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The history of the legions from the civil wars of the late republic to the creation of the more or less fixed frontier armies of the early empire presents many problems. But the development of the professional auxiliary system of the Roman imperial army – best known from the military diplomas of volume XVI of the Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum – is much more obscure.¹ In particular, the relation of the auxiliaries that feature in the historians of the early empire to those known from the diplomas and from other epigraphical sources, especially from the epitaphs of deceased auxiliaries, is not clear. Kraft,² for example, has drawn attention to the discrepancy between the two types of evidence in the Rhineland area: the tribal names in the titles of the auxiliary cohorts in Tacitus differ from those of the inscriptions. However before the problems presented by the relationship between the literary and the epigraphical auxiliary units and the origin of the ‘professional’ cohorts of infantry and alae³ of cavalry can be discussed, a preliminary investigation should be undertaken. The terminology employed by the ancient writers concerned must be studied. This is the object of this paper. The main concern will be to attempt to establish the extent to which professional regiments can be distinguished from other types of auxiliary unit from Augustus to Vespasian. The main source is, of course, Tacitus, but Velleius Paterculus and Suetonius are also of value. The Greek evidence, largely as presented by Josephus, will also be considered.

Before Tacitus’ usage in general is discussed, it will be instructive to review his account of one of the earliest operations he records in which auxiliaries played a prominent part. Germanicus’ suppression of the mutiny of the

¹ In a recent survey called The Roman Empire and its Neighbours (London, 1967), 122f., F. Millar contrasts what ‘seem to have been still predominantly temporary local levies commanded by their own chieftains’ with ‘regular units armed uniformly . . . commanded by (equestrian) prefects or tribunes, and liable to service anywhere in the empire’, and suggests that the process began with Augustus and was completed by about 70 A.D. G. Webster, The Roman Imperial Army (London, 1969), 143f., speaks of auxiliary units being ‘completely reorganized and given regular status’ at the time of Augustus, with citizenship on a full scale for the discharged in effect by the time of Claudius.

² K. Kraft, Zur Rekrutierung der Alen und Kohorten an Rhein und Donau (Bern, 1951), 37ff.

³ Like cohort, ala (and its plural) will be treated as an English word in what follows. The two general treatments of the imperial auxilia remain G. L. Cheesman, The Auxilia of the Roman Imperial Army (Oxford, 1914), and the articles in Pauly-Wissowa’s Realencyclopaedie by Cichorius on the ala (R.E. I,1893,1223ff.) and the cohort (R.E. IV,1900, 231ff.). References will not normally be given for alae and cohorts that appear in Cichorius’ lists.
legions stationed in the Rhine at the accession of Tiberius and his subsequent campaigns in Germany (14–16 A.D.) may be chosen. Tacitus starts by saying that the number of auxiliaries available to Germanicus on the Rhine was thought to have been a factor in Tiberius' fear of his adopted son: he had in his power *tot legiones, immensa sociorum auxilia*. The phrase is obviously rhetorical and cannot be subjected to precise analysis. A plan put forward during the mutiny was to arm the *auxilia* and *socii* against the rebel legions. Furneaux 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 emotional context intended to shame the mutineers. The *praesidium auxiliarium equitum*, however, which 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 *arma classem socios* where auxiliaries are clearly distinguished from legionaries (here *arma*) by the old term *socii*. Actual details of the land forces are given later. Germanicus had with him *duodecim milia e legionibus, sex et uiginti socias cohortis, octo equitum alas*. The detachment from the legions amounted to the equivalent of two 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 alae were quingenary, there were 13,000 infantry and 4,000 cavalry auxiliaries. The alae are later referred to as *equites*; the infantry auxiliaries as *auxiliariae cohortes* and *ceteri sociorum*. Some, if not all, the cohorts were lightly armed (*expeditae cohortes, leues cohortes*).

The forces for the campaign of 15 A.D. are characterised as *pedes eques classis*, a phrase obviously parallel to the *arma classem socios* of the year before, except that *pedes* must have included both the auxiliary and the

---

5. I,36,2.
6. ad loc., a view accepted by Koestermann (ad loc.).
8. I,39,6.
9. 45,2.
10. 49,4.
11. 51,2. 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 X has fallen out of the text before *auxiliariae* as probable. However the phrase can be taken in the sense of 'auxiliary cohorts' rather than 'the auxiliary cohorts'; in any case the number 10 has no secure basis and cannot be used to calculate army sizes.
12. 50–1. The *expeditae 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.
legionary infantry. At the outset the army was divided into two. Germanicus gave Caecina, the legate of the army in Lower Germany, four legions and 5,000 auxiliaries: the latter presumably included cavalry and infantry. He also had tumultuarias ceteruas Germanorum cis Rhenum colentium: these would have been drafted for the occasion, no doubt from the Ubians and neighbouring tribes on the Rhine. From the point of view of nomenclature, it is of interest to note that the units of free Germans across the Rhine who were supporting Arminius are also called ceteruas: the term here is intended to be derogatory. Germanicus' forces consisted of totidem legiones, duplicem sociorum numerum, i.e., four legions, 10,000 auxiliaries. The proportion of cavalry to infantry is not stated. But the total of the auxiliaries of Caecina and Germanicus, excluding the cirschenanee German bands, was 15,000, compared with the less certain figure of 19,000 for the expedition of the previous year. During the battles of 15 A.D., Caecina's four legions are referred to as quadraginta cohortes Romanae, which is merely a stylistic variation. The Chaucans supplied auxilia. A reference to subsidiariae cohortes can only mean auxiliary cohorts, since the legions are mentioned as supporting them in the next phrase.

The classis legiones ac socii (under whom are subsumed the eques in the collective singular) appear in the expedition of 16 A.D. as well. Welcome detail occurs in Tacitus' description of the marching order of Germanicus before the battle of Idistaviso: Noster exercitus sic incessit: auxiliares Galli Germanique in fronte, post quos pedetes sagittarii; dein quattuor legiones et cum duabus praetoriiis cohortibus ac delecto equite Caesar; exim totidem aliae legiones et leuis armatura cum equite sagittario ceteraeque sociorum cohortes. Other passages in Tacitus add further information. The eight legions and two praetorian cohorts need not detain. The Galli Germanique auxiliares or even the ceterae sociorum cohortes would have included the Raetorum Vindelicorumque et Gallicae cohortes mentioned in the next chapter. The form of the word Gallicae gives pause, since normally such an adjective indicates the area in which the regiment served rather the tribe of which it

13. 60,2. Cf. 45,2.
16. I,60,2.
19. II,8
20. 16,3.
was composed.\textsuperscript{22} Here, however, it seems best to regard it as an example of Tacitean \textit{variatio} for \textit{Gallorum} and understand that the cohorts were composed of Gauls rather than of other provincials stationed in Gaul before the expedition. One of the grounds Tiberius is said to have had for opposing further campaigns on the part of Germanicus was Gallic weariness with supplying horses.\textsuperscript{23} It may be that riders were also sent, but these would probably not have received organization as formal cohorts as yet. Of German auxiliaries, Batavians and Chaucans are recorded. The skill of the Batavians in swimming is mentioned at the landing at the river Amisia (Ems) before the major engagement at Idistaviso. Their \textit{dux} Chariovalda took them across the river Visurgis (the Weser) prior to the crossing of the rest of the army. In this operation they formed part of the \textit{equites} and Chariovalda had his horse killed under him. Hence Batavians must be included among the cavalry auxiliaries.\textsuperscript{24} The Chaucans 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.\textsuperscript{25}

The next element in the battle line consisted of archers on foot.\textsuperscript{26} \textit{Sagittarii} were mentioned previously as stationed on the Roman side of the Visurgis during the interview of Arminius and Flavus.\textsuperscript{27} Towards the rear were mounted archers, and associated with them the \textit{leuis armatura}. Its separate mention from the \textit{sociorum cohortes} implies different organization, as if it were part of the more professional element in the army. It took part in repelling the attack of the Angrivarians on the Romans when they landed at the Amisia.\textsuperscript{28} 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 Angrivarians and the Cheruscans. This was accomplished by the use of Roman artillery and the deployment of slingers, described as \textit{funditores libratoresque}.\textsuperscript{29} Slingers in the republican period were auxiliaries and there is no reason for not regarding these as such. Presumably they can be classified with the \textit{leuis armatura}.

In the middle of the line Germanicus was accompanied by \textit{delecto equite}. Neither Furneaux nor Koestermann comments on this phrase. When Tibe-

\textsuperscript{22} Cf. Chichorius, \textit{R.E.} IV, 1900, 233.
\textsuperscript{23} Tac. \textit{Ann.} II, 5, 3. Cf. I, 71, 2, where, however, \textit{equos} is again the word.
\textsuperscript{24} II, 11, 1; II, 8, 3; 11, 3. For the Batavi, cf. Ihm \textit{R.E.} III, 1897, 118ff.; for Chariovalda, \textit{P.I.R.} \textsuperscript{2} C 716.
\textsuperscript{25} Tac. \textit{Ann.} II, 17, 5: \textit{Chaucis inter auxilia agentibus}, against Furneaux (note ad loc. s.v. \textit{sagittariis}) who would include the Chaucans among the \textit{auxiliares} ... Germanique.
\textsuperscript{26} The \textit{sagittarii} of II, 17, 6, are to be regarded as the \textit{equite sagittario} of 16, 3, according to Furneaux ad loc.
\textsuperscript{27} II, 9. For Arminius and Flavus, cf. below, p. 96.
\textsuperscript{28} 8, 4. For the Angrivarii, cf. Ihm, \textit{R.E.} I, 1894, 2192f.
rianus' son, the younger Drusus, was sent to deal with the mutiny in the Pannonian legions in 14, he was accompanied by two enlarged praetorian cohorts and additional forces: additur magna pars praetoriani equitis et robora Germanorum qui tum custodes imperatori aderant - that is, he was also accompanied by cavalry of the praetorian guard and members of the corporis 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 Pannonian legions, his Roman force may have been made larger than that of Germanicus. A second possibility should be considered. As noted above, when the Angirvarians defected, light armed troops participated in avenging their treachery. The full phrase is missus ilico Stertinius cum equite et armatura leui. In 15 Stertinius had been sent against the Bructerans expedita cum manu. In 16, Stertinius et e numero primipilarum Aemilius commanded the cavalry at the crossing of the Visurgis, and, when Chariovalda fell, they came to the rescue of his men. At the outset of the battle of Idistaviso, Germanicus gave orders for the swiftest cavalry to attack the Cheruscan flank, and for Stertinius to go round and attack their rear - Stertinius cum ceteris turnis circumgredi tergaque inuadere. Tacitus does not specify the precise position of Aemilius and Stertinius in the Roman army at this juncture. Aemilius is usually identified with a Paullus Aemilius whose epitaph records that he had been primus pilus bis, praefectus equitum, tribunus cohortis III praetoriae. There seems little reason for doubting the identification, and for not regarding Aemilius as holding his praefectura equitum or command of an ala at this stage. Stertinius must have been much superior; in fact Ritterling-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. It is true that sometimes the leui armatura was included, but the cavalry obviously the most important of the auxiliaries involved, the most professional among them, and could well be the delectus eques of Germanicus.

The auxiliaries of Germanicus in 16 fall into various categories. The

30. Tac. Ann. I,24,2. For the German corporis custodes, cf. Keune, R.E. IV,1901,1800ff. (No. 2). It is true that Drusus' praetorian cohorts were 'strengthened', but he had the same number as Germanicus. Hence B. Levick's remark (Drusus Caesar and the Adoptions of A.D. 4, Latomus XXV, 1966,240) that 'Drusus seems to have had a special connection with the praetorian guard' seems unwarranted.


