminate Judaea. Epigraphical evidence becomes less scant, and will be discussed where it seems possible to date it with some security in this period.

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

Detail next accrues in Tacitus' reports on the events leading up to the capture of Caratacus in 51 A.D. and the revolt of Boudicca in 61. When Cato the Younger became governor of Britain in 47 he was obliged to restore order, making use of "citae cohortes". These can be regarded as auxiliaries, since "citae" would seem to be a variant for "legio" or "expeditae", and later in the same chapter Cato is described as leading "sine robore legionum socialis copias" against the dissident Icenienses. Since they had chosen a place impervious to cavalry, he adopted the unusual.....
unusual tactic of making his cavalry dismount and fight on foot with the infantry auxiliaries: "distributis cohortibus turmas quoque peditus ad munis accingit". The cohorts in both engagements are auxiliary. In 51 the Romans crushed the Ordovices of Powys in Wales who were under the leadership of Caratacus. Before the decisive battle, prefects and tribunes exhorted the Roman troops: "praefecti et tribuni ... ardores exercitus intendebant". The tribunes are the legionary tribunes - the prefects the commanders of auxiliary units. Accordingly the sentence must be taken as an indirect way of stating that the two arms of the legions and the "auxilia" were involved. The same distinction must underlie the contrast in "ac ... inrureter ferentarius gravisque miles, illi tellis admittantes, hi conferto gradu". "Ferentarius" is an archaism, referring to a light-armed soldier, and hence representing the auxiliaries as a whole, balanced by the legionaries ("gravis miles"). The third double phrase actually uses the normal terms in mentioning the different weapons of the two arms: "gladiis ac pilis legionariis, ... spatibus et hastis auxiliaribus" (where "spathe" is an unusual word for a heavy sword). It would appear that Tacitus is deliberately experimenting with new expressions for what he now regarded as a regular feature of Roman fighting, the close employment together of two branches of a professional fighting force. Some minor reverses among the Silures of South Wales are next reported. The discomfiture of "legionariis cohortis" need not concern: the "turban" that were defeated must, however, have been auxiliary. Catarius tried to restore the situation with "cohortis exspectem" - by now a familiar phrase...
who had to be saved by the "mob" of the "legiones". Fighting against the Silures continued often "in undum latrocinii" - we would call it guerrilla warfare rather than "brigandage". At one stage two cohorts were lost while foraging: "duas auxiliaria cohortis avaritiae praefectorum incatiu sum populantis intercepere". The pattern of auxiliaries later backed by legionaries was repeated when the Romans supported queen Cartimandua of the Brigantes under the next governor, Titius Galba (52 - 57 A.D.)

There are the usual combinations of legionaries and auxiliaries in the section devoted to Boudicca. In the final battle with the rebels the governor, Statius Tamulus, had "quarta decima legio cum auxiliaris uicissimatis et e proximis auxiliariis, decem seme milia armaatorum". Unfortunately the figure is too vague to be able to estimate the number of auxiliaries. The size of the detachment mentioned for the Twentieth legion is not given, and the Fourteenth may not have been up to its full strength of 5 to 6,000 men. One may hazard the guess that the auxiliaries formed roughly a third of the total. Next the battle order is described:

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

After the crushing of the revolt, Nero sent 20,000 legionaries, 6 auxiliary /cohorts.....
cohorts and 1000 cavalry. It has been thought that the 8 cohorts were the 8 Batavian cohorts later found in Britain co-operating with the Fourteenth Legion. But it is most likely that Batavians formed part of the invading forces under Claudius, as stated above, so that the identification, although possible, is not obligatory. On the arrival of these reinforcements, the auxiliaries were assigned to small forts for the winter: "cohortes a maxue nouis hibernacula locatae". This, and the phrase "e proximia auxiliares" quoted above, are the first definite indications of auxiliary regiments being stationed in a network of forts in the literary record.

No regimental names appear in the passages discussed so far, except for the identification of nine as Batavians. References to auxiliaries in other parts of Tacitus might help. The Batavians appear in the "Histories" under the year 61 AD, where they are said to have made a reputation for themselves in Britain. 8 cohorts accompanied the Fourteenth Legion when it was summoned from Britain by Nero. The Batavians next appear by name in 64, when 4 cohorts fought at the battle of Mons Graupius. It is likely that the "lectissimo auxiliario, quibus nota usus et patrius mandi suas quo simul sequae et arma et equos regunt", who led Agricola's successful attack in 78 on Pons (Anglesey) were Batavians, if one may judge from the tactic described. Two other names from the area of the lower Rhine are preserved. A cohors Gallicorum mutinied while being trained in 83: the fact that they were being formed so late makes it unlikely that other cohorts of Gallici had preceded them. Then 2 cohorts of Hungariae are mentioned at the battle of Mons Graupius.
whether Tungrians formed part of the Claudian-Heronian army cannot be deduced from this, but it is significant that the auxiliaries named in the literary record came from Lower Germany.

Information may also be gathered from inscriptions. A tombstone from Chester (Camulodunum) records an aid.1 Varucus:

Longinus idaeus, examatn i. duplicarius, se prorsa Treccus pago Nervi, anno. 
Al. cepor. XV. heredes exea testam. J/c. h.s.e.

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

Tib. Claud. Viriutius aux. exa. XXVT. Thracus annorum LVII stipendiarius 
f.XXVT. h.s.e.

Another Thracian cohort is recorded at Chester (Camulum):

Caius Sits eques. chro. VI Thracum (sig) ann. XL stip. SSXX. heredes exa 
test. f. curvus. h.s.e.

At Wirncster (Corinium) there were two aux, one Thracian, the other Celtic:

Sextus Valerius Senialis eques. (sig) ala Thracn. (sig) civis Frisiaus tur. 
Senialis un. AXAX at. AA. h.s.e. e. (sig) f.c. 27

Sannicus ........
Sanitius eque (see also Indian tur. Alban cirt. AVI cibres. cur.
Tullius Mutilus et al.). Mutilus auctio er. texta, etc., 26

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

This list may now be compared with that provided by Floro30 he asserted Aelia's auxiliaries, but is doubtful about the Thracian units.

Since Thrace did not become a province till 46, the units could hardly have arrived in Britain in 41. Yet, as has been shown in earlier chapters, Thracian auxiliaries had long served the army. Further Sextus Valerius Genialis of the unit above was a Thracian. He could not have been one of the original draft for this unit, which must have been in existence for quite some time before 46, for Genialis to have died after 20 years of service at about the middle of the First century A.D. There is not prepared to read back from the "agricola", but basically the lists are the same.

We can now turn to the German area, beginning with Vellius' visit to the Rhine in 39 A.D. 31. Suetonius 32 gives as the reason for the expedition a reminder which Vellius had received that his German bodyguard needed recruits - "admonitus de supplendis numero nativos, duos circa et habebat". If this could serve as a plausible motive for the expedition, it is clear that it was considered necessary to maintain the original character of the guard. The guard accompanied Vellius to Germany; at one point he sent "paucos de custodia Germanos" across the Rhine to
hide so that the praetorian cavalry could gain practice by tracking them down. Gaius collected a large army for his proposed invasion, but the figures that we have are exaggerated out of all proportion. Dio says that there were either 200,000 or 250,000. This sounds like an estimate of the total strength of the Roman army, legions and auxiliaries together.

Suetonius gives no specific figures: "legionibus et auxilia auxilia undique excitis, dilectibus ubique ascipientiis actis". Some were slow in arriving to gain a reputation for stern discipline, Gaius dismissed with ignominy "legates qui auxilia serius ex diversis locis adduxerant". The "legati" must be the legioary legates: their lateness may have been due either to the fact that the auxiliaries under their responsibility were stationed in small forts over a wide area, and needed considerable time for mustering, or that they were occupied with the new levies already mentioned. No details survive, but it has been suggested that the chieftain of the Janninefates who got away with making fun of Gaius' expedition was supposed to provide "auxilia".

In 47 a.d., Iulius, the son of Flavian and the nephew of Arminius, was sent out by Claudius to become king of the Cheruscan. Tacitus tells us that during his upbringing in Italy, he had been trained both in Roman and in German methods of fighting. It is obvious that such figures as Iulius would have made changes in tribal tactics, and that ultimately recruits for the Roman "auxilia" would have benefited from such contacts. Another avenue of Roman influence in the German area came from deserters who took control of invading armies. This appears from "Tacitus".
description of Cappaeus who led the Chaucers in raids on the coast of Gaul in 47 - "qui natione Cauvinefag. auxiliare stipendium meritum, post transfusa, leviua navigia praedebundum Gallorum maxima oram semitabat". In 54 A.D. the Chattans made a raid on upper Germany. The forces employed against them were "auxiliaria Vangiones et Nemetas, addito equite alario". Little difficulty attaches to the "eques alarius", obviously a Latin variant for an equestrian part of the Vangiones and Nemetans as "local levies", comparing the "tumultarii catenarius Germanorum, cum senatum coelestis" of Germanicus' expedition of 15. This would imply a hasty formation of a tribal contingent to deal with an emergency. But conditions were very different by this date, and, even if the Vangiones and Nemetans were drafted for the first time at this stage, the term "auxiliarum" implies a professional organization. The distinction between "auxiliarum" and "alarius" seems to be that between infantry and cavalry, rather than tribal contingent and professional regiment. The Romans had set certain areas on the right bank of the lower Rhine aside to be kept empty of inhabitants and free for military purposes. When the Frisians occupied these without permission and had to be ejected from them by force in 50, the soldiers employed were "auxiliarum eques". When, immediately thereafter, the Ampevarians attempted the same thing under Chaucan pressure, their chief Colin ina referred to his years as an auxiliary as part of his long service to Rome. The Romans acknowledged this, and admitted that it needed recompense, but used diplomatic means to prevent the occupation.
Hardly anything has survived concerning the Danubian area.

When the governor of Dalmatia in 42 A.D., Publius Sallutius Scipionianus, became involved in a conspiracy against Claudius, he was said to have had a large force of legionaries and auxiliaries at his disposal.

When trouble broke out in the "regnum Vannianum" among the Suebians in 57 A.D., Claudius did not accede to Vannius' request for assistance. However, he did order the governor of Pannonia to move troops up to the bank of the Danube to make a show of force to discourage any attempt to invade the province. These troops consisted of "legiones imperiose provinciae lecta auxilia".

Since the garrison of Pannonia consisted of 3 legions at this date, it is clear that the whole army was not involved. Hence it seems best to regard "lecta" as "select" or "chosen from" the regular auxiliaries of the province, and not, as Furneaux and Koestermann, of "levies especially called out".

Interest in the last century on fighting with the Scythians and the rebellion in Judaea. But minor incidents are also of value. In 47 A.D. Claudius sent Mithridates out to recover the kingdom of Armenia.

In this he was aided by his brother Tiberiannus, the present king of Iberia. The "siles exercitus" tackled the Armenian fortresses - presumably there were legionaries. At the same time the "Siberus exercitus" scoured the plains. The Iberians were largely cavalry.

In 49 a different Mithridates, a descendant of the Mithridates the Great of Pontus who conducted the famous "Mithridatic" war of the
end of the Republic, tried to erect the Bosporan Kingdom (in the Crimea) from his brother Cotys, who had become its ruler in his place. Cotys was supported by a few cohorts under a member of the equestrian order: "paucus cohortium c. Iulio aquila equite Romano". Cotys and Aquila then concluded an alliance with Numones, king of the Aorsiants, a Sarmatian people. The arrangement was that Numones would fight the cavalry battles, the Numones handle the sieges. Their marching column is described as follows: "frontem et terga Aorsi, media cohortes et Bosporani tutabantur nostri in arsis". It seems best to refer "nostri in arsis" to the Bosporans, meaning that they were armed like Roman infantry. Does this imply that the "cohorts" were legionary? This would be the natural interpretation, but the derogatory tone of "paucus cohortium" above (coming immediately after the term "robur exercitus") and the fact that a minor skirmish occurred in which a "praefectus cohortis" and "plerique auxiliarium" were slain, must mean that the cohorts were auxiliary.

The next incident, in 51 B.C., comes from Armenia. Mithridates was attacked by the son of his brother Pharamaneres. He took refuge in a fort called Cornae (Garnia) described as "tutus loco ac praesidio militum, quae Caselius solito praefectus, centurio Caserius praeerat". These "milites" were obviously those designated as "miles Romanus" in 47. Tacitus remarks that their superior siegework frustrated the enemy's "blindness" until battering was used. When the procurator of Cappadocia tried to intervene, he drew together the "auxilia" of his province = "auxilia

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

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

Under Nero full-scale war broke out in the East. In 54 the famous Corbulon was appointed to oust the Parthian Tiranidas who had seized control of Armenia. New recruits (called "luuentum" by Tacitus) were drafted for the Oriental legions, and the Jewish prince Herod Agrippa and king Antiochus of Commagenes were ordered to supply forces. Lesser Armenia was assigned to Aristobulus, Sophene to Thaesa. The Syrian army was split in two, "pars auxiliarium cum duabus legioniis" remaining in Syria under the legate, Ummidius Quadratus, while to Corbulon went "par c eiusum sociorumque numerus ... aditus cohortibus aliquae quaes in Cappadocia hiemabant". The local "socii reges" were ordered to obey the Roman commanders. Vologases, the Parthian king (whose brother Tiranidas was), was not prepared for war at this juncture, and surrendered hostages to Ummidius Quadratus, who sent a centurion to receive them. Corbulon, however, sent a "praefectus cohortis" to take them over...

Tacitus .......
Tacitus returns to the East under the year 58. Corbulo had found it necessary to restore discipline in his troops. A fresh levy was held, and soldiers transferred from another province. "Et habiti per Galatiam Cappadociamque dilectum, adiectaque ex Germania legio cum equitibus aliis et peditatu cohortium." It would be interesting to know whether the levy included auxiliary as well as legionary recruits. The transfer of the legion is especially notable, since for the first time it is stated that a legion on transfer was accompanied by auxiliary alae and cohorts. During the winter Corbulo kept his legions in camp. He arranged his auxiliary cohorts in various forts, putting them under the command of a former leading centurion with strict orders that there was to be no fighting: "dispositisque per idoneos locos cohortibus auxiliaribus...: curas praesidiorum saeclo orritis primi illi honore perfuncto mandat." There must have been a separate officer in command of the cavalry, for we hear of "turmas" that came "in proximis castellis." When Sacius joined these in a sally and was defeated, Corbulo punished him and the "praefectos militarum" (i.e., the auxiliary soldiers and the unit commanders) with the old-fashioned penalty of having to encamp outside the fortified lines.