32. I,60,3.

33. II,11,1.

34. 17,1.

professional element was represented by the *sagittarii* and some of the *leuis armatura* and cavalry entrusted to Stertinius, who was notably a Roman, and not a native commander. It may have included elements from provinces other than Gaul or Germany. Whether the Raetian, Vindelican or Gallic 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 Chaucan auxiliaries. The status of the *ceterae sociorum cohortes* cannot be definitely determined. Tacitus may be using the word *cohortes* here in a purely tactical sense. If so it would refer to *ad hoc* levies.\(^{36}\) On the other hand, it may be used in the technical auxiliary sense, in which case *socii* is merely an archaism.

In the analysis of the auxiliaries of Germanicus which has just been attempted the method adopted has been to use references to *auxilia* in descriptions of actual fighting or other situations to elucidate the more formal statements which Tacitus makes about the forces involved in a major battle or in a whole campaign. Some doubt remains, but in the majority of cases this has enabled us to establish the status of the auxiliaries concerned with a considerable degree of certainty. Tacitus' actual vocabulary can now be assessed in its context.

The plural term *auxilia* is used generally by itself, as in *postremum auxiliorum agmen*,\(^ {37}\) and in conjunction with *socius* – *immensa sociorum auxilia, auxilia et socii* (p. 90). A specific use occurs for the forces supplied by a friendly tribe in the area of the campaigns in the words *Chauci cum auxilia pollicerentur, in commilitium adscitii*.\(^ {38}\) Accordingly the term is not reserved for trained or professional auxiliaries attached to the Roman legions. The adjectival form, *auxiliaris* or *auxiliarius*, is comparatively common. It qualifies *equites*, obviously to designate an ala, and is used in conjunction with *cohortes* to indicate what are patently professional units (p. 90). *Auxiliaris* is also used substantively, normally in the plural, both with numbers – Caecina’s *quinque auxiliarium milia* (p. 91) – and with a tribal name – the *auxiliares Galli Germanique* (p. 91).

*Ala* is found only with *equites*–*octo equitum alas* (p.90). The subdivision of the ala, the *tirma*, occurs once, in *Stertinius cum ceteris turmis* (p. 93). *Cohors*, too, is expanded or defined, as in *auxiliares cohortes* (p. 90). The phrase *sociae cohortes* (with the specific number 26, p. 90) appears in a context where it is clear that *sociae* is merely a variant for *auxiliares* and that professional units are meant. In the phrase *ceterae sociorum cohortes* (p. 91), however, where *socii* is substantial, the tactical meaning of cohort is probably uppermost. The other adjectives found associated with *cohortes* –

\(^{36}\) The possibility entertained by Koestermann on Tac. *Ann. II*,16,3.


\(^{38}\) *I*,60,2.
expeditae, leues, subsidiarvae – (p. 90; 91) denote function or armour. Tribal names also appear, as in Raetorum Vindelicorumque et Gallicae cohortes (p. 91). However caution must be applied, since legionary, praetorian or urban cohorts may be meant, as in Caeccina’s quadraginta cohortes Romanae (p. 91, where however Romanae helps to prevent confusion).

But once the standard terms auxilia, ala and cohors are avoided, uncertainty increases. The old term socius, already noted in conjunction with auxilia and cohors, is found by itself, as in arma classem socios or classis legiones ac socii (p. 90; 91), or as a variant for what had previously been specified as auxiliariae cohortes and ceteri sociorum (p. 90). Like auxilia, therefore, socius is a general term covering all types of auxiliary, from the professional to the local ad hoc assistant. Specification of cohorts by tactics or weapons has already been noted (p. 95). Terms denoting weapons or armour are also found independently, sometimes with pedes or the collective singular pedes. Thus there were pedites sagittarii, sagittarii, funditores libratoresque and armatura leuis (p. 91–92). Another word is expeditus as in expedita cum manu (p. 93). On the cavalry side, equites (or eques) is commoner than ala, although, as noted, they can be combined. A specific type of cavalry is mentioned once, the eques sagittarius at Idistaviso (p. 91). Then there are alternates to the regimental terms cohort and ala, or their subdivisions, like turma (p. 93). One such is manus, which was noted above in expedita cum manu – here used without derogatory overtones. Cateria, as in the phrase tumultuariae cateruae Germanorum cis Rhenum co lentium (p. 91), is intended to underline the inferiority of hastily drafted units. This effect is produced since the word is frequently used of enemy units.39

The tribal designations given by Tacitus in these chapters all come from the wider German front. The auxiliares Galli Germanique (p. 91) probably included professional regiments, especially as they embraced the Raetorum Vindelicorumque et Gallicae cohortes (p. 91). Regiments with the names of all these peoples are known from the epigraphical record.40 The standard usage is the genitive plural of the tribal name. Tacitus, however, also uses the adjectival form, as in Galli Germanique (p. 91), and the derivative adjective Gallicae (p. 91) – though here probably in a special sense. Then the tribal name is used substantively in the plural, as in the reference to the Chauci (p. 94). This auxiliorum agmen Batavique in parte ea . . .41 Batavii must represent a Batavian regiment (or regiments). Compare, too, the description of the Batavian commander, Chariovalda dux Bataurorum.42 Another auxiliary, or person of auxiliary origin, who is singled out, is Flavus, the brother of

---

40. Cf. Cichorius, l.c. n. 3, s. vv.
42. II,11,1.
Arminius. Flavus had remained true to the Romans, while Arminius had returned to his own people after serving in the Roman army to lead the German resistance to the Romans that had resulted in the defeat of Varus in the Teutoburg forest. Tacitus dramatically contrasts the feelings activating the two brothers by describing an interview between them. What is of interest is that during the interview Flavus is made to list the rewards he had from received the Romans: *Flavus aucta stipendia, torquem et coronam aliaque militaria dona memorat.* Unfortunately he does not give us his rank, and the system of the *dona militaria* had not yet been standardized, so that his rank cannot be deduced from the decorations which he had received. But the wording used could apply equally well to a legionary, showing how integrated the two arms could be. Even where tribal and individual names are used in Tacitus to refer to auxiliary units, considerable flexibility obtains.

Auxiliaries do not appear so fully in military sections of comparable length elsewhere in the *Annals.* It would also go beyond the scope of this article to classify all the references to *auxilia* found in the whole work. Accordingly only the main usages will be noted.

The word *auxilia* is nearly always qualified in some way or other. An example occurs in the review of the non-legionary part of the armed forces of the Roman Empire which Tacitus gives under 23 A.D.: *at apud idonea prouinciarum sociae triremes alaeque et auxilia cohortium, neque multo secus in iis urium: sed persequi incertum fuit, cum ex usu temporis huc illuc mearent, gliserent numero et aliquando minuerent.* Auxilia cohortium is merely a periphrasis for *cohortes,* as the neighbouring *alae* shows. The *auxilia provincialium* of Cappadocia which were ineffectively deployed in Armenia in 51 are puzzling. At first sight they appear to mean auxiliaries who were inhabitants of the province concerned, i.e., Cappadocians. This they may well have been, but they were not troops hastily drafted for the occasion, but men ready for service. This means that they must have been regular units of one kind or another. *Auxilia regum* means forces supplied by client kings, and therefore not part of the professional auxiliary forces. Various adjectives accompany *auxilia.* In 35 a force of 4,000 legionaries and *delecta auxilia* was used in Cilicia. The select auxiliaries could have been

---

43. 9–10. For Flavus, cf. *P.I.R.²* F 450; for Arminius, A 1063.
44. He is called an *explorator* in Tac. *Ann.* XI,16,3, but the term there is intended to be deliberately disparaging. For the *dona militaria,* cf. Fiebig, *R.E.* V,1903,1528ff.
45. Full lexical compilations will be found in A. Gerber et A. Greef, *Lexicon Taciteum* (Leipzig, 1877–90, r. Hildesheim, 1962), s. vv.
47. XII,49,1, contra the interpretation of Furneaux and Koehlmann ad loc. Contrast the use of *tumultuarium provincialium manum* of such a fresh levy in *XV,*3,2. For ‘Cappadocian’ auxiliaries, cf. below.
48. XIII,38,4; XV,26,2; cf. II,78,2.
49. VI,41,1.
various units chosen for the operation or men chosen from different units. *Lecta auxilia* occur in 50: the governor of Pannonia was ordered to make a show of force on the banks of the Danube to discourage any trouble that might develop from difficulties that had arisen in the Sueban kingdom of Vannius. The troops involved consisted of *legionem ipsaque e provincia lecta auxilia*.\(^{50}\) Since the garrison of Pannonia consisted of 3 legions at this date, only part of the army was 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, as ‘levies specially called out’. ‘Tribal’ or provincial appellatives appear in the description of the division of forces between Corbulo and Caesennius Paetus in 62: *copis ita diuisis ut quarta et duodecima legiones addita quinta, quae recens e Moesia excita erant, simul Pontica et Galatarum Cappadocumque auxilia Paeto oboedirent, tertia et cetera ex rerum usu sociarent partirenturue*.\(^{51}\) The use of the name of the people, Moesi, for the more usual provincial name of *Moesia*, signals caution in interpreting. The phrase *Pontica 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 (Polemo)’.\(^{52}\) The words *Galatarum Cappadocumque 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’. Since the *legiones* of Syria are mentioned separately, the *prior miles Syriae* must refer to auxiliaries stationed in Syria. The forces labelled cetera presumably refer to *ad hoc* contingents provided by allied kings. The adjectival use of *auxiliaris* or *auxiliarius* need not be discussed. The substantival use is both qualified and unqualified. In 50 the Chattans made a raid on upper Germany and were opposed by *auxiliaris Vangionas ac Nemetas, addito equite alario*.\(^{53}\) Little difficulty attaches to the *eques alarius*, obviously a Tacitean variant for an *ala* or a part

---


51. Tac. *Ann.* XV,6,3 with Furneaux and Pelham ad loc. For Cn. Domitius Corbulo, cf. *P.I.R.*\(^2\) D 142; for L. Caesennius Paetus, C 173. ‘Cappadocian’ auxiliaries have been mentioned above. For the sense proposed here, cf. Tacitus’ description of Corbulo’s auxiliaries in 54: *cohortibus alisque quae in Cappadocia hiemabant* (XIII, 8,2). It is significant that Cichorius, l.c. n.3, records no units named after Cappadocia or Pontus. Cohortes Galatarum are recorded, but only definitely in 139 A.D.

52. *P.I.R.*\(^2\) I 472.

53. Tac. *Ann.* XII,27,2. The Chatti are described as *latrocinia agitantes* and *populatores*. 
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of one. Pelham has described the Vangiones and Nemetans as ‘local levies’, comparing the *tumultuarias cateruas Germanorum cis Rhenum colentium* (p. 91) 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 *auxiliares* implies a professional organisation. The distinction between *auxiliares* and *alarius* seems to be that between infantry and cavalry, rather than tribal contingent and professional regiment.

The word ‘cohort’ occurs alone especially when it is contrasted with cavalry or when it is in a context where its meaning is apparent from other references or indications. Otherwise a numeral or its equivalent helps. For example, in 63 Corbulo led four legions into Armenia together with *uexilla delectorum ex Illyrico et Aegypto, quodque alarum cohortiumque, et auxilia regum*. Quod . . . alarum cohortiumque must be a way of avoiding giving the precise number. More specifically cohorts are designated as auxiliary by *socius*. Terms referring to weapons are used, such as *leues, expeditae* and the variant *citae*. A tribal name, in the adjectival form, is used in *Sugambra cohors*. Before leaving the word cohort, it should be noted that it can refer to the legionary cohorts, even when unqualified by some such adjective as *Romana*. An example of this occurs in the list of charges brought against

---


55. Cf. Tac. *Ann.* XII,31,4 – *cohortibus* explained by the earlier *sine robore legionum socialis copias*; XIII,8,2; XV,10,3.

56. XV,26,2.

57. The phrase *auxilia regum* has already been noticed. The detachments from Illyricum and Egypt must be legionary. (Cf. Furneaux ad loc. and R. Saxter, *Untersuchungen zu den Vexillationen des römischen Kaiserheeres* ... Cologne/Graz, 1967,12). In passing it may be noted that *Illyricum* is being used anachronistically, presumably to refer to Pannonia, Dalmatia and Moesia. Another indefinite phrase – *paucas cohortium* – occurs in the section Tac. *Ann.* XII,15–7. In it the phrase *frontem et terga Aorsi, media cohortes et Bosphorani tutabantur nostris in armis* is difficult to interpret. At first sight *cohortes* seems legionary, but *nostris in armis* appears to balance Aorsi (for whom cf. Thomaschek, *R.E.* I,1894, 2659ff.), who are specifically said to be ‘foreign’ (*externi*), and since the Bosphorans (Brandis, *R.E.* III,1897,757ff. (No. 3), esp. 782), who are attested epigraphically (Cichorius, i.e. n. 3,255) as regular Roman auxiliaries are said to be armed like Romans, *cohortes* by association seems auxiliary. In fact the somewhat derogatory *paucas cohortium* (which occurs immediately after the phrase robur exercitus), the *praefectus cohortis* and the *plerique auxiliarium* that were slain in a minor skirmish must have been part of these *cohortes*. Cf. Furneaux and Koestermann ad locc.

58. Tac. *Ann.* XII,38,4; XIV,26,2; XV,9,2.

59. E.g. IV, 73,2; 25,1; XII, 31,2 (cf. however XIV, 26,1, for *citae* applied to legions).


61. E.g. Tac. *Ann.* III,20,1; XII,38,3; XV,5,1.
Germanicus’ enemy, Piso, in 19 A.D. One was that his wife had been present at army manoeuvres: *sed exercitio equitum, decursibus cohortium interesse*. When the matter came up in the senate, the words used were *praesedisses nuper feminam exercitio cohortium, decursu legionum*.62 From this it is clear that, in the first passage, the cohorts were legionary, while in the second the cohorts, now corresponding to *equitum*, must represent auxiliaries in general. These then were joint exercises of legions and *auxilia*. *Ala*, like *cohors*, stands alone, or with numerals or their equivalent. It is also found with *equites*, as in the phrase *ala equitum, quae conscripta e Treuiris militia disciplinaque nostra habebat*.63 This phrase may be regarded as a full description of a regular cavalry unit: the emphasis on conscription and Roman military discipline should be noted. It is the equivalent of the more ‘epigraphical’ *una ala Treuirum*64 under the command of the pro-Roman Treveran leader Julius Indus. It is noteworthy that this, which was a second regular Treveran unit, had first been referred to in the very vague words *cum delecta manu*. An adjectival forma of a tribal name is used with *ala* in *alam Canninefatem*.65 *Alaris* and *alarius* are used as variants for *ala*, once with a tribal adjective added: cf. *alaris quoque Pannonios, robur equitatis*.66 Cyvalry are also indicated by *turmae*, into which the ala was divided. Generalia an earlier passage makes the auxiliary sense clear. Thus, in a place Impervious to cavalry a Roman commander decided to dismount his horsemen and use them as infantry: *quamquam sine robere legionum socialis copias ducebat, perrumpere adjedidit et distribuitus cohortibus turmas quoque peditum ad munia accingit*.67 *Turmae* is sometimes accompanied by a numeral or a descriptive adjective.68

As alternates to cohort Tacitus uses *pedites*, or the singular *pedes*, or the collective *peditatus*.69 *Pedes sagittarius*70 occurs. Especially noteworthy are the German auxiliaries referred to as *quod peditum Germanorum inter nostros merebat*.71 But *pedes* and its cognates may of course refer to legionary infantry. Words indicating armour and weapons are other substitutes for

62. II,55,6; III,33,3; cf. Furneaux and Koestermann ad locc.
67. XII,31,4 (cf. above n. 55); cf. 38,3.
68. Cf. *paucae turmae* (III, 46,2 – a rhetorical passage intended to disparage the number of cavalry involved; XIII,36,2); *turmas socialis* (IV,73,2).
69. The last term occurs when a legion is described as having been transferred *cum equitibus alarlis et peditatu cohortium* (XIII,35,2) where the context and the addition of *cohortium* makes it plain that auxiliary infantry is meant. An instance of *cohortium* similarly added to another general term – *auxilia* - was noted above (p. 96).
70. XIII,40,2.
71. IV,73,2; for legionary *pedites*, cf. XV,10–11, and below, n. 81.
auxiliary infantry. Such are *sagittarii* and the old-fashioned *leuis armatura* and *libritores funditoresque*. The latter phrase, in the reverse order, occurred in the Germanicus section. This is its second and only other occurrence in the *Annals*, where an attack on an Armenian stronghold under Corbulo in 54 A.D. is being described. In the account of the final defeat of the British chieftain Caratacus in Wales there are two references to auxiliary weapons. In the first – *inrupere ferentarius grauisque miles, illi telis adsultantes, 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, *grauis miles*. The second phrase actually uses the normal terms in mentioning the different weapons of the two arms: *gladiis ac pilis legionariorum, ... spathis et hastis auxiliarium*, where *spatha* is an unusual word for a heavy sword. Before the battle, prefects and tribunes exhorted the Roman troops: *praefectique et tribuni ... ardoer 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. It would appear that Tacitus is deliberately experimenting with various expressions for what had become a regular feature of Roman fighting, the close employment together of two branches of a professional fighting force. As far as the cavalry is concerned, *equites, eques* and *equitatus* are the equivalents of *ala*. In fact the two words are often combined. It should be recalled, however, that the Roman legion was provided with a small detachment of cavalry, so that *equites legionum* can appear.

The next word to consider is *socius*, regularly used for *auxilia*. A comparatively standard phrase is that based on the contrast between ‘citizen’, in the sense of ‘legionary’, and ‘ally’, in the sense of ‘auxiliary’. Thus Augustus at his death is said to have left a document behind on the size of the army: *quantum ciuium sociorumque in armis*. On one occasion the word appears associated with a regular item of Roman military organization, the unit standard – *quod sub signis sociorum*. Used adjectively, or in its derivative form of *socialis*, it qualifies nouns such as *cohors, turma, copiae* and *reges*, as various phrases quoted above have made clear. Several words denoting military groups of indefinite sizes are applied to detachments of auxiliaries. One of the commonest is *manus*. As noted (p. 99), Julius Indus’ *ala* was referred to as a *delecta manus*. An *auxiliaris manus* was used in the same

72. Cf. e.g. IV,47,2 (quoted below p. 101); XIV,34,2; XIII,39,3 (and for Corbulo, above p. 97).
73. XII,35,3. For *ferentarius* and *spathis* cf. Furneaux and Koestermann ad loc. For Caratacus, cf. *P.I.R.2* C 418.
74. IV,73,2. On the legionary cavalry, cf. Webster, o.c. n.1,116.
76. II,52,3.
context as Indus’ ala, the revolt of Florus and Sacrovir in Gaul in 21. This too consisted of regular cavalry. But the word also refers to untrained local contingents. In the closing stages of the revolt of Tacfarinas (24 A.D.) the Romans received assistance from the Mauretanians, who organized raiding parties: praedatorias manus delecti Maurorum duexere, no doubt using local methods to defeat a local enemy. In 62, Corbulon hastily levied local troops: tumultuarium provincium manum armat. These were obviously not cohorts and alae, but may well have become such later. Delectus (and lectus), especially when followed by the genitive, are often used for special forces, naturally in a good sense. It would be interesting to know whether such phrases as peditum et equitum auxiliarium delectos or delectos, sagittariorum or those in which the words are used as ordinary adjectives represent choice by unit or individual selection from various units to form a special task force. The word can of course also refer to legionary detachments. Several less specific expressions are found, such as copiae or uires. The word robur is usually found in association with legions, but it can refer paradoxically to auxiliaries. Exercitus is found in the setting: ui militis Romani ad excindenda castellorum ardua, simul Hibero exercitu campos persultante. The Iberians were largely cavalry, and were co-operating with the Romans as allies rather than auxiliaries. The sense is quite clear from the preceding miles Romanus, which is characteristically in the genitive after the singular of uires and designates the legionaries, and from the contrast between the largely artillery operations left to the Roman experts and the cavalry function of scouring the plains assigned to the Iberians. Exercitus is not only a useful variant for the obvious eques or its equivalent, but also serves to suggest the higher status of the Iberians. Milites is seldom used of auxiliaries, though an example occurs in a reference to some Jewish-Samaritan clashes in Judaea under Claudius. Since no legion was stationed in Judaea at that date, the ‘soldiers’ must have been auxiliaries. Less respectable words are provinciales – examples of which have already been seen (p. 96, n. 47; p. 101) – and populares. For the latter, compare Tacitus’ description of Arminius while he was still true to the Romans: in castris

77. III,45,1.
78. IV,24,3.
79. Already quoted above, n. 47.
80. IV,73,1; 47,2; respectively. Saxter, o.c. n. 57,4, notices the usage, but does not discuss the point raised here as such.
81. As the tria milia delecti peditis (of Tac. Ann. XV,10,3) from the legio duodecima mentioned just above the phrase. Cf. the uexilla delectorum ex Illyrico et Aegypto (XV, 26,2), discussed above, p. 98 and n. 57.
82. For copiae, cf. above, p. 99; for uires, p. 96.
83. VI,37,1; XV, 10,3, (quoted above, p. 99).
84. XI,9,1. For the Iberi, cf. H. Treidler, R.E. Suppl. IX,1962, 1899ff. (esp. 1909f.).
85. Tac. Ann. XII,54,3, where the Jewish forces are called latronum globos. Cf. below, p. 120.
Romanis ductor popularium meruisset. The expression must refer to a Cheruscan contingent, which was still under its own chieftain, who was however receiving Roman pay and whose men were sharing in the discipline of a Roman camp. The position was probably halfway between an ad hoc levy and a fully professional regiment. For another instance, compare the Thracian king who remained loyal to the Romans in the troubles in Thrace in 26 A.D. and rendered assistance: rex Rhoemetalces cum auxiliis popularium.