Frontinus also reports the incident, but with precise figures: he says that "duas alae et tres cohortes" were involved. When the actual invasion of Armenia began, Corbulo decided to divide his forces so that "legiones praefectique" might attack different places. This variant for "legiones et auxilia" has been noted earlier in the chapter. He also employed the client kings, Antiochus of Commagene and Pharamasenes of Iberia, to attack /outlying ......
outlying districts. The tribe of Bithynians (or Bithynians) allied themselves to the Romans at this point, and performed useful services. During subsequent fighting there are two descriptions of Scorpilo's troops drawn up in battle order, the first before a conference between the two armies, the second when Tiridates attempted to drive them off before the siege of Artaxata: "Corbulo ante in cirtio et auxilia repuat pro cornibus, medio sextus legione constuit, cui occita ex castra tris allia tertiana praecuatorat, una cum aquis, quasi eadem legio spectaret."* Here the royal "auxilia" must have formed the bulk of the cavalry: "Easter dextra tertio legio, a dextra sexta incusabat, media decimanae desectam; ... et tergum silea equites tuebantur; ... in cornibus pedes magittari et cetera mane equitum ibat."* The "infantry archers" were probably professional, since the bow was one of the chief weapons of the Armenians and the Parthians, and practised skill would be needed to counter it. The death of a "decurio equitum" is noted: so far the prefect has been the most junior cavalry officer mentioned. At the outset of the siege of Artaxata, Corbulo used "levia armatura" to surround the walls and start the attack from a distance. This can only be a revival of an old term for some of the auxiliary cohorts.

In 64, on his way from Artaxata to Digranocerta, the second capital of Armenia (? Sevanian), Corbulo was attacked by some mountain tribesmen, but managed to crush them without shedding Roman blood by dispatching the Iberians against them: "Invincit Iberias." To keep Tiridates on the run, Corbulo sent ahead auxiliaries under separate command, following rapidly with the legions. Tiridates eventually withdrew completely. ...
completely, and was replaced on the Armenian throne by a Roman nominee, Tigranes. Corbulo left legionaries and auxiliaries behind to support the new king: "additus et praesidium militium legionarium, tres cohortes duaeque equitum alae..." - the auxiliaries obviously consisting of professional units.

When, in 62, Tigranes threatened to invade Armenia again with Parthian assistance, Corbulo sent 2 legions to the assistance of Tigranes. He warded off an advance of Vologeses towards Syria by moving the rest of his legions to the bank of the Euphrates and seizing Vologeses' routes of advance by means of hastily levied local troops: "tumultuarium provincialium manum erat...". These were obviously not cohorts and alae, but may well have been turned into such. Meanwhile Tigranes was holding out in Tigranocerta with the support of his Roman "milites".

Corbulo protested to Vologeses about this, that "saeuus unicumque regem, cohortes Romanas obvendit...". The king was Tigranes, the Roman "cohorts" were the 1-4 legions and the 2 legions mentioned above. "Auxilia" are ignored. The situation was altered on the arrival of a new general, Cassennius Paestus, to direct Roman operations in Armenia. (This was done at Corbulo's suggestion, so that he could concentrate on the Syrian frontier.) Tacitus describes the division of the military forces between Paestus and Corbulo as follows: "copie ita divisae ut quarta et duodecimae legiones addita quinta, quae recente Moesia erant, simul profectae et Galatarum Cappadocorum auxilia rectori oboeostrae, tertia et..."
sexta et decima legiones priorque Syriam miles apud Corbulonem manerant; cetera ex rerum usu anciantem partirentur. The use of the name of the people, "Syres", for the more usual provincial name of "Syria", signals caution in interpreting. It is not stated that the Fifth was accompanied by auxiliaries when it was transferred to Cappadocia from Moesia, but the Sannianala or ala recorded below72 most probably came with it. The phrase "frontica ... auxilia" would normally mean "auxilia" stationed in Pontus. But as Pontus was still a client kingdom, the phrase must mean "auxiliaries supplied by the king of Pontus (Jonas)". The words "Galatana Cappadociae ... auxilia" suggest auxiliaries who were Galatians and Cappadocians. Some of them may well have been of local origin, but, as these two areas were provinces, the words must mean "auxiliaries stationed in Galatia and Cappadocia"74. Since the "legiones" of Syria are mentioned separately, the "prior ... miles syriam" must refer to auxiliaries stationed in Syria. The forces labelled "cetera" presumably refer to "ad hoc" contingents provided by allied kings. Operations late in 62 are reported both on the Syrian and on the Armenian front. Corbulo tightened his grip on the approaches to the Buxhetes crossings by occupying hills on the opposite bank "per saxinas cohortes, non legiones castris"75. The cohorts involved assumed the "levitarius" provincial status first recorded in the area. Zetton tried to block the advance of Volosanes by stationing "tria milia delecti peditin" (i.e., presumably legionaries, the Twelfth having just been named) on an elevated position and "alae duxque saxonicos, robusti equitatus" on the plains. Since his position was too precarious,
Corbulo prepared a standby force to assist him should the need arise. This consisted of 1000 men from each of 3 legions, 80 auxiliary cavalry ("alae") and an equal number from the infantry cohorts.

By 63, Astutus had been recalled and replaced by Corbulo with wide powers. Syria was now given to Cæsius Gallus. Tacitus concentrates on the legions in this section (Corbulo received the fifteenth from Pannonia on transfer), but we hear of an instruction given to "tetrarchia ac regibus praefectisque" to observe Corbulo's commands. These would presumably include orders to supply troops. The tetrarcha and kings offer no difficulties, but who were the "praefecti"? They cannot be the commanders of cohorts and alae, as Furneaux quoting Gaspard, nor Roman prefects of "alae" district (Furneaux' second suggestion). They are not Roman officials at all - the procurators and praefectores in the neighbouring provinces are mentioned separately. The enclitic "que" joins them to the tetrarcha and kings. They must be the rulers of the "praefectures" or petty sheikdoms who were helping some allies. Corbulo selected 4 legions (IV, III, V, XIV) for the march into Armenia together with "auxilia delectorum ex Illyricum et Aegypto, quaedam aleru cohortiszqua, et auxilia regum". The last two phrases will be readily understood. The detachments from Illyricum and Aegypto must be legionaries, since all the types of auxiliary are encompassed by what follows. There was however no province of "Illyricum" at this date: Tacitus must be using it anachronistically for Dalmatia, Pannonia and Moesia.

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

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

The New Testament evidence can be added to that of Josephus. For this reason it is necessary to go back to the principate of Tiberius. The chronology of the New Testament is notoriously difficult; only approximate dates can be given. The soldiers that guarded Christ at his trial and crucifixion under Pontius Pilate, governor from 26 - 36 A.D., are described as "hata " the Greek for "cohors", hence they were an auxiliary unit. One of their officers is called a "hatalarchon" or "centurion", which, as the Greek itself shows, meant a centurion. When Galba became emperor, he sent Nerullus, who is otherwise unknown, to be commander of the cavalry in Judaea: "..." understood this in the sense that Nerullus became governor of Judaea, but this depends upon the emendation " of the text for which there ....
there is no manuscript authority, and the puzzling office must be allowed to stand. When the Roman governor of Syria, Septimius, was sent to compel the Jews to erect a statue of Caesar in the Temple at Jerusalem in 41 A.D., he set out, according to the "Syllus ludicus"[66], and so on.

The conversion to Christianity of the centurion, Cornelius of Caesarea (Naimas), is featured early in "Acts", where he is referred to as "a centurion" in the "column called Italia". In other words he was a centurion in the "column called Italia". If Cornelius' conversion is to be dated to 41 - 42 A.D.[67], a difficulty is seen in that Herod Agrippa was king of Judaea then, having replaced the Roman procurator as a favour from the emperor Claudius. The implication is that there would have been no Roman troops in Judaea at the time. But the Herodian kings needed strong military support no less than the Romans, and Claudius must have left the Roman troops previously in Judaea there under the new king. This is confirmed by the fact that when Judaea reverted once more to provincial status on the death of Agrippa in 44, Claudius threatened to transfer regiments of "Italians" and "Samaritans" (i.e. Samaritans) from their local stations to Pontus and to replace them with troops from Syria: the "Italians" were from the army of "the praetorius" and the "Samaritans" were from the army of "the praetorius".
In obvious that those troops had been in Judea during the royal interlude: in fact the reason for the transfer was their insulting behaviour to the royal family during Agrippa's funeral. Other conclusions follow from this statement by Josephus. Nozigliae\(^9\) has shown that, although here and in "Antiquities" AA, 8, 7, 176, the Cæsareans are mentioned, Josephus normally refers to Sebastians alone as the troops stationed in Cæsarea. Further the troops numbered 3000, which is precisely the number of Sebastians that fought for the Emperor under Augustus on the death of Herod the Great. At some time, therefore, between the death of Herod and of Agrippa in 44 B.C., 3000 royal troops, obviously with successive replacements of those discharged, had become 1000 and 4 cohorts, each 500 men strong. Claudius felt that they should be transferred from their home situation to a distant province, but allowed himself to be dissuaded. Professional organization was not the death of local ties. The threatened replacements were to have come from Roman legions in Syria. As noted above, Josephus normally uses "legio" for "legion", but it is unthinkable that legions should be drafted into auxiliary units. Hence, as Noziglia remarks, there must have been auxiliary unit.

Judea under Claudius suffered from a series of comparatively serious incidents, needing the use of force. When the prophet Thaides had collected a large following, an army of cavalry was dispatched against him\(^2\). During the Passover celebrations, a unit of soldiers was normally stationed.....
stationed near the temple. This Josephus called "Hoplites". This can only mean an auxiliary cohort, called also an auxiliary cohort because it was part of the occupation army and the Jews were concerned. On one occasion when one of the solders insulted the crowd, the resulting riot necessitated the bringing in of reinforcements. These are called normally the term used for legionary soldiers. "Hoplites" here may just be a variant for "soldier", but possibly indicates that the auxiliaries on duty in Jerusalem were heavily armed. Some Jewish-Samaritan clashes led to serious complications. Tacitus, in a brief notice, merely says that "milites" were involved. Josephus, however, in the "Antiquities" relates that after some Jewish auxiliary reinforcements
were summoned from Caesarea by the procurator. In the "Antiquities" the forces appear as "quaestiones" and the "Antiquities" the forces appear as "quaestiones" and the
was honored from Caesarea by the procurator. In the "Antiquities" the forces appear as "quaestiones" and the "Antiquities" the forces appear as "quaestiones" and the forces appear as "quaestiones" and the forces appear as "quaestiones"... in
Latin terms, an ala sebastea, 4 cohorts of infantry and local Samaritan levies are named, (this again as being an auxiliary cohort, not a legion). A judicial enquiry into the fighting was held, and the emperor sentenced a man, Celer, to death. what his offence was, is not stated, but he is described as a "tribunus militum", i.e., "tribunus militum". Normally cohorts were commanded by prefects. Since a "tribunus tribune, one of the auxiliary regiments at least may have been military, not quingentary. Cassonius reports the appointment of Felix as procurator in the following terms: "Felix, given cohortibus et alia provinciae Judaeae praeposuit (so. Claudius)." The specific reference to the command of the cohorts and Felix may be due to the fact that the military situation
in Judaea was uppermost in man's mind at the time. More likely it is the fact that a man who had been a freedman was placed in command of troops that caused the choice of the words used.

The governorship of Felix lasted into the principate of Nero. The security situation did not improve. Josephus notes the emergence of a sinister new group of freedom fighters or terrorists, the sicarii, so named from the curved knife they used. False prophets were another source of trouble. Felix used cavalry and 100 against these. This can only mean "heavy-armed auxiliary infantry". One, an Egyptian, threatened to seize Jerusalem, overwhelming 141: "the Roman garrison" must mean an auxiliary regiment or regiments in the city. A serious disturbance occurred at Caesarea. The non-Jewish element in the population, called indiscriminately Syrians or Greeks by Josephus, felt that they could rely on the support of the auxiliaries there, as being Syrians and relatives as it were: 102 The parallel version of the "Antiquities" is more precise: most of the troops originated from Caesarea and Sebaste (Samaria): 103 The Syrian troops are in fact Caesareans and Sebasteans. They were in the majority, but nothing is said of the "origines" of the others.
The arrest and trial of the apostle Paul in Jerusalem spanned the last years of Felix and the first months of his successor Porcius Festus. The commander of the unit that kept Paul prisoner, Claudius Lysias, is called in Latin terms, he must have been a military tribune of a military cohort. Claudius Lysias provided a military escort under centurions to take Paul to Caesarea. The escort consisted of...

470 soldiers are a large number, especially if they all came from the same unit. If they do, and if the terminology can be pressed, the cohort contained cavalry, hence it was a "cohors militarum equitata". What the were is not clear. The word is very rare, but the variant reading is an hapax legomenon. It would appear to mean "throwing with the hand" and could refer to spearmen or javelin throwers or even bowmen. In later writers is given the meanings "a light soldier, perhaps a bowman or slinger", "a bodyguard". If the were or heavy-armed, to use Josephus' word, light-armed would be the natural meaning for in this context. Given the prevalence of bowmen in the past, "archer" is a suitable rendering. When Paul was sent to Rome in view of his appeal to the emperor, he was handed over to... The Latin translation would be "cohors augusta"; presumably a cohort at one stage honoured with the name of Augustus or one of his successors. But,
as noted above, Samaria was called Sebaste or Auguste, and there was a cohort of Sebasteniani. So that the phrase may represent "cohors Sebaste".

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

This survey of the first period of Judaea in the Claudio-heronian period has shown various types of officers – tribunes, prefects of cavalry and centurions – in some prominence. The greatest number of regiments stationed in the province amounted to 14 la and 5 cohorts, all of Sebasteniani (including Caesareans). In addition there was a cohors laticis. Whether the cohors laticis was one of the Sebastenian cohorts or an additional unit cannot be decided. Whether Celer and Claudius Lydias commanded the same regiment, and which regiment (or regiments) it was, is not known. But at least one of the regiments was a "cohors milliaria equitata", and if means archers, "miliaris" as well. Finally, in an emergency, extra Roman troops were enlisted.

Before the arrival of Cassius Gallus, the Roman garrison at Masada (north near the Dead Sea) fell – but no details about its composition survive. Agrippa sent 200 horse to the aid of the Jews who were still loyal....
loyal to the Romans. When Sestius set out from Syria in 66, he took the Twelfth Legion, and 2,000 picked men from each of the other legions. Since there were 3 legions in Syria, this gives him 6,000 legionaries in the detachments, i.e., a second legion as far as numbers go. His non-legionary troops comprised

The royal forces were supplied by Antiochus of Commagene (2,000 horse and 3,000 foot, all archers), Agrippa (3,000 foot and just under 2,000 horse), and Boethus (4,000 men, a third of whom were cavalry and the majority archers). This gives a total of just under 14,000 royal soldiers, of whom some 3,000 at least were cavalry, the majority armed with the bow (unfortunately it is not stated whether Agrippa’s forces were bowmen or not). If the professional auxiliaries were quingenary, they would have amounted to 2,000 horse and 2,000 foot. This gives a raw total of 12,000 legionaries. But, if Josephus’ figures can be accepted, Sestius’ strategy seems to have been to allow the client kings to supply the special arm of “nexitarii”, both mounted and on foot. He also collected a large number of other auxiliaries (a large number) from the towns of Syria. These were completely untrained. Sestius was unsuccessful in his assault on Jerusalem, and eventually withdrew, his flight turning to a rout. Josephus gives the losses of the Romans and their together: 3,000 infantry and 480 cavalry. The death of a “praefectus alae” is mentioned. Jucundus is mentioned.
Veppianian took over in 67 and mustered his forces in Ptolemais (acres or 'akka). His legions were the Fifth and the Tenth and the Fifteenth. 16 cohorts accompanied the legions. These were supplemented by 5 others from Caesarea. Josephus says that 10 of these 23 were military, while the other 13 contain 800 infantry and 120 cavalry each. As far as arines were concerned, 8 came from Caesarea 119 and 5 others from Syria. Antiochus, Agrippa 120 and John the High priest provided ... 121, that is, 2,000 infantry archers and 1,000 cavalry each. Further the Nabataean Arab Malchus 122 sent 1,000 cavalry and 5,000 infantry, the majority being archers. The total of all these forces was 60,000, according to Josephus, who then adds the very interesting remark that the very large numbers of "servants" following the army must be included, since they had shared in their owners' training.

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

| Legions: | 3 x 6000 | 18,000 |
| Cohorts: | 10 x 1000 | 10,000 |
| | 13 x 720 | 9,360 |
| | 13 x 720 | 19,360 |
| Alae: Caesarea: | 1 x 500 or 1000 | 500 or 1000 |
| Syria: | 5 x 500 or 1000 | 2,500 or 5,000 |
| | 3,000 or 6,000 | 3 = 6,000 |
| Kings: Bowmen: | 5 x 2000 | 6,000 |
| Cavalry: | 3 x 1000 | 9,000 |

| c. 30,000 – 53,000 |
The relation of this total to two other small forces that Josephus had mentioned earlier is not clear. Vespasian left a garrison of 6,000 foot and 1,000 horse (i.e. 7,000) at Sepphoris (Seferiya) under a tribune, Flacidus 124, and a cohort and also had been holding out at Ascalon (Ascalon near 'Ascalon) under the command of a prefect, Antonius 125. The numbers involved are too large for inclusion in Josephus' 60,000. The proportion of cavalry to infantry in the 60,000 is difficult to work out exactly. The allies and the allied cavalry would amount to 7 - 10,000. Legions contained 126 cavalry, and the "cohorte equitatae" the same number. This produces a total of 1920 (3 x 120 + 13 x 120), with a grand total of some 9 - 12,000, a rough sixth or quarter of the whole. Vespasian's marching order in his invasion of Galilee is described in detail 127. Light-armed auxiliaries ( 128 ) and archers formed the van so that they could repel surprise attacks and clear out dangerous areas. Next came various specialized detachments, which do not concern us here. Then followed the main body of the legions, and their servants. The next in order appear as 129 here cannot mean "mercenerii", but "stipendiarii", for so far the main auxiliaries have not been mentioned. A special force of infantry and 130 and cavalry brought up the rear.
The course of Vespasian's fighting in Galilee and advance to Jerusalem cannot be studied in detail, but certain "notabilia" may be singled out. At the siege of Jotapata (Khirbet Jefat) Vespasian used his archers, slingers and all his marksmen: the first were certainly auxiliaries, but the status of the second two groups is not clear. Later Arab archers, javelin-men and slingers are mentioned together, and then Arab archers and slingers and stone-throwers: the latter appear as auxiliaries. From this it is clear that the slingers and probably the stone-throwers and marksmen were auxiliaries. As far as the officers of the auxiliaries are concerned, two decurions are named, Valerius and Sebutius, and a centurion Bellus, who is specifically stated to have been a Syrian. 2000 archers were under the command of a certain Antoniusilio: since the archers were almost entirely provided by the kings, this looks like the placing of a Roman officer in charge of allied royal troops. Vespasian seems to have used certain of his subordinate commanders on special missions with joint legionary - auxiliary forces of differing sizes. Thus Trajanus, legate of the Tenth (the father of the future emperor), was sent against Japha (Yafa) with 2000 foot and 1000 horse. Titus, as legate of the Fifteenth, relieved him with 1000 foot and 500 horse, and is later shown operating with 600 chosen cavalry. Cerealis, the legate of the Fifth, was sent to quell a Samaritan disturbance with 3000 infantry and 600 cavalry, and, in 68 A.D., ravaged part of Idumaea with a detachment of infantry and cavalry. After the fall of Jotapata, Agrippa invited Vespasian to his kingdom. One of his objects was to secure the assistance of the Roman general...
general in putting down disorders in his own kingdom. This Vespasian did, but we do not hear of a garrison left behind by the Romans. When Vespasian made arrangements for the winter of 67-8, he stationed decurions in the villages and centurions in the towns—these clearly commanded auxiliary detachments. All this shows how fully integrated the auxiliaries were with the legions: they played a vital role in the overall strategy.

Little can be recovered concerning Egypt and Africa. Dio ascribes Gaius' decision to remove the troops in Africa proconsularis from the control of the proconsular governor and to place them under the command of an imperial legate in 39 AD. to his fear of Lucius Iulo (son of the man condemned for the death of Germanicus). Iulo is alleged to have had a large force of auxiliaries with his legions, and might be encouraged to revolt. Tacitus, however, ascribes the transfer to the governorship of Silius Silanus, describing the troops in the following way: "legio in Africa auxiliaque tutandis imperii finibus sub divo Augusto Tiberique principibus proconsuli parebant...". The name of the governor concerned need not be discussed here: the two passages together, however, imply that not only the legions but also the auxiliaries that had been in Africa were now in the new province of Numidia.

Gaius' execution of Stolessus, the king of Mauretania, led to fighting there which lasted into the principate of Claudius. The Moorish resistance was led by a freedman of the king, Adrian by name, in an inscription.
inscription from Volubilis (near Farasoun) we hear of auxiliaries used against Al-admon:

M. Val. Novatius f. Cal. Severo and. suetur illur. flumini primo in municipio suo praef. auxilior. addens al-admon oppressa bello huic ordo municipi Volub. ob serita erga repub. et legationem bene gestam quae ab duos Claudius ciuitates nomens et conubium sua pergrinvis aliquos
immanitatem amor. / incolas bonus cluisus bello interfecturus quorum heredes non extantet sui in estruit. ...

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

In 66 there was a Jewish pogrom in Alexandria in Egypt. Besides the 2 Roman legions, 2,000 soldiers who had just arrived from Africa participated ( ... ) ; there other regards as auxiliaries intended for Nero's projected ethiopian expedition. The ala Siliana was also involved: "pro consule Vitellius Siliiani in Africa habuerant, vox a Herone, ut in Aegyptum praesitterantur, exciti ...". Vitellius' governorship of Africa belongs to the principate of Nero: the statement reveals that, in spite of the creation of the legateship of Nusidia,
Senatorial Africa had some auxiliary troops stationed in it. The Ethiopian expedition was planned for 63, but some years earlier, possibly in 61, a detachment from the Praetorian Guard had been sent into Ethiopia to investigate the sources of the Nile. A tantalizing papyrus from Egypt has been connected with these events by Turner:

The first lacuna has been filled to read

\[ \text{(text)} \]

although \( \ldots \) or \( \ldots \)

are equally possible, according to Turner. The second lacuna presumably ended with \( \ldots \) Accordingly there is no secure basis for cohorts and light-armed troops (\[ \ldots \] and \[ \ldots \]), since this is a mere assumption. But there appear to be cavalry, possibly under a "praefectus" (\[ \ldots \]). Who Rufus was is not clear. Not even the link with Nero's plan is secure: Altheim and Stiehl\(^\text{149}\) date the papyrus to the early 2nd century A.D.

Certain general features remain to be discussed. Reference has already been made to the German "corporis custodes" under valus: in spite of his intention to keep the guard German, he placed Thracians in command of it.\(^\text{147}\) The guard showed its loyalty to him at his assassination by attempting a massacre of the senators, what they regarded as reasonable.\(^\text{148}\) They are heard of again when Nero's relations with his mother became strained: \( \ldots \).
strained: he decided to withdraw the detachment of them that he had assigned to her as a mark of respect.

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

Suetonius reports that Claudius regularized the order in which commands of cohorts, of alae and military tribunates were to be held:

"equestris militiae in ilia ordinata, ut post cohortes alae, post alae tribunatum legionis daret." However this arrangement did not long remain in force, since the command of an ala soon ranked higher than a military tribunate in a legion.

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

"... cuorurn nomine subscripsit, sicutis liberis postermique eorum civitates dedit et conubium sum uxoriae cum tunc habuisset cum est cives data aut si cujusquae eadem esset cum illis quae pastas duxissent dumtaxat singuli singulas...

cohort. II Hispanorum qui praeest L. Caesarius Priscus

equites Nemesi Dameson I. Cornecatati et Lores Procosii filias uxori eius

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

Other regiments attested by the diplomas may be noted:

ala veteranar Gallorum et Thraecum
ala Gallorum et Thraecum antiana
ala Gallorum et Thraecum 28, possibly in Moesia, in 54.
coh. I duturum et Gallaeorum
coh. I Hispanororum
coh. I Alpinorum
coh. II Alpinorum
coh. II Hispanororum
coh. V Lucensium et Gallaeorum, in Illyricum, in 60.
ala Gemelliana, in Baetica (?) in 64.
The list of regiments is very small, and possibly unrepresentative. But it is clear that Alpine, Gallic, Spanish and Thracian elements predominate. The lists already show composite titles, but they do not have numbers like the cohorts. Two composite cohorts appear, but these are not of widely separated peoples, as in the alae, but of tribes close to each other in a single province, Hispania Tarraconensia. A further point regarding nomenclature emerges. It will be seen that the coh. II Hispanorum features in both the Illyrian diplomas (the first and the third above). In the second of these the recipient is once again an "eques" and a Saxonian:

coh. II Hispan. caea praet et equitum caligarii lamiarum Anseduniae f. Verciatio.

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

v. Cassio f. f. l. præf. cae. hispanorum equitator ...

Here however the cohort has no number. One cannot then expect uniformity and rigidity of titulature at this stage.
Ibid. at this point Lutins comments on the lack of protective armour of the Britons. Their troops are referred to as "caterae armatorum" (33) and "valida et lacta arma iuventue" (40) in this section.

38.

39.


Difficulties arise over the poet recorded in 1. 5: "imperfecte aequat." Wrong ("R.I.A.M.I.G." loc. cit.) says that von Domaszewski’s proposal that Admirus was in charge of all the cavalry during the invasion cannot be proved, but Oliver (181) accepts the suggestion.

12: "pedes ... equites" at Rome (Angiow) (Edn. "Ann." XIV, 27)
"Legiones at quod pedemus ... cum equitibus" of the forces of \*retillius Cerealis Caesunius Rufus (S. Woboda, "A. S. IV, 1937, 1198 ff., (no. 8)) then legate of legio IX at Lindum (Lindos) (32).

15. 34. "Auxilium impetus" and "aqua" are later used (37). The British forces are described in the words "cateruma et turmae" (presumably to cover both infantry and cavalry) (34) and "iusentus" (36). For G. Suetonius Paulinus, cf. Mittler, "U.S." IV A, 1931, 551 ff. (no. 3).

14. LRTC, 12, 3 - 4, where MIO refers to the Britons' lack of protective armour (cf. § 2, and above, n. 8 for Tacitus).


16. Cf. Furneaux ad loc., quoting Ripperdey, who refers to "Agr. I, 99: "et erant in civitatibus legionum, ad aetasaurus cohorum, quartae decimae legionis auxilia" (67, 92), on which cf. Neubner, who accepts the identification. The Batavians are said to have won glory in Britain in "Agr. I, 12, but the passage is too general to be of use here.

17. Cf. n. 16


19. 18, 5 and Ogilvie and Richmond ad loc. This leads one to suspect that the auxiliaries used for the attack on Roma by Suetonius Paulinus included Batavians.

20. 28, and Ogilvie and Richmond ad loc., and appendix 2. For the Umipi, or, as they are more commonly called, the Usipetes, cf. E. Gutenbrunner "R.E." 1A A, 1961, 1-87 ff.


22. van de Weter, "Agr." 1955, 369, suggests that Claudius called upon the Belgians especially for troops to Garrison Britain.

23. R.I.B. 801; Kraft, 811.


1. H.I.B. 109; Kraft, 612.
2. H.I.B. 106; Kraft, 414.

29. One may note that the auxilia are included among the auxiliaries in Calpurnius' ("H.I.B." II 3 224) address to the British army before the battle of Vercingetorix (Tac. "Agr." 32, 1).

30. 1967, 61, n. 1. The diplomas are not of much help, since the first British diploma ("C.I.L." XVI, 43) falls in 98 A.D. An ala i Tungriorum is listed, but the Tungrii listed are definitely from cohorts. However, as Beazely remarks ad loc., there is room for a cohort Tungriorum among the lacunas in the list of cohorts; they appear in the second century diplomas (conveniently listed in Simpson, 1964, 184 ff.). The ala i Thracum, coh. I Hattiavorum, and Thracian cohorts are also attested.

31. Saladin, 1934, 58 ff., makes a reasonable attempt at a reconstruction of Sallust's German and British plans, explaining the literary tradition as a misunderstanding of measures taken to restore discipline and provide troop manoeuvres before action could be started. Davies, "Hist." 1966, 124 ff., and Rickett, ibid. 1966, 496 ff. (who would place Sallust's military activities in 44, i.e., those directed towards Britain, in lower Germany - 50 ff.) have recently continued the debate.

32. "Cal." 43.
33. 45, 1.
34. L.I., 22, 2. On the exaggeration in this figure, cf. Townend, "Germans" 1964, 486.
35. "Cal." 43.
36. 44.
39. 11, 18. There was probably too long an interval for Canninefates (Stein "R.S." VII, 1910, 77 f.) to have had any connection with the "ala Canninefatus" that operated in the Frisian revolt of 26 A.D., for which cf. above, p. 72.
40. All, 27. The Chatti are described as "latrocinia agitantes" and "populatores".

41. Apud Furneaux ad loc. For the cimbriene "catervae", cf., above, p. 67
    Hanf, 1944, 43 and Callias, 1964, 145, regard the units as regular.

42. Inc. "Ann." All, 58. For these areas reserved for military use,
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44. Dio LX, 13, 2. For L. Arruntius Caelius Scribonianus, cf. "P.L.
    A 118", Jagenteufel, I, 36, 21 (no. 5).

45. Inc. "Ann." All, 6, with Furneaux ad loc. (and Felham, 1.c. n. 41)
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    Iberien, 1923, s.vv.
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    (no. 1 - cap. 705); for litteratas, Deyer, "S.", XVI, 1932,
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    166; Vlau, 1966, 51 f. (no. 51).
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51. All, 48. For Caelius Follia, cf. "P.L.", 146, and for C. Iunius,
    461.


55. Tac. "Ann." Allii, 7. For H. Julius Agrippa, cf. "V.I.M." 1152; for Aristobulus, a 1092; for C. Julius Sosæmus, 1582, where he is identified with the king of Aram (Anna) known from Josaphus.
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63. Allii, 40.

64. 41.
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76. 26.
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103. 8, 9, 1, 7, 176.
105. ....
104. "ac." 21, 31; 23, 26; 24, 22; "v.l.n." 2, 917.
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119. Nonatianus's calculations (1934, 17, 71) make it likely that the sla
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123. Pius, "A.M." IV, 1, 28, 397 f. (no. 2). Forni, "Athen." 1938, 27,

124. Pius, "A.M." IV, 1, 28, 397 f. (no. 2). Forni, "Athen." 1938, 27,
For such soldiers' servants ("colones"), cf. V. Domanski, "R.R." III, 187, 1362.


126. as Josephus himself says ("R.J." III, 6, 2, 126). Cf. above, p. 27 n. 6.

127. 6, 2, 115 ff., and Reissner on 126.