Most of the auxiliary units distinguished by tribal names -- the next usage to be considered -- have already been quoted. The list, in chronological order, is as follows: a Treveran ala in the revolt of Florus and Sacrovir in 21 (p. 99); Mauretanian 'bands' in the revolt of Tacfarinas in 24 (p. 101); a Sugambrian cohort in the Thracian troubles of 26 (p. 98); a Canninefatian ala in the Frisian revolt of 28 (p. 99); German pedites associated with it -- probably in cohorts (p. 99); Bospors in Roman armour in their homeland in 49 (p. 98, n. 57); Vangiones and Nemetans, 'auxiliaries', presumably cohorts, in the Chattan raid of 50 (p. 97); a Pannonian ala in Armenia in 62 (p. 99). But, as already suggested, the Pontica et Galatarum Cappadocumque auxilia (p. 97), also operative in Armenia in 62, probably represent men supplied by the client king of Pontus, and auxiliaries stationed in Galatia and Cappadocia, rather than 'Galatian and Cappadocian' auxiliaries as such, and therefore cannot be added here. Of those listed, the Mauretanians and the Bospors approximate more to the local levy variety, while the others can claim professional organization. Individual auxiliaries who feature in Tacitus are as follows: Arminius, the Cheruscan, ductor popularium under Augustus (p. 101); Ornospades, a Parthian, simply called an auxiliator, who later returned to Parthia, active in the Pannonian Revolt of 6–9 A.D.; Boioculus, an Ampsivarian, first recorded in 58, but claiming service (stipendia meruisse) in the German campaigns of Tiberius and Germanicus (9–16 A.D.); Tacfarinas, a Numidian, auxiliaria stipendia meritus, who

---

86. II,10,3. For Arminius, cf. above, p. 96.
88. Obviously the Aorsi (above, n. 57) and the Iberi (above, p. 101) and other tribal armies from beyond the Roman frontiers which have not been mentioned cannot be regarded as part of, or candidates for, the regular Roman auxilia. The same applied to the forces of the client kings (several of whom have been mentioned).
89. VI,37,3. The word auxiliator is an hapax legomenon in Tacitus. For Ornospades, cf. R. Hanslik, R.E. XVIII,1939,1129f.
rebelled in 17 A.D.; Delecti Maurorum is how the commanders of the Mauretanian ‘bands’ that helped to crush Tacfarinas in 24 are described (p. 101); Julius Indus, a Treveran, obviously commander of una ala Treuirum, although not specified as such, in the revolt of Florus and Sacrovir in 21 (p. 99); Cruptorix, probably a Frisian, a veteran by the time of the Frisian Revolt in 28; Gannascus, a Canninefatus, a deserter who led a Chaucan raid on Gaul in 47. Of these only Arminius and the unnamed Moorish leaders are said to have been commanders of contingents. Indus must have been one. Ornospades was obviously a special case, since he was an exile from Parthia at the time of his service to Rome. It would be hazardous to argue from the later prominence of Boioculus, Tacfarinas and Gannascus to earlier positions of authority in the Roman auxiliary system. Cruptorix’ position is even less certain. As far as the tribes are concerned, the Cherus-cans and the Ampsivarians did not survive the changed conditions after the Varian disaster in 9 and the Roman withdrawal across the Rhine in 16 to leave a mark upon the epigraphical record. The same applied to the Frisians after 28. But the Numidians, Mauri and Canninefatians all did. We do not have names of Romans who were indubitably in command of single units in the Annals but the ranks of praefectus and decurio are mentioned. Sometimes the specific praefectus equitum is used. And, as noted above, praefectus and tribunus (militum) can represent auxiliaries and legionaries respectively, as can the phrase legati praefectique.

Various words are found associated with enemy forces. Those referring to divisions among them are especially cateria, manus and globus. Iuventus is especially common for recruits drafted at the outset of a campaign. Latrones designates mode of fighting. Although brigandage or terrorism may be meant, resistance or guerilla fighters or partisans is often an appropriate rendering, at least from the non-Roman point of view. Little

91. Tac. Ann. II,52: is natione Numida, in castris Romanis auxiliaria stipenda meritus, max desertor, uagos primum et latrociniis suetos ad praedam et raptus congregare, dein more militiae per uexilla et turnas componere, postremum non inciduntae turbae sed Musulamiorum dux haberi; ... lectos uiros et Romanum in modum armatos castris attineret, disciplina et imperius suceseret. For Tacfarinas, cf. Stein, R.E. IV A, 1932,1985f.
94. The Frisii (Ihm, R.E. VII,1910,105ff.) assisted under Augustus (Dio LIV,32,3), but although individual Frisians are recorded in Roman service (cf. Kraft, o. c. n. 2, p. 152, no. 384; cf. no. 612) and a cohors Frisiavonum is known, no cohortes or alae Frisiorum are known as such.
95. Tac. Ann. IV,73,3; XII, 39,3; XIII, 40,3 – decurio equitum. For these terms, cf. Cheesman, o. c. n. 3,36f.
96. Cf. above, p. 100; Tac. Ann. XIII,37,2.
97. Some examples occur in nn. 53; 85; 91; p. 91; cf. Gerber & Grefe, o. c. n. 45, s.vv.
difficulty is likely to arise with these terms, even when they are applied to Roman forces. But it should be noted that typically Roman terms are used to denote enemy units. Thus exercitus is found, and the forces of Frisians in their revolt in 28 appear surprisingly as c(ivium sociorumque manus). Rebels have their own auxilia. Enemy forces are graded. The army of Florus and Sacrovir in 21 had a nucleus of armatae cohortes supported by nearly 40,000 iuuenitus and cruppellarii, who are defined as gladiatorial slaves completely covered in plated armour. These three elements are later referred to as cohortes, semermi and ferrati. Similarly Tacfarinas' forces evolved from an untrained mob, incondita turba, of migrant brigands, uagi . . . et latrocinis sueti, that were divided into Roman units, uexilla et turmae, armed and disciplined like Romans in camps. The phrase per uexilla et turmas componere is puzzling. Furneaux is inclined to consider uexilla synonymous with turmae since the strength of the Numidians lay in their cavalry. But it seems better to distinguish the terms with Koestermann, making the first refer to units of infantry. In such contexts the tactical sense of such technical terms as cohort is dominant.

The military is far more prominent in the Histories then in the Annals and the references to auxiliaries correspondingly more frequent and detailed. Accordingly usages already noticed in the Annals will not normally be discussed again. Under auxilia there is a statement concerning the early principate: the proconsular governor of Africa had command of the legion and auxiliaries there under Augustus and Tiberius, but under Gaius the legion was taken from the governor and assigned to an imperial legate. Legio in Africa auxiliaque tutandis imperii finibus sub dio Augusto Tiberioque principibus proconsuli parebant — the wording implies a connection between the legion and the auxiliaries and that the latter were as much part of the system of frontier defence as the former. Auxilia is qualified by the derivative form of the provincial adjective in the phrases Vipstanus Messala tribunus cum Moesicis auxiliaribus and Britannica auxilia, Bataurorum cohortis missas in Germaniam . . . ac tum Moguntiaci agentis. The second example, which specifies that the auxilia were in fact Batavian cohorts, makes it perfectly clear that Britannica means 'stationed in' or 'coming from

---

99. IV,72,3.
100. II,65,1; III,39,1; 73,1; IV,23,1.
104. Hist. IV,48,1.
Britain’. Messala’s men are similarly referred to by the army from which they came rather than by their regimental names. Tacitus goes on to say that they were accompanied by many legionaries and that a battle ensued. In the battle the forces are referred to as mixtus pedes equesque: the foot must represent the legionaries, so that it is safe to infer that Messala’s auxiliaries were horse. Thus we have a tribunus militum in command of a group of cavalry regiments. Auxiliaries are also referred to by the imperial candidate for whom they were fighting, as in Vitellianorum auxilia. The singular auxilium occurs. Some new arrivals are called recens auxilium, a corps of gladiators pressed into service under Otho deforme auxilium and a cohort that had once formed part of the army of Polemo, the client-king of Pontus, regium auxilium olim.

Cohorts and alae are naturally much in evidence. An interesting sentence occurs in Tacitus’ description of Vitellius’ formal entry into Rome: quartuor legionum aquilae per frontem totidemque circa e legionibus aliis vexilla, mox duodecim alarum signa et post peditum ordines eques: dein quattuor et triginta cohortes, ut nomina gentium aut species armorum forent, discretae. Here it should be noted that the cohorts could easily be distinguished from each other, and that the criteria mentioned were tribal affiliation and armour borne. As far as the use of tribal names with the cohorts is concerned, it should be observed that the same variatio as occurred in the Annals obtains. For example, cohortes are designated as both Tungrorum and Tunrae. Like auxilia cohortes can be designated by the provincial adjective in -ic-. Raeticae and Britannicae can be quoted, although there is some difficulty concerning the latter. They occur in a passage naming the man whom Otho sent to murder Galba’s adopted son: Sulpicius Florus e Britannicis cohortibus, nuper a Galba civitate donatus. Cohortes could of course mean legionary cohorts, but Sulpicius Florus (Galba belonged to the gens Sulpicia) could not have been legionary, otherwise he would already have possessed citizenship. The Britannicae cohortes, therefore, must mean auxiliary cohorts previously stationed in Britain. Similarly, like the auxilia, cohorts are called Vitellianae. In the Histories cohorts are once described as tumultuariae, an adjective reserved for manus and caterva in the Annals and on its second appearance in the Histories. The units so designated are contrasted with 3000 legionaries and a crowd of country folk and camp-followers. Accordingly they were hastily levied and as yet untrained, but in

107. II,43,2; 11,2; III,47,2. For Polemo and Pontic auxilia, cf. above, p. 97.
108. II,89,1.
109. 14,1; 15,2; cf. IV,16,2.
110. 1,68,1, quoted below.
111. 43,2. For Sulpicius Florus, cf. Stein, R.E. IV A, 1931,75 (no. 46).
112. Tac. Hist. III,6,2.
113. IV,20,2. Cf. above, pp. 91; 101; and IV,66,1.
intention they were regular cohorts, not a local militia. Alae are designated by the province from which they came, as Raeticae, Pannonicae ac Moesicae. However the ala Britannica in the singular must have been so named: it appears in the epigraphical record. Then there are the alae whose names derive from personal Roman nomina – the alae Tauriana, Petriana, Siliana, Auriana, Sebosiana and Picentina (the fifth appears in the guise alam, cui Sebosianae nomen.) These are known from the epigraphical record, though often with an expanded titulature. Lastly there is the ala Singularium excita olim a Vitellio deinde in partis Vespasiani transgressa. praeerat Iulius Briganticus sorore Cliulis genitus . . . inuisus auunculo. What singulares means here is not clear. Fiebiger has defined the word as ‘militarisiche Einzelpersonen, die höhern Offizieren angeteilt waren und von Ihnen als Ordonnanzen 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 singulares 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. As in the Annals alae can be represented by their subdivisions, the turmae. These are sometimes found operating separately, as in quattuor equitum turmae and designated by a tribal name, Treuororum turmae. Auxiliaries are designated by their regiamental standards in the Histories. At the outset of the Batavian Revolt an attack was made on the winterquarters of two cohorts 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 uexillaque et quod militum in superiorem insulae partem congregantur, duce Aquilio primipili, nomen magis exercitus quam robur: quippe uiribus cohortium abductis Vitellius e proximis Neruorum Germanorumque pagis segnem numerum armis onerauerat. The phrase

114. I,68,1 (quoted below); III,2,4.
116. Tac. Hist. I,64,3; 70 (quoted below, and IV,49,2); II,17,1; III,5,2 (quoted below); 6,2; IV,62,4. On this type of ala, cf. Cichorius, I.c.n. 3,1225, and s.vv.
119. There is some uncertainty concerning auxiliary standards. An ala had a vexillum and signa for its turmae. A cohort seems to have had signa for its centuriae: a separate standard for the whole regiment is not attested. Cf. Cheesman, o.c.n. 3,39ff.
signa uexillaque appears to be a periphrasis for auxiliary detachments – no legionaries were involved.\textsuperscript{121} Besides ‘standard’ or ‘flag’, uexillum can mean ‘detachment from a larger unit’\textsuperscript{122}. Normally legionary detachments are meant. But compare the phrase Gallorum Lusitanorumque et Britannorum cohortes et Germanorum uexilla cum ala Petriana\textsuperscript{123} of troops 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 uexilla has caused disagreement. Since the plural alae is used in reference to these forces in the next sentence and only one ala, the Petriana, is named, it is thought\textsuperscript{124} that uexillum here means ala. 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. The uexilla were probably part of the Germanorum auxilia that accompanied the army that Vitellius sent to invade Italy after his proclamation as emperor. As these Germanorum auxilia are mentioned separately from cohorts and alae, and later there is a reference to transrhenani or Germans from across the Rhine, they must have been allied contingents and not professional auxiliaries.\textsuperscript{125}

Socius in the \textit{Histories} does not require comment. To the less precise or more metaphorical terms denoting army groups that were discussed in the \textit{Annals numerus} should be added in the specific sense of unit. It is used contemptuously in the phrase quoted above\textsuperscript{126} describing the reason for the weakness of the army on the Rhine after Vitellius had withdrawn the best units for his invasion of Italy and filled the gaps with local recruits. Numerus does not mean a different category of soldier: the derogatory tone is intended to reflect on Vitellius, and at most implies that the Nervians and Germans were recently drafted and badly trained. The Nervians\textsuperscript{127} are of course well enough known, but the Germans are difficult to identify. In fact the names of various local peoples have been suggested as emendations, especially as the defection of a Tungrorum cohort\textsuperscript{128} to Civilis is mentioned in the next chapter. However ‘German’ here may be a generic name used instead of a specific

\textsuperscript{121} On its first appearance (Tac. \textit{Hist.} II,18,2), the phrase refers to praetorian cohorts and legionary detachments. But here the context is different. The contrast implied is with the not infrequent aquila signaque of legionaries.