128. Josephus himself had been made responsible for the Jewish defence of Galilee, and claims to have collected an army of over 10,000 men (II, 1, 6, 576).

129. II, 7, 5, 151 - the markmen called.

130. 9, 1, 108; 13, 211; cf. 13, 285.

131. 7, 144; 7, 7, 403; IV, 1, 5, 36 ff. For Debunius, cf. "R.I.R." 141, 110.


135. 7, 32, 314; IV, 9, 1, 406. A similar force of 500 foot and 500 horse is found under the command of Macidus when first mentioned, however (cf. n. 124 above), he was a legate, not a legionary legate. In IV, 1, 3, 57, he commands 900 horse.

136. III, 9, 7, 443 ff.

137. IV, 8, 1, 442. On a larger scale, Vespasian left garrison in Jericho and Adida (Aedetha) prior to his planned assault on Jerusalem in 68 (9, 1, 486).

For instance, cf. above, p. 76.


I am not correct on the name of the governor.

For Italy, cf. above, p. 76.

Jos. "Bel." II, 11, 10 ff., and Thomasen, 1964, II 28 f. (cf. I, 10 ff.), argue that Dio and not Tacitus, is correct on the name of the governor.

For Italy, cf. above, p. 76.


1964 - vol. II, 53.


Dio (I.A. 23, 2) speaks of "tribunus militum".

Jos. ("Bel." XL, 1, 19, 122) names this tribunus, who had been a gladiator, over the guard at the defeat of Mucius. Sedman ad loc. regards him as a Thracian, but says that cannot be a technical term equivalent to "tribunus militum".


41. 2 f. "insculpsum remanserat militum. Gallus al equite N. oppressa trahit cernibus". The revolt of Sicyon will be discussed in the next chapter.

151. "Ch." 29, 1; Sala in loc.


On these, cf. above, p. 6.

C.I.I. XVI, 3, with Hesselink ad loc. for the date: Kroft, 1911.

For the termini, cf. Tach, "J.R.W." IV, 149, 1911.

C.I.I. XVI, 3. 5 also are mentioned, but only these 3 names have survived.
126. **C.I.L. XVI, 6.** Supplying a consular date, the province and the 
governor under whom the regiments served. For the Antores, cf. 
Söhner, "L.L.," 11, 1895, 1896 f.; Malaise, III, 1897, 1336 ff.; 
Schulten, III, 1927, 17 ff. (no. 1).

127. **C.I.L. XVI, 5.** XVI, 6, of 54 - 17 A.D., is very fragmentary and 
supplies no regimental names.

128. **I.H.S.** 191; for Gallican names, cf. "I.H.S." 191; for 
Lustugins, Kraft, 1912; for the Varcessi, E. Fara, "I.H.S." VIII A, 
1929, 345 ff.
The revolt of Vindex, which led to the fall of Nero, broke out early in 68. Vindex, himself of Gallic descent, was governor of Gallia Lugdunensis. His forces are said to have numbered 100,000 men. The tribes who supported him were the Mediones, Arverniens and Sequaniens. Vienna (Vienne) was assailed by Lugdunum (Lyon) - both Roman colonies, but of differing origins - of having supported Vindex. There may have been other support for the revolt, but it is not recorded. The figure of 100,000 seems excessive, and Dainworth would explain it as a somewhat exaggerated estimate of the strength of the legions and auxiliaries of the army of upper and lower Germany. In the event, according to Plutarch, 24 legions fell.

Verginius Rufus, legate of the forces of Upper Germany that crushed Vindex, had German cavalry and Belgians among the auxiliaries. Two Gallic peoples, the Traverans and the Lingones, supported him, but whether this means that they supplied extra "auxilia" is not known.

Balba, then governor of Hispania Tarraconensia, accepted leadership of the revolt and was proclaimed emperor in April, 68, before the defeat of Vindex. Verginius Rufus' troops then called the rebels "rebels", thereby implying that they had more respectable opponents to deal with than the followers of a rebel Gaul. In Tarraconensia Balba had 1 legion, 2 alae and 3 cohorts, according to Suetonius, and he then set about conscripting further legions and auxiliaries. In fact only one legion was formed, which
Tacitus calls the "septima Galbiana"\(^{11}\), normally in contexts where it could be confused with the "septima Claudiana". Among the auxiliaries we hear of "Vesconus lactae a Galba cohortes"\(^{12}\) when they were sent to Upper Germany. Otho, then governor of Lusitania, joined Galba at the outset\(^{13}\), but nothing is stated about the troop movements involved.

On his arrival in Rome in the autumn of 68, Galba found the city full of troops being levied or transferred for the expeditions or crises of Nero's last months. Tacitus describes the non-praetorian and non-urban forces as follows: "inducta legiones Hispana, remanente quae quaeque Nero conscripti fuerat, plena urbe exercitu insistito; multi ad hoc numeri e Germania et Britannia et Illyrico, quos idem Nero electos ... resuscuerat"\(^\text{14}\).

The "Spanish legion", as noted above, was the legion that accompanied Galba from Spain. It would have been either the new seventh or the old sixth. The "legion which Nero had conscripted from the fleet" later appears as "legio classica" and "prima adiutrix"\(^\text{15}\). The "numerii" were detachments drawn from the areas stationed in the areas named. Saevar\(^\text{16}\) is of the opinion that they consisted mainly of legionaries. But when Galba was threatened by Otho and appealed to him for support, they are referred to as "legiones ... et auxilia"\(^\text{17}\). Further, Otho sent "Sulpicius Florus e Britannicie cohortibus, nuper a Galba ciuitate donatus" to murder the man whom Galba had adopted as his heir\(^\text{18}\). "Cohortes" on occasion can mean legionary cohorts, but Sulpicius Florus (Galba belonged to the gens Sulpicia) could not have been a legionary, otherwise he would already have possessed citizenship.

The "Britannicae cohortes", therefore, must mean auxiliary cohorts previously stationed in Britain and forming part of the "numerii e ... Britanniae". The
German detachment is later described as "Germanici exercitus milites", "Germanici milites" and "Germanica auxilia"."Vexillum" has three senses that could be appropriate here: auxiliary cavalry, veterans in reserve, and detachment. It is obvious from the equation just quoted that the last sense is the correct one, and this chapter Illyricus is being used anachronistically or broadly; for "Pannonici...legio exercitus milites" are equated with "electos Illyrici exercitus". Saxon's view cannot stand, and the "numeri" must be regarded as part legionary; "exercitus milites" are equated with "electos Illyrici exercitus". Saxon's view cannot stand, and the "numeri" must be regarded as part legionary, part auxiliary. That they were so argues for a close link between the two arms, and a high degree of professional organization on the part of the auxiliaries concerned. As action of Drusus after his entry into Rome should be noted: he decided to disband the German "corpora custodes" of Nero, sending the men back home without a bounty; Seutonius refers to the corps as "Germanorum cohortes".

After staging his proclamation as emperor on the Rhine on January 1st, 69 A.D., Vitellius' supporters mobilized their forces for an invasion of Italy. Key communities in the area - the "agrippinenses". Treviri, Lingones - offered enthusiastic support in the form of auxilia equus armas pecuniae. It is hard to know whether tribal auxiliaries can be understood or not. The agrippinenses were the inhabitants of a Roman colony (now Cologne) and hence entitled to serve in the legions, but they may represent the surrounding Ubians, still auxiliary material. The Treverans could serve as auxiliaries, although their chief town was also a colony (now Trier).
The Lingones were still partly peregrines: who granted the whole "ciuitas" citizenship. In any case, it is not clear whether this offer was accepted, and, if so, whether contingents of these peoples were included in the large number of Gallic auxiliaries that supported Vitellius in Italy. Governors of neighbouring provinces threw their weight in with Vitellius. Of the governor of Gallia Lugudunensis we are told that he had the "ala feuriana" and the "italica legio" at Lugdunum: these were both shortly withdrawn. It is possible that the aia formed part of the invasion force. Tacitus' description of this is as follows:

"Valenti inferioris exercitus electi cum aquila quintae legio et cohortibus alius, ad quadraginta milia armatorum dat; triginta milia secunda e superiore germaniae existat, duorum subveniit auxilia, ille tunc auxilia, a quibus vitellius et eaque copiae suppletit ...". Unfortunately the total of 70,000 cannot be broken down into specific legionary and auxiliary proportions on the evidence of this statement. But there is a contrast implied between the regular cohorts and also and the "Germaniorum auxilia". Later there is a reference to "transrhenanorum" 27 mentioned at the crossing of the Rhine. These German "auxilia" or "transrhenani" must have been allied contingents supplied by free Germans. Meunier 28 would place the "Bataui" mentioned at the Rhine in the same category, but the "octo ostiowiros cohortes, quatuor decem legiones auxilia" 29 on their way from Italy to Britain who joined Vitellius when his revolt was known 30 probably the Bataui referred to. They would have been more professional than allied German contingents
at this stage. It is not clear whether they are to be regarded as part of, or in addition to, the 74,000 named above.

Some details on the composition of the "auxilia" assigned to Valens and Caecina can be recovered as the narrative proceeds. Thus "Gallorum Lusitancrumque et Britannorum cohortes et Germanorum auxilia cum ala retriana" were sent into Italy ahead of the main forces. The cohorts require no comment, except to note that this is the first reference to British ones. The sense of "auxilia" has caused disagreement. Since "alae" (in the plural) is used in reference to these forces in the next sentence, and only one ala, the Retriana, is named, it has been thought that "auxilia" here means "alae". But this cannot be pressed: other unnamed alae such as the ala Siliana may have been meant. However, it is best to interpret the phrase in the light of what has gone before rather than in the light of what follows. As we have seen, "Germanorum auxilia" were included in the invasion force. The "Germanorum auxilia" here must mean detachments of these. They were probably cavalry, since they are closely associated with the Retriana, but certainly not properly organized Roman alae, as argued above. On the march to Italy Valens had to divert part of his forces to protect Gallia Narbonensis from an attack by Otho's fleet.

The auxiliaries involved comprised "duae hungrorum cohortis, quattuor equitum turmas, universae preter alae cum Julio Claudico praefecto". A quingenary ala appears to have been divided into 16 "turmas"; hence the 4 "turmas" of cavalry represented a quarter of a regiment. In describing the fighting between the Vitellians and the Othonians at Placentia

/(Placentia), .....
(Piacenza), Tacitus singles out the "cohortia Germanorum, cantu truci et
core patrio nudia corporibus super usuros acute quatientium" 33. The
question arises, whether these German "cohorts" can be regarded as regular
regiments like the Turonian cohort just mentioned. The strong emphasis
placed on their "ancestral" mode of entering into battle makes this
unlikely. They are rather to be classified among the "Germanorum auxilia"
referred to in the original description of the invading force 34. "Cohort"
must be used here in a tactical, not a professional sense. It is likely
that at least 2 of the cohorts accompanying Valens were Gallic, to judge
from a fight between a Gallic auxiliary and a legionary that Tacitus
 describes in connection with a feast which Vitellius gave for Verginius
Fuscus in North Italy after the battle of Bedriacum. It is true that the
Gallic auxiliary may have accompanied Vitellius rather than the original
invasion force to Italy. But the dispute arose with a soldier of the
fifth legion, which was part of Valens' force. Accordingly it seems
preferable to consider the Gaul as one of Valens' auxiliaries. To avenge
the defeat of their comrade by the Gaul, the legionaries then cut 2
cohorts to pieces. Probably both were Gallic 35. We are told that, after
the defeat of Otho, Vitellius decided to send the Gallic auxiliaries
home: "redita ciuitatibus Gallorum auxilia, insens numero et prisa
statim defectiones inter inania belli adsuantus" 36. From this it would
appear that he had enlisted a very large number of Gauls at the very
outset of his revolt. (The phrase "inter inania belli" implies that they
were of little value.) Whether the men included those offered by the
\textit{agrippinenses}, .....
Agrippianae, Iroverans and Lingones in the incident discussed above, cannot be decided. It is interesting that they were returned to their home tribes ("ciuitatibus"). This implies discharge, rather than continuance as professional auxiliaries. Here it is instructive to compare the German "auxilia" of the invasion force. They were of far greater military value, although technically allied "coxi", than hastily drafted provincials. For these to become professional "auxilia" a long training was necessary.

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

1. Iroveran aux.
2. Tungrian cohorts.
3. Gallic cohorts (in all likelihood),
4. Batavian cohorts, all of which appear to have followed Valens to Italy;

and from the army of Upper Germany:

an ala Petriana,
British,
Gallic, and
Lusitanian cohorts,
a Thracian cohort (in all probability).

The allied German contingents and the "raw" auxilia (V).

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

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

Before proceeding to the major fighting in North Italy, it will be of use to consider some of the incidents en route in more detail.
Vaccini's passage to Italy was blocked by the Helveticans, still unaware of Calba's death. The cause of their resistance was the seizure of money intended for local defence by some nearby legionaries: "rapuerant pecunias sibi in stipendium castelli quod olim Helvitiis suis militibus at stipendia tuebantur". The Helvetican "militia" must have been entirely under local control. They are commonly regarded as a local militia. The Helveticans mobilized rapidly, but were caught between Vaccini and the auxiliary forces guarding the Helveticans in the rear. These appear as "caeticius alae cohortesque et genorum et ferox suavibus, suavitatis et more militis exercitis". The defeat of the Helveticans is then described in the words "ac atatis imani cohortes Thraeicum deperierit et consectantibus "Germanos saetiaque ... trucidati". "Caeticius" here must mean "stationed in saetia", whether consisting of Saetians or not. The "cohors Thraecum" may have been part of the German or the Saetian army. The Saetian "youth" who were militarily prepared co-operated with the Germans ("consectantibus Germanis saetiaque" - presumably from the "Germanorum auxilia" of Vaccini) in slaughtering the fleeing Helveticans. It would be interesting to know whether these Saetians were a standing local militia, operating with the Roman .......
Roman persuasion, as in the case of the Helvetian garrison under discussion, or whether they were a purely tribal organization. The first alternative appears the more likely. Vercingetorix was threatened by the procurator of Noricum who drew his auxiliaries together to oppose his coming into his province. These troops Tacitus loosely calls "Noricum", but must be thinking of "auxilia Norica", i.e., auxiliaries stationed in Noricum, whether of Norican origin or not. As noted above, Vercingetorix must have various auxiliary formations ahead into Italy to strengthen the six Silius, whose accession to the Vitellian cause he had heard of while among the Helvetians. Their connection with Vitellius in Africa has already been noted: at present they were still in north Italy, where they had been marooned on their way to join the expedition against Vindex. It was particularly their decurions who instigated their change of sides. Tacitus further tells us that they won over 4 important Transpadane "municipia" (including Mediolanum, now Milan) for Vitellius. It is true that their influence was heightened because they happened to be the only military force in a "Italicae Italiae pars", but even so, the incident is a striking comment on the increasing importance of the professional auxiliaries.

Meanwhile the procurator of the Germanic alps was trying to hold his province against an attack by the Livianae. He had to use local material only, called "contani" by Tacitus. The "ius cursus" of the tribes, however, proved unequal to warfare against the soldiers of the Praetorian Guard. The

1/2 Hungrian......
2 Thaurian cohorts, the Tarraurian ala and 6 or 8 squadrons of cavalry which
Valens sent to Carthage, could not have already been mentioned. Tacitus later
refers to the 2 cohorts in the phrase "Tungrarum cohortia", using the
adjectival form, and "Tungrum". This detachment from Valens' army was
supported by local "auxilia" - "adiuncta ligurum cohortae, usus loci auxilium,
et quingenti fanonii, nondum aut signis". From the run of the sentence,
it would seem natural to take the 500 fanonii as part of the local
"auxilia", like the ligurian cohort. But there seems little reason for
stationing fanonii in this area under normal circumstances, and it is
more probable to regard the fanonii as recruits for a quingentary cohort,
previously on route to a frontier army. This would be an early instance of
auxiliaries being sent from their home area before their period of training.

In the actual battle which follows, the Vitellians were able to use
"Alpina", presumably local levies from the Maritime Alps emigrating under
their earlier defeat by the Gothians. On their side on this occasion the
pretorians were supported by "pera classiorum sextiae paganie" of
"aut ad iucUndum ... paganeus manus" who hurled rocks down on the
Vitellian "treuiram turcae". In other words marines from the fleet were
assisted by the local population using a natural technique in a hilly area.
The forces of Otho proved to be the victors. As a result of this Corsica
remained true to Otho, but its governor tried to win it over for Vitellius.
He called the "principes insulæ" together, and, after coming opposition,
proceeded to hold a levy. But the "inconditi homines" so enlisted rebelled
against the discipline of military training, and argued that even where

/Corsica ......
Corseia had been protected by cohorts and also it had been ravaged by
Nero's fleet. They succeeded in assassinating the governor, once again,
a picture emerges of a professional core supplemented by local levies in
an emergency.

Reference has already been made to the auxiliaries sent on
ahead to Italy to join the ala Julliana. These forces captured a
"Pannoniorum cohors" and cut off "centus equites ac mille classici." Neubner regards the Pannonian cohort as part of the detachment of the
German army that Nero had planned to send to Alexandria but had later
recalled to Italy for the uprising of Vindex, like the ala Julliana. The
mercenaries from the fleet are self-explanatory: it is however not clear
whether the 1,000 cavalry were auxiliary or not. When Cecina attacked
Clausentia (Lucca), his legions were accompanied by a "sparsae
auxiliarum manvs." Arrows are named among the weapons used in the assault,
but there is no indication that there was a "cohors sagittariorum" involved.

German cohorts receive special mention: as noted above, "cohors" here
should be taken in a tactical sense. Although Varro states Cecina was joined
by several "classici" and "Julius Briganticus cum paucis equitis ....
praefectus alae in Batavia genitus". Julia Briganitcus was a Batavian,
but it is not stated that the troops whom he commanded at this juncture
were Batavians. As Neubner remarks, the "few cavalry" with whom he
defected were part of the "Onthina garrison of 3 praetorian cohorts, 1,000
legionaries and cavalry mentioned in an earlier chapter, what their
/nationality ......
nationality was cannot be decided. After being exiled at Sicentia, 
Casina withdrew to Orestes. In the vicinity his auxiliaries were defeated 
by gladiators whom an Etruscan commander had transported across the go in 
boats\(^5\). In the same area (at a place called ad Castores) Casina placed 
his "ferocissime auxiliarium" in ambush: the 2 Etruscan commanders 
divided the infantry and the cavalry between themselves. Behind these came, 
on the left, a detachment of the thirteenth legion, 4 auxiliary cohorts and 
300 cavalry; in the centre 3 praetorian cohorts; on the right the first 
legion with 2 auxiliary cohorts and 300 horses. In the reserve were "ex 
praetorio auxiliis quo enuitatem\(^6\). The emphasis on the cavalry is 
noteable. There is the initial group interpreted of the commanders, 1000 on the 
left and the right of the main body, and 500 in reserve. The fact that the 
reserve group consisted of cavalry from the praetorian guard and from the 
auxiliaries is also notable: the infantry was able to dominate a part of the 
army the auxiliary cavalry was. One may also observe that where the number 
of legionaries differed in the two wings, auxiliary troops (4 cohorts to 2) 
were used to balance the two sections. As in the case of the cavalry, so 
the infantry auxiliaries are increasingly being used on the same terms as 
the legionaries. In passing Tacitus remarks the sounding of "rex epichenes, 
ludigre pro Athenaeus nomine cibarum\.\(^7\) Alcianus' father was the last king of 
Commagene: we do not know whether he was commanding a contingent of 
Commageneans or, which appears more likely, fighting in the Etruscan forces 
in an individual capacity.

Attention now turns to Vulcena, worried about the position of
Narbonensis Saul and the growing wariness of the Batavian cohorts (associated with the Fourteenth Legion) that were now with him in North Italy, as we have seen, Valens decided to send "partem Batavorum" to assist the troops he had left behind in Narbonensis, when this was announced "amores suci, flores regiones". The reason for the legionaries' discontent was:

"orbis as fortissimorum auxorum auxilio"; "uestros illos et tot bellorum victores" were being removed; it was like cutting the strongest limbs off a body! In the ensuing riot Valens was forced to disguise himself as a slave and take refuge with a "sociorum equitum". The strength and importance of the auxiliares are apparent not only to the commoners, but also to the common legionary.

Iulius described in some detail a clash around an island in the

In between the gladiators and the Vitellii. The Vitellii troops involved are called "Germani" and their effective swimming is noted. They showed more firmness than the gladiators and are then honoured with the appellation "militae". When describing the battle of Bedricus itself, Iulius reports the opportune arrival of "recent auxilia" for the Vitellii in these words: "varus auxilia, sese gladiatorem susc, quae aquibus transsactae opposites cohortes in ipso flumine trucidauerant".

These three elements - "Germani, auxilia, cohortes" - appear in Flutarch's biography of Cicero as "Parvum et Tols et monerea".

... Iulius inlatus, "auxilia"; vitellii auxilia, auxilia.

... Iulius inlatus, Auxilia vitellii. ... a most of the gladiators fell into the river, into the hands of cohorts stationed there.
In his comment on the first passage Mundy identifies the Batavians with Tacitus' Batavians (strangely not with Flutercheus), on the face of it the second passage, Mundy says that "Tacitus ... states that it was the Batavians who had destroyed the gladiators", but this ignores the 'emphates' of the relative clause "quae ... trucidauerunt". The Batavian cohorts may have been divided, as he suggests, but this does not emerge definitely from Tacitus' words. Mundy quotes without enthusiasm the view that the "emphates" may have been demobilized, found associated with the Batavians in a later context. The three elements may have been identical, but the opinion seems to lie in the distinction between the Batavian cohorts and the German allies in Vitellius that has been maintained throughout. In particular the "natura transmarmorosa" of Tacitus's first meaning of the word, is recalled. The soldiers involved, then, organized theBatavians, and the levies of Germans made by Vitellius immediately before the March on Italy.

The auxiliary forces which Maccius and Velleius brought to Italy, and those which they won over there, have already been discussed. One of the non-legionary (and non-rectorian) forces of the for the battle of Medracen? Like Nero before him, Vitellius drafted a legion from soldiers from the fleet who bad survived Galba's massacre on his entry into Rome; "reliquae ... in numero legioni consuerunt". Vitellius main force was accompanied by unspecified "altera cohors rexiteaque" and "deforae inuuper..."
auxilium, duo alia gladiatorem*. Whether the "classicorum ingens numerus,"64 which he had in his own entourage is to be distinguished from
the "legion" just mentioned is not clear. The loss of 10 cavalry and
100 "classici" near Placentia has already been noted, as well as the fate
of the 2000 gladiators. The numbers of auxiliary regiments involved at
the battle of "ad Castorem" have also been seen: they do not form a basis
for calculating the whole auxiliary force. As far as the actual names of
regiments are concerned, there is nothing except for two of very
doubtful value. "Hex Epiphanes" has been discussed already, and we also
have a mention of Otho's use of a "citius equo Numida"65, but this Numidian
is more likely to have been a private courier than an auxiliary. Then two
slave from the Numidian slaves were credited with a significant role in the
battle, but their names are not known. Before leaving the conflict
between Otho and Vitellius, it will be interesting to note various
rhetorical references to the "auxilia" involved. These occur mainly in the
speeches which Tacitus put in the mouths of the protagonists. Vitellius
is assured that "Germanorum auxilia" will follow him to Italy; no others
are mentioned in the passage concerned. Otho is made to stigmatize his
troops as "Germani" in a sentence that implies that he had unlimited
"Germani" at his disposal. This is immediately qualified, or contradicted,
by "nationes aliquae" - a few tribes. It is clear that the legionaries
themselves are to be tarred with the German brush: for Otho opposes the
"Italici et Romanae ... iuventus"66, the "true sons of Italy and Rome"
to Vitellius' men. Otho's troops are made to call Vitellius' army

/*peregrinus ......
"peregrinus ab externu," when dispersed, the Germans, admitted to be
the strongest element in Vitellius' forces ("quod genus militum apud hostis
atrucisainmum sit"), are said not to have been able to withstand the
relaxing climate of Italy. Neutral terms, however, appear in a favourable
passage. Vitellius is invited to admire the part played by his soldiers
at the battle of Cedriacum in the phrase: "hinc intrupisse legionum agmen,
hinc equites coortum, inde circumfusus auxiliarum unus". It is clear
that, when the foreignness or "Germanness" of troops is being stressed,
allowance must be made for prejudice and rhetoric.

The preparations of the Flavians may be considered next. Tacitus
states that Lucianus and Vespasian had 7 legions between them in the east
and "auxilia utrique cohortium alarumque et classes regesque". The
accession of Egypt increased the legions to 9; the auxiliary strength
remained unspecified: "classium alarum cohortium robora et fidissimi
reges". Certain of the kings are then named: John of Sophene
with "numus sapernandia uribum", Antiochus of Commagene and Agrippa with his
sister Serenice. Leviath were held: since Vespasian is said to have
testified "praefectus" or command in auxiliary regiments on many, it can
be supposed that auxiliaries as well as legionaries were enlisted.
Diplomatic arrangements were concluded with Armenia and Parthia to secure
peace on the eastern frontier. After he had heard of the successful out-
come of the battle of Cremona, Vespasian received an offer of assistance
from Vologeses of Parthia. This was now no longer necessary; it would be
interesting to know what Vespasian's reaction would have been if the offer
had .....
had come earlier. Tacitus reports the incident as follows: "Adempti legati regis Volcaenni quadraginta milia Parthorum equitum offerentes. magnificum hostium tantia succorum auxilia amibi neque indigere"76. In Caesar, however, the 40,000 Parthians appear as "quadraginta milia sagittariorum"77. They were, therefore, mounted archers of the usual Parthian type, but Tacitus and Caesarius refer to only one of their military characteristics. In the event, the forces of the East were hardly involved in the civil war, apart from the comparatively small portion that accompanied Lucianus to Italy. Both Tacitus and Josephus merely mention infantry and cavalry78. In general, however, it may be remarked that, as in the west, so in the East, the auxiliaries are associated with the legionaries on a completely professional basis. The crisis brought a search for extra forces: where Vitellius turned to the free German tribes, Vespasian approached the "serenissimis regem"79 and even Parthia, if his embassy to them was instructed to make a request for the troops which they appear to have offered of their own accord in the accounts of the Roman authors.

The Flavian attack on Italy was spearheaded by Antonius Titus80. The force by which he was accompanied consisted of "auxiliiarum e cohortibus at partes equitum"81; in a speech urging the invasion he had referred especially to the cavalry at the disposal of the Flavians: "duae" tunc (at the battle of Bedriacum) "Iannonicum ac Nossaice alae perrupere boastes; nunc occasim alarum confluentes signa ... superfluentes obitos praelitoris equites equosque"82. The emphasis on cavalry is evident: the Flavian strength is said to lie in it83. Further, as Vitellius had turned
to the free Germans and Votadinius to the client kings of the East, the Flavian leaders in Pannonia turned to the peoples across the Danube. The chiefs of the Sarmatian Iazyges were "in consilium adacitii". Since their offer of "plebes ... et uia equitum, qua sola usent" was rejected for security reasons, the implication of the phrase is not clear. The chiefs could hardly have been expected to fight without their followers, so that they must be regarded as non-participating allies. However Uido and Italicus, "reges Sueborum" who were also induced to support the Flavian faction, later appear fighting in Italy "cum delectis populārum". The governor of Raetia remained true to Vitellius, "auxilia" were detached to oppose him. These "auxilia" are defined as "alia suriana et octo cohortes ad Noricorum legiones", presumably a local militia supporting a professional auxiliary force. What part of these forces accompanied Antonius cannot be determined.

When detailing the troops that came to the support of Antonius from the commands of Pannonia and Raetia, Tacitus concentrates on the legions. At the battle of Cremona itself, the position of the auxiliaries in given after that of the legions: "cohortes auxiliarum in cornibus, latera ac terga aequi circumdatae; sed etque Italicius Suebi cum delectis populārum primi in acie uerubantur". Before passing to the Vitellian troops, some individual incidents should be noted. Before the battle of Cremona, Antonius gave his auxiliaries a foretaste of plundering: "auxiliares cohortes in Cremonam agrum minus ut specie /parandarum ...."
parandorum copis rum ciuili praedae miles in bueretur. Ex exploratores, ut mox est, longius curabant. Once again, Tacitus' association with cavalry should be noted: the numbers involved are large. But on the human side, Tacitus' use of the "ciuili praedae miles in bueretur" is striking. There is not here the obvious contrast between Roman citizens and auxiliary troops of non-Roman origin, otherwise "barbarus" or "externus" might have been used. "Miles" in its place seems to imply that Tacitus is avoiding the obvious comment to assimilate the auxiliary and the legionary soldier. It was military indiscipline in the last resort that had led to the deplorable incident: hence "miles" for auxiliary. The foray was interrupted by the unexpected appearance of the enemy. This led to a number of cavalry skirmishes. Two of the Vitellian legions "laeto inter initia equitum suorum proelio": the adjective "suorum" implies that the cavalry involved was associated with the legions, but cannot be generalized to mean that legions always had cavalry attached to them. The Vitellian legions failed to take the initiative, and the Flavians attacked: "mutantes sciem (of the Vitellians) victor equitatus (of the Flavians) incertae; et Vipetanum Messala tribunus cum Mesais auxiliaritus maequitur, quos multi e legionaribus quamquam repibus ductus sequunt: ipsa scia paecis aequae rupere legioni arum aegem. The initiatory and decisive role of the cavalry, referred to in the stylistic variant "victor equitatus", is again apparent. Vipetanum Messala's auxiliaries are referred to by the army from which they came rather than by their regimental names. In the attack on the Vitellian
camp after the actual battle of Cremna, Antonius is found acting "cum
delectis auxiliaribus" which in Josephus are called cavalry\textsuperscript{92}. Antonius
presents the interesting spectacle of a Roman legionary commander con-
sistently choosing to lead the auxiliary cavalry in battle.