\textsuperscript{123} Tac. \textit{Hist.} I,70,2.

\textsuperscript{124} Davies, Irvine and, most emphatically, Wuilleumier ad loc. For the other view, cf. Heubner ad loc. Saxter, o.c.n. 57, does not discuss the passage.

\textsuperscript{125} Tac. \textit{Hist.} I,61,2; II,17,2. Cf. Callies, l.c.n. 54,151.

\textsuperscript{126} Cf. above, p. 106.


\textsuperscript{128} Tac. \textit{Hist.} IV,16,2. For the Tungri, cf. K. Scherling, \textit{R.E.} VII A, 1948,1345ff. (and esp. 1356 for their claims to be included among the cisrhenani. For similar claims among the Nervii, cf. l.c.n. 127,57).
tribal designation, or it may be a re-appearance of the old cisrhenaean Germans: most of the peoples in the region claimed a Germanic origin. An *ingens Maurorum numeros . . . per latrocinia et raptus apta bello manus*¹²⁹ is recorded in Africa. Since however it was operating in support of regular cohorts and alae, it cannot have been a professional unit. *Numerus* had earlier been used of the detachments which Nero had summoned for his projected Eastern expedition just before his death and which Galba found in Rome on his arrival there in the autumn of 68. There were *multi . . . numeri e Germania ac Britannia et Illyrico*.¹³⁰ Saxer is of the opinion that they consisted mainly of legionaries. But when Galba was threatened by Otho and appealed to them for support, they are referred to as *legiones et auxilia*, and the *Britannicae cohortes* discussed above (p. 105), which formed part of them, were in all probability auxiliary. *Numerus* here must refer to detachments from both arms of the provincial forces named. After *numerus* the singular of *uires* may be noted. It is used for indeterminate numbers of non-provincial allies offered for a specific occasion. Thus the Sarmatian Iazyges were prepared to assist the Flavians by supplying *plebem . . . et uim equitum, qua sola valent*.¹³¹

*iuentus* is the most important among the ‘less Roman’ words. In a minor incident during the Vitellian advance to Italy the forces of Raetia became involved. They appear as *Raeticae alae cohortesque et ipsorum Raetorum iuentus sueta armis et more militiae exercita*.¹³² The Raetian ‘youth’ were probably a standing local militia, since they were not untrained prior to the engagement. Another auxiliary force from the neighbouring province of Noricum consisted of *ala Auriana et octo cohortes ac Noricorum iuentus*¹³³—the *iuentus* was presumably a local militia supporting a professional auxiliary force. In a levy which Vitellius held in Africa, the *iuentus* showed reluctance to *enlist*, presumably both for legionary and auxiliary service.¹³⁴ Besides *populares, plebs* and *pagani* are used.¹³⁵

Auxiliary and para-auxiliary forces are represented by provincial or tribal names. There is nothing new here, but the names that occur will be listed

¹²⁹ Tac. *Hist.* II,58,1.
¹³⁰ I,6,2; 26; 31. The detachment from the Rhine armies is later described as *Germanici exercitus milites, Germanici milites and Germanica uexilla*. The special use of Illyricum has already been noted. For variants Tacitus uses *Pannonici . . . exercitus milites and electos Illyrici exercitus*. Contra Saxer, o.c.n. 57,13.
¹³⁴ II,97,2 (*cohortes* are mentioned in addition to *legio*).
¹³⁵ III,21,2; 5,1 (quoted above); II,14,2 (and cf. *pagis* in IV,15,3, quoted above).
since those in the Annals have been given. The cohorts136 named were composed of Batavians, Belgians, Britons, Cannoinesates, Gauls, Ligurians, Lusitanians, Nervians, Pannonians, Tungrians and Vascones. But the 'German cohorts' found entering battle in the Othonian-Vitellian contest in North Italy 'in the ancestral fashion' probably belonged to Vitellius' transthenane allies. If so cohortis here is being used in a tactical, not in a 'professional' sense.137 Two 'tribal' alae are named – of Batavians and Treverans. The names associated with auxilia are Gauls, Germans, Poeni and Ubians.138 Those associated with the non-technical terms, and usually referring to ad hoc contingents are Arabs, Baetasians,139 Germans, Mauri, Nervians, Noricans, Tungrians. The tribal or geographical name is unqualified in the following cases: Alpini, Batavi, Belgae, Caeracates, Dalmatae, Galli, Germani, Mauri, montani, Norici, Pannonii, Parthi, Raeti, Sequani, Suebi, Transeutenani, Triboci, Tungr, Vangiones.140 Individual auxiliaries are also named or referred to. Those in positions of authority are fairly prominent. The names given include praefecti who were of Roman origin. The abstract term praefectura141 is used. However not much will be gained by giving all the details. Many of the terms discussed above appear in descriptions of enemy forces, especially in the lengthy account of the Batavian Revolt led by Civilis.

Finally certain passages in which auxiliaries are discussed in a rhetorical way in the 'Histories' should be noticed. These occur mainly in the speeches which Tacitus put in the mouths of the main protagonists in the struggle. 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 'Germans' at his disposal. This is immediately qualified, or contradicted, by nationes aliguals – a few tribes! It is clear that the legionaries themselves are to be tarred with the German brush, for Otho opposes the Italiae alunni et Romae iuventus, the 'true sons of Italy and Rome', to Vitellius' men. Otho's troops are made to call Vitellius' army peregrinum et externum. When dispersed, the Germans, admitted to be the strongest element in Vitellius' forces – quod genus militum apud hostis atrocissimum sit –, are said not to

137. Tac. Hist. II,22,1 – cohortis Germanorum, contu truci et more patrio nudis corpoibus super umeros scuta quatientium; cf. 23 – pacitati cohortum (referring to this force).
139. For the Baetasii, cf. Ihm, R.E. II,1896,2762.
140. For the Caeracates, cf. Ihm, R.E. III,1897,1281; for the montani, H. Philipp, XVI, 1933,203f. (no. 2); for the Sequani, Keune, II A, 1923,1639ff. (esp. 1648); for the Suebi, Schönfeld, IV A, 1931,564ff. (esp. 576); for the Triboci, E. Linckenhed, VI A, 1937, 2405ff. (esp. 2406).
have been able to withstand the relaxing climate of Italy.\textsuperscript{142} Neutral terms, however, appear in a favourable passage. Vitellius is invited to admire the part played by his soldiers at the battle of Bedriacum in the phrase: \textit{hinc inrupisse legionum agmen, hinc equites coortos, inde circumfusas auxiliorum manus}.\textsuperscript{143} From this it is clear that, when the foreign or 'German' character of troops is being stressed, allowance must be made for prejudice and rhetoric, and caution is needed in interpretation.

When Petilius Cerialis arrived to take command of the operations against Civilis after the victory of Vespasian in the Civil Wars, he decided to send some recent levies back home. Tacitus reports the incident as follows: \textit{dilectus per Galliam habitos in ciuitates remittit ac nutiarii iubet sufficere imperio legiones: socii ad munia pacis redirent securi uelut confecto bello quod Romanae manus excepissent. auxit ea res Gallorum obsequium: nam recepta iuuentute facilius tributa tolerauere, pronoires ad officia quod spernebantur.}\textsuperscript{144} The first sentence is highly rhetorical, as the use of the old term \textit{socii} shows. It is replaced by the more technical \textit{iuventus} in the second sentence.

The shifting of emphasis caused by rhetorical considerations can also be illustrated from variations in the terminology used for enemy forces modelled on the Roman pattern. An example occurs in the handling of Civilis' cisrhenane and 'free' German allies. In one of the first attacks on Vetera Civilis supplemented his \textit{robur Bataurorum} with \textit{Germanorum caterruis},\textsuperscript{145} where \textit{caterruae}, apart from being derogatory, probably also refers to the native formations. A second way of distinguishing these two groups was the use of \textit{transrhenani} for the free Germans, as in the phrase \textit{Bataui Transrhenanique}.\textsuperscript{146} But when viewed from another angle, especially when contrasted with the Romans, both groups are subsumed under the name \textit{Germani}, especially in the final phases of the conflict after the arrival of Cerialis.\textsuperscript{147} But at times the Batavians alone (or the Batavians and their closest allies, the Canninefates and Frisians) appear simply as \textit{Germani}.\textsuperscript{148}

\textsuperscript{142} The passages quoted are in I,52,3; 84,4; II,21,4; 32,1. Cf. the Vitellians' hope of arousing \textit{Germaniae gentis} (III,41,3) to continue the war. The Flavians feared that an \textit{ingens Germanorum uis} (III,15,1) might invade Italy via Raetia on behalf of the Vitellians.
\textsuperscript{143} II,70,3.
\textsuperscript{144} IV,71,2. For Q. Petilius Cerialis Caesius Rufus, cf. E. Swoboda, \textit{R.E. XIX}, 1937, 1388ff. (no. 8); Ritterling-Stein, o.c.n. 14,55.
\textsuperscript{145} Tac. \textit{Hist. IV,22,2}. Cf. 27,1; 28,1 – \textit{Ciulem ... universa Germania}; 33,1 – Civilis' \textit{veteranas cohortis et quod e Germanis maxime promptum}; V,17,1 – \textit{Germanos Batauosque}
\textsuperscript{146} IV,23,2, and passim.
\textsuperscript{147} 29,3 – \textit{Germanos ... Romanus miles}; 33,4 – \textit{in partibus nostris ... e Germanis}; 57,1 – Germans contrasted with Treverans; 60,2; 66,2; 76,1 – the \textit{Germanos} in council here include not only the Batavian and the 'free' group, but the Treverans as well. Later in the chapter, in a speech assigned to \textit{Tutor}, \textit{Germanos} means the free Germans; 79,1; V, 14,2 – miles \textit{Romanus ... Germanos}; 16,2 – \textit{Germanos, quod roboris fuerit} in a speech of Cerialis; 20,2.
\textsuperscript{148} IV,60,2; 79,2; V,14,2; 15.
Sometimes the name is used in 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.

The rhetorical slant in certain parts of the Histories dealing with auxilia is far less prominent in the Annals, but an example from the latter work may be quoted. Reference has already been made to the auxilia involved in the revolt of Florus and Sacrovir in 21 A.D. When C. Silius, the legate of the upper German army, advanced to crush the rebels, he delivered a speech outlining earlier victories and belittling the forces which had won them: una nuper cohors relegem Turonum, una ala Treverum, paucae huivs ipsius exercitus turmae profilgiuere Sequanos. The single cohort was not an auxiliary, but an urban one. The ala Treverum with its seemingly epigraphical title was in all likelihood the ala Indiana, and the paucae turmae had previously appeared as an auxiliaris manus and consisted of at least one ala.