While Cassina and Valena were engaged in Italy, Vitellius was
levying troops in Gaul and receiving reinforcements from Britain\textsuperscript{93}. Only
legionaries are mentioned. Even Vitellius reached Italy and joined up
with Cassina and Valena; he sent various troops back. These included
Gauls and the 8 cohorts of Metawius already mentioned\textsuperscript{94}. Now that his
position was secure, he attempted to reduce the size of his forces:
"apudari legionum auxiliarumque numero ubet usitia supplemendis; et
praeciscae missiones offerebantur\textsuperscript{95}". A whole regiments were not casemired;
it was their effective strength only that was affected. We are next
informed that 60,000 "armati" followed Vitellius into Rome: the division
between legionary and auxiliary is not given. An even larger number of
"calones" and "lixae" followed the army itself\textsuperscript{96}. The formal entry into
Rome is described as follows: "quattuor legionum aquilae per frontem
totidemque circa e legionibus sunia vexilla, mox duodeci alarum sigma
et post peditem ordines eque; dein quattuor et triginta cohortes, ut
nomina gentium aut species armorum forent, discreet\textsuperscript{97}". This passage
affords indications regarding army strength. Unfortunately the "vexilla"
provide an element of uncertainty. They are usually regarded as detach-
ments of the 4 legions that had remained in Germany\textsuperscript{98}. Since it is known
that the strength of these legions was greatly depleted, it may safely
be assumed that the detachments that had been drawn from them were of the larger kind, i.e., 2,000 rather than 1,000 strong in each case. Hence a total of 8,000 is arrived at. But there still remains the problem of the 8,000 men whom Vitellius had brought from Britain: these are listed among the forces whom Cassius took to Cremona, but appear to be ignored here. The total, 8,000, causes difficulty in itself. Dacre explains the figure as 6,000 legionaries and 2,000 auxiliaries, since there were 3 legions in Britain at this stage. But Vitellius sent the Fourteenth back to Britain. This inclines one to suggest that he may have regarded the paper strength of the British army as 4 legions, and so arranged the 8,000 men under 4 "auxilia". This is not to deny that there may have been detachments of auxiliaries from the British army, but Tacitus is probably ignoring them in these two contexts. Taking the 4 "auxilia" as legionary, the following break-down of the army at the Milvian Bridge can be given:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 legions</td>
<td>up to 24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 legionary &quot;auxilia&quot;</td>
<td>up to 8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total legionaries</td>
<td>32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 alae (if quingenary)</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 cohorts (if quingenary)</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures must be treated with caution if we already noted, regiments were below strength. The auxiliaries however form less than three quarters of the total. The grand total falls short of the 60,000 "civati" noted above...
above by 5000. Finally it is interesting to note that the auxiliaries are classified under two heads: tribal affiliation or weapons borne. Once they were in use, the troops deteriorated rapidly. Tacitus singles out the decline in health of the "Germanorum Gallorumque" as these are probably blanket terms referring to several of the professional auxiliary regiments. There was also a wholesale interchange between newly created urban troops, legions and auxiliaries.

On the announcement of the defection of Vespasian, Vitellius ordered fresh reinforcements from Germany, Britain and Spain. In a speech referring to this Antonius Primus is made to say (after mentioning Germany and Britain) that Gaul and Spain would provide "veni horesse and tribute" to the Vitellian cause. These provinces provided recruits for the legions, but it is fair to surmise that, since horses are mentioned, auxiliaries were also in question, especially for the cavalry. Unfortunately in describing the array that set out under Cassius from Rome to oppose the Flavians, Tacitus concentrates on the legions involved, just mentioning the cavalry and "alata auxilia". At the battle of Cremona they are referred to merely in the words "saequae auxiliae". Prior to the battle "tria Vitellianae cohortes et alae, cui deboniansae novem" were worsted by the Flavians at Forum Alensi Legionis 7. When Lucullus became, prefect of the fleet at Ravenna (a post to which he was promoted after holding the prefecture of an ala) defected to Vespasian, he was taken to Atria (Adria) for detention by a prefect of an ala who was garrisoning...
the town. Presumably other auxiliary regiments were performing similar functions elsewhere in the war zone of North Italy. After Cremona, the Flavians decided to send two defeated Vitellian supporters to announce their victory in Gaul. One was Alpinius Montanaus, a Treveran who was a prefect of a cohort. Unfortunately, the nationality of his cohort is not stated.

In the period between the battle of Cremona and the occupation of Rome by the Flavians, a succession of troop movements and minor engagements occurred which merit some attention. Fabius Valens, who was not present at the battle of Cremona, requested assistance from Rome on hearing of the defeat of the Vitellians. Vitellius sent his "tres cohortas cum ala Britannica", a force exactly parallel in size to that wrought at Forum Alieni. To judge by its name, the ala Britannica must have been stationed in Britain at some stage, but whether it came directly from there or from a period of service on the Rhine cannot be established. The next report concerns the arrival of a legion from Salutaris with new recruits: "sex simile Salutarus, recens dilectus". It is probable that these were intended for auxiliary service, since they accepted enrolment into the Roman fleet, whose men were clamouring for service in the legions, many successfully. When discussing Lucullus Magnus, Tacitus had stated that a great number of its auxilia consisted of Salutarii and Samnites in the first instance. Antonius Primus eventually decided to leave the bulk of the legions in North Italy, while he advanced southwards with auxiliary infantry and cavalry and detached legionaries. The force which Vitellius
sent from Rome to hold the Apennines against the Flavian approach consisted of 14 cohorts of the praetorian guard, "comites equitum" and "flaviana legio". But Vitellius' resources appear to have been drying up: when the defection of the fleet at Misenum to Vespasian was announced, the forces which he despatched against it consisted of an urban cohort and gladiators, a favourite recruiting ground for the urban based. When this force defected as well, Vitellius sent his brother, L. Vitellius, to Campania with 6 cohorts and 500 cavalry. These were probably praetorian, since Vitellius had recalled part of his forces from the Apennines, and is more likely to have assigned these to his brother than "cohortes vigilae" or urban cohorts. The cavalry may have been either praetorian or auxiliary.

Vitellius then proceeded to enlist men from the Roman "plebs" and from slaves: he was faced with fighting on two fronts simultaneously, against the rebel fleet which had established itself at Terracina (Terracina), and against the Flavian force advancing across the Apennines towards Rome.

The success of L. Vitellius at Terracina, and his surrender after the death of his brother in Rome, need not detain us, except to note that the Flavians sent cavalry ahead of the legions along the route which he would take to Rome as a precaution. Later they sent Lucullus Bassus with some light armed cavalry to restore order in Campania. Antonius Primus had little difficulty in his advance on Rome. However Petilliu Serafinus, who had been sent on ahead with a force of 1,000 cavalry to make a diversionary attack on Rome, suffered a surprise defeat in which the prefect of an ala was captured.

A final incident involving what was possibly an auxiliary soldier in that in which "oblivus a Germanico militium" appeared to aim a blow at Vitellius

\[\text{just} \ldots.\]
Just before he was killed, as the phrase stands, the soldier could have been a legionary or an auxiliary from the German army which had accompanied Vitellius to Rome. Dio however calls him *Hellicius tacitly suggesting an auxiliary (or a member of the German bodyguard). Then Lucianus arrived in Rome, attempted to curb the power of Antonius Primus. One of his measures was the generous granting of military tribunates and auxiliary prefectures to his close supporters, another was to despatch the Seventh Legion, that worshipped Antonius, away from Rome. Other legionary movements are reported, but in no instance do the "auxilia" receive mention. 122

Local incidents and provincial matters may now be considered. While Vitellius was in Lucianus on his way to Italy, a revolt broke out among a small section of the Usulii, the Boiena. 123 Their prophet-leader, Mariccus, succeeded in obtaining assistance from Vitellius in crushing the uprising: "grannissimui" cuitus *selecta iuventute, adiectis a Vitellio cohortibus, fanaticis multituzimen assiste disiciit*. The cohorts of Vitellius were presumably auxiliary. Of interest is the ease with which Mariccus could gather an armed force in the proximity of a strong Roman army, and the apparently independent action of the *seduans*. Their "seduants" must have been under training, to have been so readily available.

The Batavian revolt was on a completely different scale. In his...
introduction to this subject, Tacitus gives a brief account of the Batavians and their relation to Rome. They did not pay taxes, being required only to supply men and arms. Experts at swimming, they could even cross rivers under arms and keep hold of their horses: "uiros tantarum armis imperio ministrantium, furor bellis exercitum, max auta per Britanniam gloria, transmissis illius conscribibus, quae super adstitim mobilissim populi regionem rectabant. erat ut domi delectus equus, praeceptum candi studio, arma equorum rotis eran integris turmis Auenus perrumpere . . . ." 124. Their service in Germany and Britain has been noted in earlier chapters. It would appear that they kept a force of cavalry at home, presumably for border defence. Their troops abroad, and therefore obviously those at home, were under native commanders.

Several of the causes alleged for the revolt throw light on the auxiliary system. Civilis, the leader of the revolt, had twice been in difficulties with the Roman authorities: it has been plausibly suggested that that the first occasion was due to intriguing with Vindex. 125. In the event however, the Batavians fought alongside the Romans against Vindex. 126. A second cause was a levy of Batavians instituted by Vitellius as part of his preparations for his attempt on the purple. "Fuerat vitellii Batavorum munus ad dilectus aequabatur, quae suscepit nuper gravis onerabant ministri. 127. The abuses arose from the avarice and lust of the recruiting agents, whose Civilis called "praefecti centurionesque" presumably auxiliary commanders as well as legionary centurions were responsible. Civilis then exacerbated the feeling of the Batavians by proclaiming that
the separation of the recruits from their families would be for ever ("silius supremus"). The implication was that they could not be serving at home, but abroad. Thirdly, Antonius Frame had got into contact with Civilis, instructing him to stage an uprising so as to prevent forces leaving Germany to assist Vitellius in Italy: "mactis satis ad eas scripsit Antonii litterae, quibus aertere vocita vitellii auxilia et tumulus Germanici specie retentare legiones iubebatur". This was clearly an attempt on the part of the Flavians to detach Civilis from the "clientela" of Vitellius.

The strength of the legions in lower Germany was seriously depleted. What indications survive concerning the auxiliaries available to the Romans? An attack was made on 2 cohorts in winterquarters close to the coast near the mouth of the Rhine. Unable to sustain the attack, the prefects of the cohorts burnt the "castella" concerned, and joined the other troops in the vicinity. The strategy is described as follows: "signa auxiliaque et quod militibus in suscipere insulae partes congregantur, duce Aquilio prizipiliari, nomen sepulcis exercitus quam robur: quippe uritus cohortias abductis Vitellius a praecipius teriones Germanorumque pagis segna numera armis carceraret". The phrase "signa uspiliaque" appears to be a periphrasis for auxiliaries detached - no legionaries were involved. Vitellius had withdrawn the normal auxiliary cohorts ("aures cohortium") and substituted what Tacitus deprecates as an armed force of local villagers. The Sarmatians are well enough known: Sarmatian cohorts are found on the Roman side later, but who are the "Urmans" here? The names of various local peoples have been suggested as alternatives, especially an
the detection of a "Tungrians cohors" to Cælius is mentioned in the account of the ensuing battle. "German" here, however, may be a generic for a specific name, or a re-appearance of the old cimbrenae Germani: most of the peoples in this region claimed a Germanic origin. The phrase "Tungrian cohort" should make us wary of interpreting "sestis numerus" above as a reference to a different category of soldier. The derogatory tone is intended to reflect on Vitellius, and at most means that the Nervians and Germans were recently recruited and badly trained. But they were formed in cohorts: before Cælius joined in battle with them he offered them all safe conduct to return to their "hiberna". The name of the original 2 cohorts has not survived. Cælius allowed prefects whom he had captured to return to their communities in Gaul. Like Alpinus Montanus, they must have been "gallic". The cohorts were allowed to return home or to join the rebellion. They too may have been "gallic", although any people in the vicinity would serve. We have at this juncture an auxiliary force normally stationed in small forts of their own for the winter. They are drawn together in an emergency, and placed under the command of a comparatively high-ranking legionary officer. The names involved are Nervian and Tungrian, German in all probability, and possibly "gallic".

Information next appears when the commander of the army of Upper Germany, Nordeonius Plaicus, ordered a legionary incursus, Semoiternus Lupercus, to proceed against Cælius. He took the following forces: "Legionarius e praesentibus, Tbolio et praeside, Frisiorum equites hauud longe agentis ..."
addita Batavorum.\textsuperscript{133} They are referred to again as "legiones cohorteasque ... alae", and the centre element in the phrase "Vbiorum Treuirorumque Ubiiiae". Ubian cohorts are next heard of during Civilis' siege of Vetera (Xanten).\textsuperscript{134} They fell prey to Civilis' German allies who surprised them "in uion Marcudaro" (Messen). In spite of this, however, "Ubial" continued to plunder the Germans across the Rhine, until completely crushed by the rebels. The use of the term "cohorts" in two different references, and the word "auxilias" creates the impression that the Ubians accompanying Munius Luperceus formed regular auxiliary units. The Ubians, however, who raided across the Rhine sound like a local force acting on its own initiative. The Treveran were also attacked by Civilis' forces. "Treuir"\textsuperscript{135} are said to have erected defence works against the attack, but to have suffered heavy losses. More must have been involved than a professional auxiliary unit. Such a unit - an ala - appears when "Classicus praefectus alae Treuirorum" decided to change sides and join Civilis after the death of Horaceonius Flaccus\textsuperscript{136}. Classicus and the Treveran ala are last recorded in the Vitellian forces that repulsed the Usurians in their attempt on Gallia Narbonensis. The most likely explanation is that Classicus and his regiment had since returned to the Rhineland and that the "equites" accompanying Munius Luperceus were in fact this ala. There can be no doubt about the professional character of the Batavian ala referred to in the passage under discussion. We are informed that its commander was a Batavian, Claudius Labec, who was captured by the Treveran and sent to the Frisians for custody\textsuperscript{137}. We have, then, a Ubian cohort (or cohorts), a Treveran and a Batavian ala.
At the same time as Gordianus Flaccus detainted Munius Lepercus against Civilis, orders came from Vitellius that "Batavorum et Canninefatae cohortes" were to proceed to Rome. These Batavian cohorts were not officially part of the German army; earlier they are described as "Britannicae auxilia, Batavorum cohortis missae in Germaniam ... ac tum Moguntiaci agentium". They were the same 8 cohorts on their way back to Britain, temporarily camping at Moguntiacum (Rheinzabern), but then recalled to Italy by Vitellius. This is the only reference to a cohort (or cohorts) of Canninefatae associated with them. At what stage they had joined them is not clear. These cohorts had already been tampered with by Civilis; their reaction on receiving their orders to proceed to Rome are instructive.

"Pratum itineris donatium, duplicem stipendium, augeri equitum numerum. ut promissa manea Vitellio, postulabat, non adequantur, sed causam seditionis". Their demands were not intended to be taken seriously, as they were already determined to revolt. The donation for the journey and the doubling of their pay are easily understandable. The "increase in the number of cavalry" is less clear. The motive is clear: cavalry received higher pay than infantry. The cohorts must have been "equitatae" for an increase in cavalry (rather than for the creation of cavalry) to have been demanded. But whether the mutinous troops intended the normal proportion of cavalry to infantry in "cohortes equitatae" to be altered, or whether they were pressing for elevation to the status of alae is not apparent. The cohorts then proceeded northwards to join Civilis. At Bonna (Bonna) the legiorem legate, Herennius Gallus, opposed them with 3000 legionaries, "Tresliberius Gallicus cohortes, simul paganorum ..."
lixarumque ignaque sed procax ante periculum manus\textsuperscript{144}. The countrymen and the camp-followers ("pagani lixaerque") were obviously pressed into service for the emergency. Godley compares the "Belgarum cohortes" to the Nervians and Thungrians (discussed above) of the first clash with Civilis: they were part of the province of Belgica at this date. This would incline one to understand "cohortes" here in its professional sense; and, in fact, "tumultuariae\textsuperscript{145} does not prevent. By the time of Tacitus "tumultus" had long lost its early sense of a sudden incursion in Italy, especially in Cisalpine Gaul. Here "tumultuariae" must mean hastily or recently levied. In effect the belgian cohorts were untrained and useless, but in intention they were regular cohorts, not a local militia.

Hannibalianus Gallus' force, therefore, consisted of legioearies, improperly trained or embryonic cohorts, and an armed mob.

Hordeonius Flaccus had meanwhile sent agents to collect "auxilia" from the provinces of Gaul\textsuperscript{146}: he moved up himself and established his headquarters north of Bonn in Colonia agrippinensis (Cologne): there considerable numbers of Gallic auxiliaries reached his\textsuperscript{147}. These "auxilia Gallorum" must have been intended for regular auxiliary service, but were obviously unable to be trained before being put to use.

The next large-scale engagement between the Romans and Civilis took place at Sedubus (Krefeld-Gellep), north of Colonia agrippinensis. On the way the rebels overwhelmed the winterquarters of an ala at "sciburgium (Hoerns-Hamburg, north of Sedubus)\textsuperscript{148}. The ala concerned was in
all probability the ala Frontoniensis. After their victory at
Aesciburgium, the Batavians bore down upon Gelduba with such speed that
Ditty Vocula, a legionary legate to whom Bordeonius Flaccus had surren-
dered the effective command of the troops, was unable to draw up his forces
in time. The auxiliaries involved comprised unnamed cavalry and
"Nerviorum cohortes" and "Vascenianus ... cohortes" (the latter being summoned
after the start of the battle)150.

The Roman fortunes reached their lowest ebb after the surrender
of the legions and the destruction of vetas by the Batavians. Further
outposts were destroyed: "cohortium aliarum legumus Hibernae subuessa
crematique, illa tantum relictia, quae Moguntiaci et Vindonissae siste sunt".151. Moguntiacus and Vindonissae (allindsch) were legioatory headquarters: the
passage however is of interest for showing that there was a clearly
integrated system of legionary and auxiliary forces at this date. When the
surrender at Novaeodium (neuses) occurred, the forces involved are described
as "legio sexta decima cum auxilis simul deditis"152 - auxiliaries clearly
being associated with the legion. One of the units involved was the ala
Ficentina, which, however, returned to its Roman allegiance almost
immediately. After the surrender of the legions, the Romans profited by
divisions among the rebels. Claudius Labec, the pro-Roman Batavian,
collected a small force, described as "Bastaniorem Turгорecique et Nerviorum
tumultuarum manus"153, and attempted to withstand Civilis. The Turcians
and Servians had joined Civilis by this date: the fact that some of them
supported Labec shows that these tribes too were not united against Rome.
In the Gallic side, the Sequanians opposed the pro-Batavian Lingones. The rebels failed to take advantage of their success, which enabled the Romans to send forces from the south up to the scene of the rebellion: "unaevicensima legio vindicissae, Sextilius Felix cum auxiliariis cohortibus per Histiam intrupere; accessit ala singularium exulta cilia a Vitellio deinde in partis Vespasiani transgressa. praesert Iulius Eriantius sororem Giulii genitus ... inuisus avunculo." The ala singularium is of interest here. Fiebiger has defined "singularares" as "militaireche Einzelpersonen, die nöheren Offizieren angeeilt waren und von ihnen als Ordonnanzvien verwendet wurden." This definition does not fit this particular case, except for the element of individual selection or choice. Stein's suggestion "dass ihren Kern die 'equites singularares' eines Heerescommandanten, vermutlich von Untergermanien, gebildet hatten" may be true. But probably Vitellius selected sufficient cavalrymen from existing alae or from alae that had been reduced in number in the fighting of the civil wars and formed a new regiment from them. It is noteworthy that he assigned the command to a Batavian, even if he had Roman citizenship. This appears to be the first definite instance of a prefect of 'native' origin commanding an ala of a different tribal or national origin to himself.

The auxiliaries on the aines of which we have record before the arrival of the reinforcements from Hast'a and the army of Germania superior may now be listed.
als Batavorum.

cohors Batavorum, under the command of Civilis himself.\(^1\)

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

cohors Belgiorum.

cohors Jannensatium, although some doubt attaches here.

auxilia Gallorum.

Germani, though difficult to define.

cohortes Narviorum.

als Treverorum.

cohors Aungrorum.

cohortes Ubiorum.

cohortes Vannorum.

als Picentina.

unnamed regiments include

as als (presumably the Frantoniana).

als.

II cohortes (possibly Gallic).

cohortes\(^2\).

Among the irregular forces were

limes.

the Bastasians, Tunerians and Herrians of Labeo.

Sequani (?)

\(^1\)II (??)
At this juncture lulius Caerelis arrived with further forces to put down the rebellion. He sent troops that had recently been levied in Gaul back home, with the boast that the legions would be sufficient\(^{156}\). But this claim must not be allowed to mislead: from references to "equites", "praefecti", "cohortes" and "auxiliarii"\(^{157}\) it is perfectly clear that Caerelis' legions were supported by auxiliaries in the normal fashion. His attitude to the recent Gallic levies did not extend to what were proved and tried auxiliary regiments, none of which is named by Tacitus. From the account of one of Civilis' last offensives we learn that Caerelis had been able to restore the previous system of posting regiments in permanent quarters: Civilis attacked "praesidia cohortium alarum legionum", special mention being made of "Grumnae Vadaequae, cohortium alarumque centra"\(^{164}\). The plural probably indicates that there was more than one auxiliary regiment in each of these forts.

The way in which Civilis' forces grew may now be set beside the Roman soldiers for comparison. As noted above, Civilis started out with a single cohort of Batavians. He won the support of the majority of his own tribe, and then of the neighbouring Canninefraces and Prisians\(^{161}\). The Canninefraces were currently supplying auxiliaries to Rome; the Prisians had done so under Augustus, but no Prisian regiment is recorded as such\(^{162}\). These three peoples formed the core of Civilis' resistance movement. In the first engagement after the attack on the 2 cohorts stationed near the coast, Civilis was strengthened by the defection from the Romans of a cohors Vangrorum. In the clash with Tantius Rufus an arm Batavorum deserted to...
the rebel. Next the 4th Batavian and the Germanic cohorts left
Huguntiacus to join them. These were a great asset and, as Tacitus says,
turned Civilis into a general in command of a proper army - "Civilis
seuventus ueteranorum cohortium insti lea exercitus duxerat. After the
victory of the Batavians at Colonia over Germanicus Gallus and the refusal of
the legionaries at Vetera to swear allegiance to Vespasian, the whole
Batavian tribe in said to have rushed to arms, the Bructerans and
Neuterans, who lived without the Roman Empire across the Rhine, joined
Civilis and "Germania" - presumably other tribes in free Germany - was
contacted. In other words, Civilis has active and prospective free
German allies from this point onwards. From Tacitus' account of the
fighting at Golduba we learn that the Suebians, a German people on the
left bank of the Rhine north of the Ubians, had joined Civilis. The
Ubians themselves were crushed, and had to become unwilling allies of the
rebels. At the battle of Golduba itself the Suvian cohorts deserted
to the insurgents. Further south, Chattans, Teutians and Nattiacans
attacked Huguntiacus: these were 'free' Germans from across the Rhine.
It is not stated whether they were acting in concert with Civilis or using
the confused situation to their own advantage.

The next stage was more dangerous - certain Gallic tribes joined
Civilis. But in fact, it has been shown, they only came in after the death of
Vitellius. Before this, as noted above, they had been fighting for the
Romans. No open move was made until after the murder of Horaceonius
Flaccus: the people who acted first were the Treverans and Lingones, who
had supported Verginius Rufus against Vindex early in 68 A.D., and who had been punished by Calba for so doing. Their sympathies would naturally lie with troops loyal to Vitellius, the "German" emperor. The instigators were "Classicum ... praefectum alae Trauirorum", who obviously felt that his position in his tribe should resemble that of Civilis among the Batavians, and "Julius Tutor et Julius Sabinius, hic Trauir, hic Lingonum, Tutor ripae, et a Vitelli praefectus". After the destruction of Veters, the surrender of the Roman legions and the occupation of Colonias Agrippinensis, Civilis won over the Sunucans - "occupatis Sunucis et iumentum eorum per cohortes composita". The Sunucans lived between the Ubians and the Hungrians; they were Germanic or semi-Germanic and must not be reckoned with Civilis' Varlic supporters. They were drafted by him into cohorts. The word here must refer to tactical units, and the phrase creates the impression of Civilis using Roman methods of organization. The Bastarilans, Tungrians and Servians of the pro-Roman Claudius Labienus have already been noted; Civilis succeeded in winning these peoples over, and in particular gained control of the whole tribe of the Hungrians. The next development occurred after the Romans started their offensive against the rebels when the legion from Vindonissa and the auxiliary forces of Sextilius Felix advanced towards the scene of the fighting. The Treveran, Julius Tutor, opposed Felix with a force described as follows: "Troiorum copiae, recenti Vangionum, Ceieracatae, Tribocorum dieuncta sueta, veterane pedite atque squite in remuit, corruptis apu aut seuti subiectis legiones". No comments are called for. The Vangiones and Tribocans, and presumably
by the Agrippinenses. His loss on this occasion involved "flagrantissima cohortium suarum integrae, quae e Chaucia Prisiliae composita Tolbiaci in cannot be finibus Agrippinensium agobat". Like the Frisians, the Chaucans had once Tutor's force had a "Roman" pattern. It comprised actual Roman legionaries, professional treveran "auxilia" and newly drafted troops of lesser value.

Tutor was defeated, lost his legionaries, and the Veniones, Cheracanes and Tribocana returned to their Roman allegiance. One of the first engagements in which veriliius Cariali was involved was against the Treverans under Valentinus at Nigodulum (Ariel). Cariali captured "nobilissima Belgarus, in quibus duces valentinus". Here it is clear that by "Belgians" Treverans must be mainly meant: Tacitus in using a larger for a more specific term.

In a speech delivered soon after this, Cividius referred to Belgians on his side, calling them "quod rebus sic" of the Gallic forces. Here too opportunity to rejoin the Romans. Cividius advanced into their territory and encamped at Tolbiacum (Mulpich): he lost a cohort as a result of a stratagem by the Agrippinenses. His loss on this occasion involved "flagrantissima cohortium suarum integrae, quae e Chaucia Prisiliae composita Tolbiaci in finibus Agrippinensium agobat". Like the Frisians, the Chaucans had once supported the Romans. They were now however not under Roman control.

The Chaucans appear once again, as "auxilia" coming to aid Cividius in the final stages of the revolt just before the attack on mines and Vade.

Cividus' forces fell into several distinct groups. His main supporters were the Etavius and Cannefates, two peoples connected to Rome, but not under direct provincial rule. The Frisians belong here too, even ...
even if such a relationship had not been restored after their revolt under Tiberius. The next group consisted of comparatively unimportant people of Germanic origin on the left bank of the Rhine—the Suevrians, Semucans, Euctasians, Ubians. The Suevrians and even the Nervians may be included here, although they were much more powerful. Such peoples could be described as 'barbari cæteri amenti'170. Also of Germanic origin, but further south, were the Vangiones, Eburones and Trinovantes. The Gallic element was represented by the Lingones and Treverans, at times classified as belgians. The peoples on the right bank of the Rhine, the "free Germans", were the Bructerans, the Bibractae and the Chaucans. Further south the Chattans, Lei pates and Mattiacans fell into this group. This distinction between the different groups of Civilians' supporters is reflected in Tacitus' use of generic terms as well as in the actual tribal names discussed above. On occasion the three main elements are juxtaposed as Gaul, Batavian and German180. The distinction between the "Germanic" peoples supporting Civilians and his "free German" allies is more interesting. In one of the first attacks on Vetera Civilians campaigned against his "pater
Batavorum" with "Germanorum materies"167, where "patera"m, apart from being derogatory, probably also refers to the native formations. A second way of distinguishing these two groups was the use of "tranquerhanni" for the free Germans, as in the phrase "satus tranquerhannique"182. But when viewed from another angle, especially when contrasted with the Romans, both groups are subsumed under the name "Germanni", especially in the final phases of the conflict after the arrival of Cerialis183. But at times the
and Frisians) appear simply as "Germani". Sometimes the name is used in a neutral ethnographical sense, but at others it is distinctly pejorative, and approximates to "barbari". Tacitus uses "Germanus" a neutral ethnographical sense, but at others it is distinctly pejorative, and approximates to "barbari". Tacitus uses "Germanus", especially in a derogatory sense, to discredit Civilis. A Roman auxiliary who does not remain loyal takes on the worst characteristics of one of Rome's greatest enemies, the barbaric Germans.

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

The manuscript of the "Historiae" unfortunately breaks off before the description of the final surrender of the Batavians and Vespasian's operations in Germania later in his principate. For references to auxiliaries during this period we are reduced to two diplomas and two inscriptions. The first diploma, dated to AD 70, covers the intake of 6 miles and 12 cohorts who were "in Germani sub On. Flavius Cornelianus Clientula". The alae were the

I Flavia Usuina
I Cannae

/II Flavia ....
II Flavia Gemina
Licentiana (sic)
Scubulorum
Claudia nova,
the cohorts were the
I Thracum
I Asturum
I Aquitanorum veterana
I Aquitanorum biturigum
II Augusta Cyrenaica
III Gallorum
III Aquitanorum
III Aquitanorum
III Vindelicorum
V Hispanorum
V Dalmatarum
VII Raetorum.

Pinarrius Clemens had conducted campaigns which led to the annexation of the
colline between the Rhine and the Danube comprising the district called
the "Agri Lecumates" (in the Black Forest) by the Romans. Almost nothing
is known of the scale of the operations; they were however of sufficient
compact for Clemens to have been awarded the "ornamenta triumphalis" "ob
rem in Germania prospera gestam". Some, if not all, of the auxiliary
/unites.....
units of the diploma must have been involved in the fighting. 2 also bear the title "Flavia Semina". "Semina" means formed from the remains of earlier alae. Presumably the earlier alae had been decimated in the batavian Uprising. The addition of Vespasian's "gentilicus" to their title may imply that the men had distinguished themselves earlier, or that a sense of pride was to be fostered in the unit. The I Cannae-
fatius recalls the ala Cannae mentioned in the Frisian revolt of 28 A.D. and the Cannae associated with the Batavian cohorts stationed at Moguntiacum at the outset of the batavian Uprising. The Cannae played a prominent role in the uprising, as detailed above. It is not possible to speculate whether the soldiers discharged from it in 74 A.D. with at least 25 years service included men who had participated in the rebellion and been pardoned. It is at any rate clear that the regimental name did not suffer because of the revolt. The next 3 alae are unnumbered. The Vicentianae received honourable mention for retracting its surrender to Civilis at Novesium. The cohort I Thracum recalls the "cohors Thracum" used by Cassius against the Helvetians on his march to Italy. The III Gallorum suggests the "Gallicae cohortae" of Germanicus at the battle of Idistavium in 16 A.D., the "cohors Gallorum" that Cassius sent ahead to Italy against Otho and the "Gallorum auxilia" and "auxilia e Gallia" recorded during the Batavian Uprising. The III VII Vindelicorum and the VII Aequorium suggest the "Aequorium Vindelicorumque ... cohortae" under Germanicus at the battle of Idistavium; the "Aequorium Iuventue" that assisted Cassius against the Helvetians were probably not
in regular cohorts. It is clear that in several cases links can be established between regiments listed in this German diploma and those operating earlier in the area. The clearest case is that of the ala Picentiana.