The third work of Tacitus that should be considered is the Agricola, although it goes beyond the chronological limits set for the paper. Auxiliaries appear in one rhetorical context, the speech put in the mouth of the British leader Calgacus. The Roman army, he maintained, was a compound of disparate elements; in particular he names Gauls, Germans and Britons. Agricola's enlistment of Britons from the pacified south is in fact recorded. Three other tribal names occur, all in special contexts. A cohors Usiporum per Germanias conscripta et in Britanniam transmissa mutinied while being trained and then underwent a series of adventures described in a problematic chapter of the biography. Four Batavian and two Tungrian cohorts are singled out for special mention in the climactic battle of

149. E.g. IV,16,1, where the Batavians and Canninefates are called Germani, laeta bello gens.
150. E.g. IV,60, where the Germans break faith with the Roman legionaries that surrendered at Vetera.
151. 29; cf. 61; V,14,1.
153. Tac. Agr. 32,1; 32,3. That Germani is being used collectively is shown by the phrase ceteri Germani quam nuper Usiperi reliquerunt (32,3). Other German tribes that are named are the Batavians and the Tungrians. For Calgacus, cf. P.I.R.² C 224.
154. Tac. Agr. 29,2 - ex Britanniis fortissimos et longa pace exploratos.
156. Tac. Agr. 36,1; cf. the form Bataui (36,2).
mons Graupius. Professional alae and cohorts\textsuperscript{157} are mentioned in the description of battle, but without their regimental names. Elsewhere, except for the unnamed ala which was almost totally destroyed in Wales just before Agricola’s arrival in Britain, variants appear for the two technical terms. One that may be noted is numerus and another is the description of the auxiliaries who used their special skill of being able to swim in armour with their horses to open Agricola’s attack on the island of Mona (Anglesey). They appear as lectissimos auxiliarium, quibus nota uada et patrius nandus usus, quo simul seque et arma et equos regunt. These can be none other than Batavians, famous for this very accomplishment. But the designation ‘Batavian’ is avoided. It is notable that these three instances all come from the same chapter\textsuperscript{158} (in it Agricola has his first experience of the military situation in Britain as governor). Other expressions do not present anything new: in passing it may be noted that no details are given on pre-Agricolan auxiliaries except for the bare statement that the invading force under Claudius consisted of legiones auxiliaque.\textsuperscript{159}

In making a general assessment of Tacitus’ terminology for the auxiliaries it is important to remember that his highly individual style cannot easily be made to fit into rigid categories. In fact, it is doubtful whether the categories were rigid even in practice. In addition, Tacitus would be reporting the abnormal or unusual: the regular and normal would be taken as read. Allowance must also be made for the fact that neither the Annals nor the Historiae is complete. Up to this point a roughly chronological sequence has been followed. But of course the works excerpted were written in the reverse order to that used above. The Agricola is normally dated to 98 A.D., the Historiae within the next decade, and the Annals at least another decade later.\textsuperscript{160} This means that the events related in the Agricola occurred some ten to twenty years before publication, those in the Historiae up to forty years before and the earliest events in the Annals at least a century before writing.

The Agricola belongs to a different genre to the historical works. In general it tends not to give the names of units except in a highly dramatic incident and a famous battle scene; the names given are known from other literary works. Cohors and ala are not used except where military precision is of importance. Where, however, general expressions like auxilia or vague terms like equites are used, it is pretty clear that professional regiments are meant. By the time of Agricola the auxiliary system was fully developed. However Tacitus avoids technical vocabulary to a large extent.

\textsuperscript{157} 37. For another reference to cohorts, cf. 41,2, where apparently the term is used quite generally for military units.

\textsuperscript{158} 18,4 Cf. Ogilvie-Richmond ad loc. for their identification as Batavians.

\textsuperscript{159} 13,3. For similar phrases, cf. 18,2; 24,3.

\textsuperscript{160} After R. Syme, Tacitus (Oxford, 1958), 19; 118ff; 471ff. Cf. S. Borzsak, R.E. Suppl. XI,1968,389; 445; 497ff.; 466ff. The same works may be consulted on Tacitus’ style (Syme, 340ff.; Borzsak, 485ff.; 496ff.).
By the nature of its subject the *Histories* required considerable detail and precision in military matters. Armies and military groups of various sizes are often specified. These conform to a general pattern: legions, professional auxiliaries and local assistance. The latter varies from the highly trained armies of client kings to hastily drafted provincials or even allies from across the frontiers of the empire: in Italy contestants had to have recourse to gladiators and unsuitable volunteers. A careful reading of such army descriptions will usually allow the professional auxiliary element to be distinguished. *Cohors* and *ala* are the standard words, but the non-auxiliary senses of *cohort* (p. 98) as well as its tactical use (p. 94; 109) can cause confusion. *Auxilia* covers the whole range of auxiliaries (p. 96) and therefore has to be carefully investigated before its precise import can be established. Regular variants for these terms are *pedites* (p. 99), *equites* (p. 100) and *socii* (p. 100), the latter usually archaizing. All three can refer to any type of auxiliary. Another type of variant is to mention the commander, officers or subdivisions of regular units: *praefectus* (p. 103), *decurio* (p. 103) and *turma* (p. 99) are the commonest terms. This usage is most frequent in a cavalry context; in effect the auxiliary *centuria* and *centurio* do not occur. The words for standards, *vexillum* and *signa* (p. 107), are occasionally used like the last group.

General military terms may include or represent *auxilia*. *Exercitus* (p. 101) and *milites* (p. 101) are very rare in this sense, although found. *Copiae* (p. 101) is more usual. *Delecti* and *electi*, especially when followed by a partitive genitive, have almost taken on the sense of ‘unit’ or ‘detachment’ (p. 101). *Numerus* (p. 107) has begun to be used in the same sense. *Vexillum* (p. 107) is not confined to legionaries. The metaphorical terms *uires* (p. 101) and *robur* (p. 101) are borrowed from legionary contexts for complimentary use. *Manus* (p. 100) is used of a small number, not infrequently in a derogatory sense. *Juventus* (p. 108) on a larger, and *caterua* (p. 91) on a smaller scale are words more commonly applied to enemy hordes, but can be used, normally disparagingly, for special effects. The uncommon *populares* (p. 101) and *pagani* (p. 108) are also applied to people serving in an auxiliary capacity. It should be noted, however, that the auxiliary significance of these words is nearly always made clear by their context and by the use of qualifying adjectives or phrases of one kind or another. This applies even to the more technical vocabulary discussed in this paragraph. When ‘geographical’ indications are given, usually tribal but also provincial, there is a wide spectrum (p. 104f.; 108f.). The proper title may appear, an adjectival form may be substituted or the tribal name may be used substantively without *cohors*, *ala* or other equivalent term. The general may be given for the specific: thus it is not often clear whether a German or a Gallic cohort represents a *cohors Germanorum* or *Gallorum* as such or is merely a means of avoiding an obscure name, such as Tungrian or Sequanian.

The *Annals* cover a period fifty times longer than the *Histories*, one too
in which the main developments took shape. Military events play a much smaller role. *Cohors, ala, auxilia* and their equivalents all appear. But *pedites* and *equites* are more frequent than in the *Histories*. *Socius* is much more common. *Praefectus* and *turma* can be used as variants as in the earlier work. However the use of words for ‘standards’ in this way does not occur. The general group appears with omissions and one addition, that of *provinciales* (p. 101). *Numerus* is not used of a unit as in the *Historiae*. *Vexillum* is avoided. *Ituentus* (p. 103) is almost confined to enemy forces, and *pagani* is not used of auxiliaries. Generally speaking the technical vocabulary is much less common and proper names are avoided to a large extent. It is rare for tribal names to be given. Individuals appear as infrequently – more often than not after they had deserted Rome and rebelled.

A final general comment may be made. Out of the way detail occurs especially in passages dealing with the North Western frontier areas – Gaul, Germany and Britain (p. 91f.; 102–7; 109; 111f.). This is shown by types of weapon or strategy noted, or by the use of certain archaisms (p. 100; 104). This may be due to the accident of survival, or to a special interest or special sources available to Tacitus.

The first author to be considered after Tacitus is Velleius Paterculus.¹⁶¹ He had served in the German and Pannonian Wars fought at the end of the principate of Augustus, initially as a *praefectus equitum*. Accordingly his references to auxiliaries in the Pannonian Revolt of 6–9 A.D. will be of special interest. He remarks in general that all the Pannonians had a knowledge of Roman discipline, which would imply extensive co-operation with the Romans as auxiliaries.¹⁶² He mentions an army of five legions operating with *auxiliaribusque et equitatui regio*.¹⁶³ Then in the next sentence, technical terms are used: *fusa regorum equestris aries, fugatae alae, conversae cohortes sunt, apud signa quoque legionum trepidatum*. In enumerating the complete forces of Tiberius against the rebels, Velleius names ten legions in one camp with *LXX amplius cohortibus, XIII** et pluribus quam decem veteranorum miliibus, ad hoc magnu voluntariorum numero frequentque equite regio*.¹⁶⁴ The army consisted of ten legions, 10,000 veterans, a large number of special recruits called *voluntarii* and then the auxiliary part comprising more than seventy infantry cohorts, at least fourteen alae (for this is the obvious emendation of the lacuna, at least as far as its non-numerical aspect

---

¹⁶¹ A. Dihle, *R.E.* VIII A, 1955, 637ff. (no. 5) esp. 640ff., who is of the opinion that Velleius' work was composed rapidly just before 30 A.D. In the introduction to the new edition (1967) by F. Portalupi (p.xvi) it is suggested that Velleius composed his history between 15 and 30 A.D.

¹⁶² Vell. II,110,5.

¹⁶³ 112,4.

¹⁶⁴ 113,1. Unfortunately the reading is disputed: Laurent suggested *X alis et*, Lipsius *XIII alis et* for the lacuna. What is in doubt is not the emendation, *alae*, but how many alae there were. Portalupi does not comment on the passage.
is concerned) and cavalry supplied by a client king. There is less detail on
the Varian disaster in Germany in 9 A.D. We are informed that the Romans
lost three legions and \textit{totidemque alarum et sex cohortium}.\textsuperscript{165}

From these passages it is clear that Velleius, like Tacitus, distinguishes
between more professional cohorts and alae and \textit{ad hoc} support by client
kings. This use of numbers with the cohorts and alae is precise and it is
obvious that the \textit{auxiliares} of the first passage is merely a shorthand term
for the fuller phrase. Lastly it should be noted that Velleius\textsuperscript{166}
informes us that both his father and he had served as \textit{praefecti equitum} on the Rhine;
his appointment dated from 4 A.D., but when his father's began is not
stated. As such they must have commanded cavalry units and are evidence
for professional alae under Roman officers going back to early in the prin-
cipate of Augustus. In view of this it would be useful to date the time of
composition of Velleius’ work precisely. The only fixed point is 30 A.D.
since it was dedicated to the consul of that year. This means that at most
some twenty years intervened between the events mentioned and the final
completion of the work. The vocabulary therefore may be that of the latter
part of Tiberius’ principate, but there is no real reason for thinking that
Velleius was not using the terminology in use during the campaigns in which
he participated.

The next work to be considered is the fourth book of the \textit{Strategemata}
that goes under the name of Frontinus. Corbulo is said to have punished
certain auxiliary units in Armenia in 58 A.D. by making them camp outside
the fortified lines. They appear as \textit{duas alas et tres cohortes}.\textsuperscript{167} Tacitus
relates the same incident, but the troops involved are called \textit{praefectos
militesque};\textsuperscript{168} typically, precise figures and precise terms are avoided,
although the context makes it clear that auxiliary units are in question.
Secondly, the reason for the punishment of an auxiliary commander in the
same campaign is reported as follows: \textit{Aemilio Rufo praefecto equitum,
quia...parum instructam armis alam habebat...}.\textsuperscript{169} Here too the language
is technical.

Suetonius has a few passages relating to auxiliaries in the \textit{Twelve Caesars},
a work published early under Hadrian, presumably not long after the
\textit{Annals}. When Claudius is made to appoint Felix governor of Judaea,
professional terms are used to describe the auxiliary army at his disposal:

\textsuperscript{165} 117,1. In 119,4, according to an emendation, a legate disgraced himself by attempt-
ing to flee to the Rhine \textit{cum alis}; however the original reading is \textit{cum aliis}. Portalupi does
not comment.

\textsuperscript{166} 104,3.

\textsuperscript{167} Front. \textit{Strat. IV},1,21.

\textsuperscript{168} Tac. \textit{Ann. XIII},36,3.

Felícem, quem cohortibus et alis provinciaeque Iudaeae praeposuit... When Vespasian took command of the Jewish War in 67 his forces consisted of two legions, eight alae and ten cohorts. In 68 Galba had a legion, two alae and three cohorts in Spain before recruiting extra troops for his attempt to become emperor. During his preparations against Vitellius in 69, Vespasian received an offer of quadraginta milia sagittariorum from the king of Parthia. In Tacitus they are described as quadraginta milia Parthorum equitum. (Vespasian was able to refuse the offer, and Tacitus comments as follows: magníficum laetumque tantis sociorum auxiliis ambiri neque indigere.) These must have been the famous mounted cavalry of the Parthians. They were obviously not regular Roman auxiliaries, but Suetonius’ language is precise (as is Tacitus’ in this case): the exact number and the distinctive weapon are given. On three occasions the general term auxilia is preferred. In the Pannonian Revolt (6–9 A.D.) Tiberius is said to have had a large number of legions and an equal number of auxiliaries. Velleius’ statement that three legions, three alae and six cohorts were lost in the Varian disaster in 9 A.D. has been quoted; Suetonius merely says tribus legionibus... et auxiliis omnibus caesis. Galba’s recruiting in Spain in 68 has just been mentioned: he enrolled both legionsaries and auxiliaries. Suetonius comments on the stationing of auxiliaries in two phrases. Augustus assigned them to provinces with the legions: ex militaribus copiis legiones et auxilia provinciātim distribuit. Tiberius is made to allow the senate some say de... legionum et auxiliorum discriptione. Auxiliary commanders are mentioned comparatively frequently. Augustus allowed the sons of senators to initiate their careers not only with legionario tribunates but also with cavalry commands, praefectūrae alarum. Sometimes two such laticlaviī were placed in command of one ala: binos plerumque laticlauios praeposuit singulīs alīs. Praefecti alae are mentioned twice in the life of Tiberius as if the rank were quite normal. Claudius’ short-lived reform of the order in which auxiliaries commands were arranged is recorded as follows: equestris
militias ita ordinavit, ut post cohortem alam, post alam tribunatum legionis darer.¹¹⁸¹ One would not expect the auxiliaries to feature largely in biographies of emperors. But there are sufficient references to allow one to conclude that Suetonius used the technical vocabulary. And on one occasion where he used the general term auxilia Velleius shows that professional units were in fact meant. Further, like Velleius, he uses the professional vocabulary of the principate of Augustus.

Josephus is the most important among the Greek writers. Broadly speaking, he uses general rather than specific terms. It will be best to begin with his description of the three armies with which the Romans invaded Judaea at various stages of the Jewish War. When Cestius Gallus set out from Syria in 66, he took the Twelfth Legion, and 2,000 picked men from each of the other legions. His non- legionary troops comprised πεζόν ... ἑξ σπείρας καὶ τέσσαρας ἵλας ἰππέων, πρὸς αἷς τὰς παρὰ τῶν βασιλέων συμ- μαχίας. 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 Sohaemus (4,000 men, a third of whom were cavalry and the majority archers).¹¹⁸² This gives a total of just under 14,000 royal soldiers, of whom some 5,000 at least were cavalry, the majority armed with the bow (unfortunately it is not stated whether Agrippa’s forces were bowmen or not). In collecting his forces, therefore, Cestius seems to have deliberately left the provision of the special arm of sagittarii, both mounted and on foot, to the client kings. He also collected a large number of other auxiliaries or ἐπίκουροι from the towns of Syria. These were completely untrained.¹¹⁸³ When Vespasian took over in 67 his three legions were supported by eighteen cohorts.¹¹⁸⁴ These were supplemented by five others from Caesarea. Josephus says that ten of these twenty three were milliary, while the other thirteen contained 600 infantry and 120 cavalry each. As far as the alae were concerned, one came from Caesarea and five others from Syria. Antiochus, Agrippa and Sohaemus had provided σωρῶν ... συμμαχικῶν, that is, 2000 infantry archers and 1000 cavalry each. Further the Nabataean Arab Malchus¹¹⁸⁵ sent 1000 cavalry and 5000 infantry, the majority being archers.

¹¹⁸¹. Cl. 25,1 and Smilda ad loc.; v. Domaszewski, o.c.n. 205, 129; xxxv. The auxiliary praefectura occurs in Vesp. 8,3 again.


¹¹⁸⁴. III,4,1,64ff.; cf. IV,10,3,598. E. Birley, ‘Alae’ and ‘Cohortes Milliariae’ in the Corolla Memoriae E. Swoboda Dedicata (Graz/Cologne, 1966), 66, doubts the accuracy of Josephus’ statements on the size of the auxiliary regiments. The question cannot be discussed here.

¹¹⁸⁵. Fluss, R.E. XIV,1928,857f. (no. 2). G. Forni, Contributo alla Storia della Dacia romana in Athen. XXXVI, 1958,27, refers to a passage in the Talmud where it is said that 8,000 Palmyrene archers were in the service of Rome during the wars of Vespasian. He identifies these with the force of Malchus.
The total of all these forces was 60,000 according to Josephus, who then adds the interesting information that the very large numbers of ‘servants’ following the army must be included, since they had shared in their owners’ training. Vespasian’s order of march during his invasion of Galilee is described in detail. Light-armed auxiliaries or ψυλοί and archers formed the van so that they could repel surprise attacks and spy 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 ὁ μίσθωτος χήλος: since the main body of the auxiliaries has not been mentioned as yet, μίσθωτος here must mean stipendiarii rather than mercenarii. A special force of infantry and ὀπλίται and cavalry brought up the rear. When Vespasian set out for Rome in 69 he left his son Titus to finish off the war in Judaea. In Titus’ army there were four legions, αἱ τῶν βασιλέων συμμαχία πολύ πλείους καὶ συχνοί τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς Συρίας ἐπίκουροι. His order of march was as follows: the van consisted of οἱ βασιλικοὶ καὶ πᾶν τὸ συμμαχικὸν. Next came various specialized detachments, such as the surveyors, then Titus and his special troops and the legionary cavalry, τὸ τάγματος τὸ ἵππικόν. After the engines of war were μετ’ ἐπιλέκτων χιλιάρχων καὶ σπειρῶν ἐπαρχῶν. The legions followed, then the baggage-train, then τὸ οἰκετικὸν ἀκάστοτο τάγματος. Last of all were οἱ μίσθωτοι καὶ τούτων φύλακες ὀδραγοί.

There are considerable similarities in the descriptions of Vespasian’s and Titus’ marching order. Auxiliaries form the van in both cases. The prefects of the cohorts are together in the centre in both cases. The servants of the legions or calones are noted on each occasion. The rear is formed by οἱ μίσθωτοι. Here however a difficulty arises. In Vespasian’s army οἱ μίσθωτοι seem to have represented auxiliaries but in Titus’ case all the auxiliaries, called πᾶν τὸ συμμαχικὸν, are together in the front. This would imply that οἱ μίσθωτοι were in a different category. Some further comments are called for. As already stated, Suetonius gave the number of Vespasian’s auxiliary regiments (eight alae and ten cohorts). It is not possible to reconcile these figures with Josephus’, except perhaps to suggest that the sum of 18 regiments in Suetonius corresponds to the number of cohorts only in the fuller account by the Jewish historian. Tacitus, however, provides useful assistance on Titus’ forces. He names the legions and then says comitabantur uiginti sociae cohortes, octo equitum alae, simul Agrippa Sohaemusque reges et auxilia regis Antiochi ualidaque et solito inter accolas odio insensa Judaeis.

186. δίχα θεραπότων, ... διὰ δὲ συνάσκησιν πολεμικῆν οὐκ ἄν ἀπότασσοντο τῷ μαχιμοι, κατὰ μὲν εἰρήνην ἐν ταῖς μελέταις τῶν δεσποτῶν ἀεὶ στρεφόμενοι, συγκινδυνεύοντες δ’ ἐν πολέμοις, ὡς μῆτ’ ἐμπειρία μῆτ’ ἀλκή τινος πλήν τῶν δεσποτῶν ἐλαττοῦσθαι. For such soldiers’ servants (calones), cf. v. Domaszewski, R.E. III, 1897,1362.


188. V,1,6,41ff.

189. 2,1,47ff.
Arabum manus ... 190 Josephus' 'auxiliaries from Syria' must correspond to Tacitus' twenty cohorts and eight alae: this means that the 'auxiliaries from Syria' must have been part of the Syrian army rather than Syrians as such. Tacitus then gives the actual names of the kings to whom Josephus refers collectively. The 'band' of Arabs useful for their neighbourly hatred of the Jews is not found in Josephus but is obviously separate from the regular auxiliaries and the royal forces in Tacitus. It is tempting to suggest that it corresponds to of μίσθωτα, a force hired for the occasion.

These quotations from Josephus show that he used σπείρα or σπείρα πεζόν for cohors and ἰλή or ἰλή ἵππεων for ala (p. 117). Sometimes weapons or armour are specified, as in the case of archers or ψιλοί (p. 118). The general word for auxiliaries is ἐπίκουροι (p. 117) or some form of σύμμαχοι (p. 117). Μίσθωτα (118) should probably be regarded as a variant to be interpreted by its context. Special attention is given to the forces supplied by client kings: βασιλεῖς and σύμμαχοι (p. 118) appear in various forms, especially in combination.

Not much will be gained by illustrating these points further. It may be noted however that the technical word ἰλή is used for the principate of Augustus. In the troubles that broke out in Judaea after the death of Herod the Great in 4 B.C. the then governor of Syria came to Judaea with two legions and 'the four alae of horse that were with them'. 191 Some features of Josephus' auxiliary vocabulary not noted above can now be mentioned. Τάγμα normally means a legion, but can be used of an auxiliary unit. 192 Όπλιται, 193 too, normally associated with the heavy armed soldiers of the legion can refer to auxiliaries. It is not always clear whether it is being used with specific reference to the armour being worn or whether it is simply another word for soldier. A cohort can be called a λόχος 194 instead of σπείρα. Under Titus a certain Pedanius performed a spectacular feat. He is described as τῶν ἄποισα σπείρας τις ἵππεων 195 – a horseman from a cohort. The regiment must have been a cohors equitata.