The next diploma names 6 alae and a cohort "in Germania sub Q. Julio Cordino Nutilio Gallico" in 78 a.D. Nutilius Gallicus was celebrated for the capture of Veleda, the Druidian prophetess who had served as a figurehead in the Batavian Uprising almost a decade before. The regiments from which the soldiers were discharged were the alae

Horiorum
sinerum
Messica
Afroruc veterana
Sili
Sulpicia

and the cohort

I Flavia Hispanorum.

"Horiorum iuentus" has been recorded, but cannot be equated with a professional ala Horiorum. The circumstances surrounding the formation of the ala Sinularum in 69 have already been discussed. Whether the ala Messica was one of the alae at the battle of Sedriacus, or formed part of the "Noemici auxiliarii" sent by the Flavians to Italy is not clear.
but an ala Moesica is recorded at Asculgium, most probably replacing the
ala Frontoniana there. The ala Siliana has appeared on several previous
occasions. The alae are all without a number, but the cohort in the
diploma has one. Whether its title "Flavius" points to a new formation
by Vespasian or honours an act of bravery cannot be established. The
recipient of the diploma, a krireyeh, belonged to the ala Moesica "cui
præstet T. Staberius f. f. iuli secundus". This commander of the ala is
known from an inscription discovered in Rome, where his career is given as
praef. coh. Chalcid. in Africa tribuno militum leg. VII Seminæ felicis
in Germania praef. equit. alae Moesicae felicis torquatae.

This is the sole place where the ala has the title "felix torquata". The
fact that the inscription was erected by T. Staberius Secundus' mother at
her own expense (no further posts are named) may indicate that she took a
special interest in a decoration awarded to the ala during her son's
command. His previous post, the tribunate in the Seventh Legion, can most
probably be dated to 75 - 74, when that legion was in Germany. It was
during this period that it acquired the title "Felix". This leads one
to speculate that the ala Moesica may have been decorated with its similar
title for an operation in conjunction with the legion.

The two inscriptions referring to the "auxilia" of Germany are
those recording the careers of the brothers Pusitius Lucanus and Pusitius
Tullius. They both filled the post of "praef. auxiliarum omnim
adversus Germanos", but the question is when. Desser rejccts the early
view...
view that this occurred during the Batavian revolt, and accepts the suggestion that it was during the expedition of Curius Clemens. Brown prefers the expedition of Utillius Callicius, and has the support of Thonemann. Von Borsawski does not discuss the matter, but remarks that such posts were held after a legionary legateship. Alföldy, however, has announced that in an as yet unpublished work he will argue for the older view of the Batavian revolt. The brothers served as military tribunes in the legio V Alaudae which was stationed at vetera until AD 69. This would have been during the latter part of Nero's principate. The special auxiliary command may have followed soon afterwards. On the other hand, the command is associated with various special legateships and honours accorded to the brothers, and in a section at the head of the inscription in each case before the praetorship and junior posts prior to that are mentioned in descending order. The honours consisted of decorations normally given to those of praetorian rank and adscription into the patriciate. The latter item is usually dated to the censorship of Vespasian and Titus in AD 73-4. It seems to reward special services in Africa as well as the auxiliary prefecture against the Germans. But as this part of the Inscriptions is not in chronological order and the brothers did not hold the same special legateships or receive identical honours, it is not possible to date any single item. Nor is it possible to associate the special legateships or the honours with the regular stages of the "cursus honorum" that came in the second part of the inscription in each case. The question of the date must therefore remain open. It is difficult, ....
difficult, too, to categorize the post of "prefectus omnium auxiliarum adiuvans Germanos" itself. Suetonius has compared the command of Julius Civilis of the cavalry in the British expedition of Claudius. But this in itself raises difficulties. At first sight it would appear that the brothers, either jointly or in succession to each other, were placed in command of all the auxiliaries, presumably of the lower or Upper German army, in an emergency caused by a German war. Whether this implies the temporary separation of the "auxilia" from their legions for a joint auxiliary offensive is not clear. This question must also remain open.

Turning from Germany to Britain, we have a few brief general notices concerning "auxilia". As noted above, British auxiliary cohorts were among the forces which Salba found in base on his arrival there late in 68 a.D. \(^205\) on the proclamation of Vitellius as emperor by the Rhine armies, trouble broke out in the British army before it joined the side of Vitellius. A dispute arose between the governor, Trebellius Maximus, and Marcus Coelius, legate of the Twentieth Legion. The situation degenerated: "modestia exercitus corrupta sone discordiae ventus ut auxiliarium quoque mili cum consilia proturbatus et migrantibus as Coelio cohortibus alicue desertus Trebellium ac Vitellium perjugarit."\(^206\) Tacitus regards the involvement of the auxiliaries as a sign of even greater disgrace.

Another interpretation that may be placed upon it, however, is the evidence it affords of the ever-increasing "professionalism" of the "auxilia".

The governor had obviously turned to them for support, but they had aligned themselves with the legionary legate. They felt themselves as much
part of the quarrel on the legions. It is probable that by the auxiliaries Tacitus means all the auxiliaries of Britain. It would be interesting to know how their support was organized by one of the legionary commanders.

A linguistic point should be noted: the technical phrase "cohortes aleaque" is used as the equivalent of the more literary "auxiliares milites". The auxiliares in Britain are mentioned for the third time in the year of the four Emperors in connection with troubles in the Brigantian area. The queen of the Brigantes, Cartimandua, who had long been supported by the Romans, was attacked by her ex-husband and rival for the throne, Venutius. She sought "praeclara" from Rome. "Cohortes aleaque nostra" saved her, but the kingdom fell to her husband. As Frese suggests, the legions were probably not involved because they were below strength as a result of having supplied detachments to Vitellius. The next item of information comes from Agricola's campaigns in Wales in 78 A.D. Not long before his arrival, the Ordovices (in Powys) had all but destroyed a cavalry regiment: "alae in Briturn nullae agentem". The phrase implies that the auxiliaries operating apart from the legions and other "auxilia" whether its stay in Ordovician territory was temporary or permanent cannot be determined from the phrase quoted, but the fact that, on his arrival, Agricola found military detachments, i.e., auxiliaries, scattered throughout the province ("separatique provinciae numeris") implies that the stationing of units in their own forts was the normal practice at this stage. In spite of the lateness of the season, Agricola decided to attack the Ordovices. His gathering together of his forces is described in the
words to "contractis legionibus auxiliis et sodalis auxiliariis munus". Here we have the co-operation, not of a legion and "auxilia", but of detachments of legions and "auxilia". The Rhosolanians were crushed and Agrippa advanced on Rome (Augustus). The force chosen to head the landing on the island consisted of "lectiminius auxiliaris, quibus nota usque et patrius mandium usum, quod simul sequentur aequo et equo regunt". This description, as already noted, probably refers to Batavians, whose old relationship with Rome appears to have been reinstated after the suppression of the Batavian Revolt.

In the Danubian area various tribes used the opportunity of the civil wars of 68 - 69 A.D. to invade the Roman provinces. The Rhosolanians, "Sarmatica gena", broke into Moesia cutting 2 auxiliary cohorts to pieces. However the Roman forces in the shape of "tertia legion adiunctia auxilia" managed to destroy them when catching them off their guard. Tacitus uses the incident to describe the Sarmatian cavalry and its method of fighting in some detail. The cavalry was normally irresistible on account of the weight of its mailed armour, the "cathaerists". Sarmatians appear again when, as noted above, the Flavian leaders thought it wise to conciliate them before advancing into Italy against the Vitellians.

Josephus reports an invasion of the Sarmatians in 70, when the governor of Moesia, Pontius Agrippa, fell. Josephus refers to the magi, of which the following is an account of this invasion. Presumably the Roman guards involved included auxiliaries.
The successor of Pontius Agrippa restored the situation with more and stronger "garrisons". These must have been mainly auxiliary forts. Another Transdanubian people, the Dacians, also crossed the Roman frontier in this area. They chose the time when the "Pannonian army" had been removed to fight the Vitellian in Italy and stormed "cohortium alarumque hibernae" before proceeding against the "castra legionum". However, Mucianus was able to check them on his journey from the east to Italy. This was at the end of 69, before Pontius Agrippa was appointed governor of Moesia. As on the Rhine and, though less clearly, in Britain, a picture emerges of auxiliary units stationed on the Danube in permanent headquarters of their own. A military diploma of 73 A.D. records discharges from cohorts stationed in Moesia under Sex. Vettulanus Cerialis. The regiments concerned were the

I Cantabrorum
I Thraco Syriana
I Jugurnitorum Itrorum
II Lucani
III Gallicorum
VIII Gallicorum
XIllicum
Vetitatorum.

The Cantabrians were last mentioned when Strabo recorded that they were fighting for Rome after Augustus' Spanish wars. A "Sagambra cohors" was recorded...
recorded fighting in Thrace under Tiberius. A cohors III Gallorum is attested in Germany in 74 A.D., which was later itself transferred to Moesia. But this is probably not the same regiment. Cilices supported also against Germanicus under Tiberius.

From the Danube, attention goes to the East where, as under Nero, Deultium proved to be the focal point in the initial period of Vespasian's principate. There are, however, some minor incidents outside Judaea that call for comment. Under Otho a false Nero appeared in Greece. He won over destitute deserters and even soldiers who were returning from their leave. His next accession of strength consisted of slave slaves whom he had stolen from their owners. It is interesting to note that he was unable to gain the support of the local population in this part of the empire. Vespasian was faced with trouble in Pонтus after Nucius had gone to Italy. The leader of the insurrection there was Anicetus, a former slave of King Tolosa and commander of the royal navy before Pontus became a province in 63 or 64 A.D. Like Civilis in Germany, he claimed to be acting on behalf of a Roman emperor, Vitellius. Winning the support of the tribes adjacent to Pontus, he attacked Trajanus (Trebizond or Trabzon), slaying the troops there. Tacitus describes them as follows:

"ca sa ibi cohors, legions auxilium olei; mox donati civitatis Romanae signa armaque in nostro modum, desidientes licentiamque oraeorum retinebant."
He was assisted by king Aristobulus of Chalcidice and king Boethus of Samaria. In other words, Vespasian's force consisted of the usual elements: a legion, professional cohorts and alae, and royal assistance. Shortly after this the Parthians were troubled by an invasion of the Alanians. Vologaeses appealed to Rome for help. Domitian is said to have been keen to lead Roman forces to the assistance of the Parthians, but Vespasian refused. The incident recalls Vologaeses' earlier offer of assistance to Vespasian during the year of the four Emperors, and is in the tradition of Roman support for friendly powers.

On hearing of the death of Vespasian suspended active operations in Judaea. They were not resumed until he set out for Rome to become emperor himself. He left his son Titus to conclude the war.

Generally speaking, Josephus merely refers to auxiliaries or cavalry without giving details. Some aspects of his account of the closing campaigns, however, repay study. He describes Titus' army as he set out for Jerusalem.

He had 4 legions, and the following auxiliary units:

- 10 equites alae
- ailissus non solesque reges et auxilia
- Regis Antiochiae inliquo et solio inter secus uolo infusa Judaeis
- Arabum manus ...

Josephus then describes Titus' order of march.

The van consisted of...
After the engines were ready, the grenadiers and supporting troops advanced. Then followed, then the heavy train, then the infantry, and last of all were the auxiliaries and cavalry. Josephus' first statement is too brief to be of such assistance. The fact that the auxiliaries were "from Syria" probably means that they were part of the Syrian army rather than that they were all Syrians. Tacitus names the kings, known in any case from the campaigns of Vespasian under Nero. But he adds the fact that there was a "band of Arabs", useful because of their neighbourly hatred for the Jews. They must have formed a different category to the professional "auxilia" and the royal services to be mentioned separately under the name of "civiles". One wonders whether they were what Josephus in the second passage calls "of election" and brought up the rear of the marching column. The order of the army on the march is similar to that of Vespasian described in Book III. Tacitus supplies certain figures for the "auxilia". If it can be assumed that he is describing the same army as that in Josephus, and if the figures for various units that are not specified in him, but are detailed in Josephus' enumeration of Vespasian's forces can be used, it is possible to suggest figures for Titus' army:

Legions: ....
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legions :</td>
<td>$4 \times 6,000$</td>
<td>$24,000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscripts :</td>
<td>$20 \times 600$ (or $1,000$)</td>
<td>$12$ or $24,000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy :</td>
<td>$9 \times 500$ (or $1,000$)</td>
<td>$4$ or $8,000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings :</td>
<td>? $9,000$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab Force :</td>
<td>? $6,000$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong> :</td>
<td><strong>53 or 67,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The force of the kings has been put at $9,000$; it should be noted that they had earlier supplied Cestius Gallus with $14,000$. This may imply that the number was lower by the time of Litium. Further, Litium's 'Arab force' may not have been the same as Malikus' Arabs under Vespasian. The different totals are of course to be explained by the difficulty of deciding whether the professional auxiliary regiments were all of the same size, and whether they were quincentary or millenary. Presumably the lower figure ($53,000$) is to be preferred, given the military situation at the end of 69 A.D. If the legions were at full strength, and the lower figures be favoured, the professional 'auxilia' formed less than $60\%$ of the legionary total. But when the royal and 'Arab' contingents are added, the auxiliaries (in the broader sense) must at least have equalled, if not considerably exceeded, the number of legionaries. But even so, it should be noted that Litium had 1 legion more than his father. (Cestius Gallus had set out with the equivalent of 2 legions.)

Such was the composition of Litium's army in so far as it can be recovered. The few occasions on which ethnic names appear may now be listed. ....
listed. An Idumean leader fell when struck by an arrow shot by an
Arab. Jewish deserters and refugees were cut open by "the Arab mob and
the Syrians" on the Roman side when it was discovered that some had
concealed gold coins by swallowing them before fleeing from Jerusalem.

An act of courage was performed by a Syrian - another by us.

In spite of his being a Syrian, his name was a common Latin one. Another such act was performed by

The Egyptian auxiliari is not specifically called an auxiliary, but was in all
probability one. The description of the arrival of Antiochus Epiphanes
before Jerusalem is interesting, because it shows an ethnic title being
applied to a force because of its fighting methods, not because of its race.
He brought numerous battalions and "civitatis equitata" battalions.

This consisted of tall young troops armed and trained in
the Macedonian fashion. They were described as

Some personal names are
also on record. A spectacular feat was performed by a cavalryman
Longinus, another by Fedanias, described as

if this description is correct, Fedanius was a cavalry-
man from a cohort. This implies a "cohors equitata". A certain Fedana,
however, was described as

when Fedana fell, he was avenged by a
centurion called Priscus, who despatched his slayer with an arrow.
One wonders whether Priscus was not a centurion of an auxiliary regiment of
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