Unfortunately tribal names are very rare in Josephus. The reference to Syria above has just been interpreted as meaning that the auxiliaries named came from Syria rather than that they were all ethnically Syrians. The 'auxiliaries from Syria' in this sense occur as early as 40 A.D. 196 On occasion

---

192. ΧΙΧ,9,2,365 (cf. τάξις in XX,5,3,106 (cf. n. 204 below)); XX,6,1,122 (quoted below).
193. B.J. II,12,1,226 (the reference being to the 'Roman cohort' in Jerusalem discussed below); 13,4,260; V,11,3,460.
194. VII,1,2,5.
195. VII,2,8,161.
196. II,10,1,186.
however actual Syrians occur.\textsuperscript{197} Arabs are mentioned, and probably an Egyptian, but as individuals rather than as members of units carrying their ethnic name.\textsuperscript{198} The best attested units are those of Caesareans and Sebastenians (the latter coming from Samaria). An ala and five cohorts appear in 44 A.D.\textsuperscript{199} In that year Claudius had reduced Judaea to provincial status on the death of king Agrippa. He threatened to transfer the regiments to Pontus on account of their insulting behaviour during the king’s funeral. In the end however Claudius allowed the troops to remain in Judaea. Momigliano\textsuperscript{200} has shown that although the garrison of Caesarea here is said to have included both Caesareans and Sebastenians, elsewhere only Sebastenians are said to have been stationed in the town. Further the troops numbered 3000, which is precisely the number of Sebastenians that fought for the Romans under Augustus on the death of Herod the Great. At some time, therefore, between the death of Herod in 4 B.C. and of Agrippa in 44 A.D., 3000 royal troops, obviously with successive replacements of those discharged, had become one ala and five cohorts, each quingenary. Some of them are found operating under Claudius in some clashes between Jews and Samaritans. Tacitus, in a brief notice, merely says that \textit{milites} were involved.\textsuperscript{201} Josephus, however, in the \textit{Bellum} relates that \textit{μίαν ἴλην ἵππεον καλουμένην Σεβαστηνῶν} was summoned from Caesarea by the procurator.\textsuperscript{202} In the \textit{Antiquities} the forces appear as \textit{τὴν τῶν Σεβαστηνῶν ἴλην καὶ πεξίων τάσσεσαρα τάγματα τοὺς τε Σαμαρείς}...\textsuperscript{203} In Latin terms, an ala Sebastenorum, four cohorts of infantry and newly drafted Samaritan levies are meant. The use of the local name of Samaritan for the \textit{ad hoc} levy is noteworthy: it clearly distinguishes the levy from the professional regiments with their formal Greek title. Lastly the term ‘Roman’ should be noted. Josephus calls the unit of soldiers normally stationed near the temple in Jerusalem during the Passover \textit{ἡ Ρωμαϊκή σπείρα}: he also refers to \textit{ἡ Ρωμαῖκη φρουρά} there.\textsuperscript{204} However the regiment must have been auxiliary, and bears the title ‘Roman’ because it was part of the army of occupation from the Jewish point of view. As far as regimental commanders are concerned, Josephus has \textit{χιλίαρχοι, ἱπαρχοὶ, \textit{i.e.}, praefecti, ἵππαρχοι} and, at a

\textsuperscript{197} V,13,4,551; cf. 5,556.

\textsuperscript{198} V,6,6,290; 13,4,551; cf. 5,556; VII,6,4,199 (the Egyptian, not however specifically called an auxiliary).


\textsuperscript{200} Momigliano, o.c.n. 170,69ff., referring to B.J. II,3,4,52; 12,5,236 (quoted below); A.J. XX,6,1,122.

\textsuperscript{201} Tac. \textit{Ann.} XII,54,3. Noted above, p. 101.

\textsuperscript{202} Jos. B.J. II,12,5,236.

\textsuperscript{203} A.J. XX,6,1,122.

\textsuperscript{204} B.J. II,12,1,224; 226; A.J. XX,5,3,106, where, as noted above (n. 192) τάξις, not σπείρα, is used; B.J. II,13,5,262.
junior level, ἐκατοντάρχαι and δεκαδάρχαι, i.e. centurions and decurions.\footnote{E.g., Jos. A.J. XX,6,132 (cf. 3,136; B.J. II,12,6,244) for χιλιάρχος. Χιλιάρχος is normally regarded as the Greek equivalent of the tribunus militum (L.S.J.\textsuperscript{9} s.v. II; A. von Domaszewski, Die Rangordnung des römischen Heeres, Cologne/Graz, 1908, r. 1967, 40), i.e., the commander of a military regiment. It is not clear whether Josephus is using the word in the technical sense or not: cf. above, n. 184. For the other terms, cf. Jos. B.J. II,19,7,554; 4,531; IV,8,1,442.}

Broadly speaking, Josephus’ armies correspond to Tacitus’. There are legions, professional auxiliaries and supplementary troops supplied by client kings or less respectable sources. The words τάγμα and ὀπλίται can lead to confusion, but otherwise Josephus’ vocabulary is comparatively straightforward. On two occasions Josephus and Tacitus refer to the same auxiliaries. In the first, the Jewish-Samaritan clashes under Claudius, Tacitus’ milites (p. 101) are explained by Josephan detail. In the second, Titus’ army in 69, it is Tacitus who supplies the more precise information (p. 118). This helps to confirm the impression that both are describing the auxiliary situation as it was in the early principate.

The evidence of the New Testament can be added to that of Josephus. The term σπείρα occurs for the troops guarding Jesus at his trial and crucifixion under Pontius Pilate (whose governorship of Judaea is generally dated to 26–36 A.D.).\footnote{Mt. 27,27; Mk. 15,15; Jn. 18,3; 12. For Pontius Pilatus, cf. E. Fascher, R.E. XX, 1950,1322ff.} There are two passages in Acts where there are named cohorts. The first describes the gentile convert Cornelius as ἐκ σπείρης τῆς καλουμένης Ἰταλικῆς.\footnote{Ac. 10,1; P.I.R.\textsuperscript{2} C 1308. Cf. Cichorius, l.c.n. 3, 304. As A.N. Sherwin-White, Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament, (Oxford, 1963), 156, notes, Cornelian, the centurion of the ‘cohors Italica’, appears to have been a provincial, surrounded by relatives and friends (Ac. 10,24).} He must have been centurion in a cohors Italica: such cohorts are known from the epigraphical record. The second was the σπείρα Σεβαστη: one of its centurions took Paul to Rome after his appeal to the emperor.\footnote{Ac. 27,1. Cf. Cichorius, l.c.n. 3,248, who regards the cohort as Augusta.} It would be natural for the phrase to be rendered into Latin as cohors Augusta: cohorts so called are epigraphically attested in Syria. On the other hand Σεβαστη was the current name for Samaria, and Josephus mentions cohorts of Sebasteinians on several occasions. Σεβαστη therefore may be a shortened form of Sebaste-norun. The most senior of the officers mentioned in the New Testament was Claudius Lysias who protected Paul in Jerusalem before his trial there. He
is called ὁ χιλίαρχος τῆς σπείρης. 209 Ἐκατοντάρχαι or centurions are mentioned on several occasions: once the Latin word appears transliterated as κεντυρίων. 210 The language of the New Testament on this subject is closely parallel to Josephus’ and must reflect the same military situation.

The earliest Greek writer whom we may consult is Strabo, who is generally considered to have composed most of his Geography under Augustus, with additions under Tiberius. He lists the Roman forces in Egypt in 24 B.C. as three legions, nine σπείραι Ἀρματίων and three ἱππαρχίαι or units of cavalry. 211 The ‘cohorts of Romans’ must have been, as in Josephus, Romans from the point of view of the local inhabitants, that is, auxiliaries, not legionaries. From Strabo, therefore, regular auxiliary units can be posited for the period of Augustus, at least in Egypt.

If Strabo is chronologically equivalent to Velleius, Plutarch matches Tacitus. Both record the same incident, the arrival of fresh support for the Vitellians at the battle of Bedriacum in 68. Tacitus reports as follows: Varus Alfenus cum Batauis, fusa gladiatorum manu, quam naeibus transuestam obpositae cohortes in ipso flumine trucidauerant. 212 These three elements — Germani, Bataui, cohortes — appear in Plutarch’s biography of Otho as Γερμανοί and Τοῖς δὲ μονομάχοις … ἑπήγαγεν Οὐαρος Ἀλφήνος τοὺς καλουμένους Βατάβους. Εἰς δὲ Γερμανῶν ἱππεῖς ἄριστοι… 213 Most of the gladiators fell into the river, into the hands of cohorts stationed there:

209. Ac. 21,31; 23,26; 24,22. For Claudius Lysias, cf. P.I.R.² C 917. He provided an escort of soldiers under centurions (τινας δύο τῶν ἐκατοντάρχων) to take Paul to Caesarea. It consisted of στρατιῶται διακοσίων … καὶ ἵππεις ἐβδομήκοντα καὶ δεξιολάβους διακοσίους (Ac. 23,23). 470 soldiers is a large number, especially if they all came from the same unit. If they did, and if the terminology can be pressed, the cohort contained cavalry, hence it was a cohors equitata. Further if Lysias’ rank of χιλίαρχος can be equated with tribunus militum as strictly understood (but cf. above, n. 205), it would mean that the unit was milliary. What the δεξιολάβοι were is not clear. The word is very rare, but the variant reading δεξιοβόλους is an hapax legomenon. In later writers δεξιολάβος (cf. the lexicon of Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich, s.v.) is given the meanings ‘a light soldier, perhaps a bowman or slinger’, ‘a bodyguard’. If the στρατιῶται were ὀπλίται or heavy-armed, to use Josephus’ word, light-armed would be the natural meaning for δεξιολάβος in the context. Given the prevalence of bowmen in the East, ‘archer’ is a suitable rendering.

210. Mt. 27,54; Mk. 15,39 (where κεντυρίων appears); Lk. 23,47; Ac. 10,1 (quoted above); 21,32; 23,23 (quoted in the previous note). The centurions in the earlier parts of the gospels belonged to the armed forces of the tetrarchs, and were not auxiliaries (cf. Sherwin-White, o.c.n. 207,124).

211. Strabo XVII,1,12,797. Cf. 54,820. The cohorts were not kept at full strength according to 53,819. Elsewhere (XVI,4,23,780) he refers to ‘allies’ fighting under Aelius Gallus (P.I.R.² A 179) during his Arabian expedition, among whom were 1,000 Nabataean Arabs and 500 Jews (the latter, Jos. A.J. XV,9,3,317, says, were picked men from Herod’s bodyguard). For 800 ‘cavalry’ auxiliaries cf. XVII,1,54,820. For Strabo, cf. E. Honigmann, R.E. IV, A,1931,76ff. (no. 3), esp. 90ff.


The interpretation of the forces involved raises several problems; here however it is sufficient to underline the identity of vocabulary in the two authors.

Dio of course cannot be classified with the writers of the early principate. But for the sake of completeness his few extant references to auxiliaries in the period under discussion may be listed. He mentions an auxiliary who distinguished himself in the Pannonian Revolt under Augustus in the words Ποις ιππεῖς Κελτός. Normally Κελτός in Dio means Germanus. Presumably Pusio was a German or Gallic auxiliary in a cavalry unit. He reports the crossing of the Medway in Kent in the Claudian invasion of Britain by Κελτοί who swam the river in full armour: these can only have been Batavians. Just before Vitellius was killed, a soldier from his side appeared to aim a blow at him. Tacitus calls him obitus e Germanicus militibus. As the phrase stands, the soldier could have been a legionary or an auxiliary from the German army units that had accompanied Vitellius to Rome. Dio however calls him Κελτός τις, definitely suggesting either an auxiliary or a member of the German bodyguard. Dio uses συμμαχικά to correspond to auxilia: another term is δύναμις ξενική. If the full text of Dio had survived, more would no doubt have been recoverable. At least it can be said that his evidence does not conflict with that of the other writers who have been discussed.

Although not as extensive as that of the Latin, the Greek evidence is essentially in agreement with it. There is the same general picture of armies consisting of legions, a core of professional infantry and cavalry auxiliaries, and an element of local troops supplied for the occasion by nearby kingdoms or tribes.

Some general comments may be made. Tacitus remains our most important source. The fact that he uses a complex vocabulary and deliberately resorts to variatio should not obscure the value of his information. All the authors take the professional auxiliary system more or less for granted. The cavalry is given greater attention than the infantry, and officers often receive special mention. Velleius (p. 115) and Strabo (p. 122) record alae and

---

214. 12,4f.
216. LX, 20,3; cf. 20,6.
218. Dio LXIV, 21,1: cf. LXIV,17,2 for a Κελτός corporis custos (for the latter, cf. above, n. 30).
219. LVI,23,1; LV, 24,5 – a general statement on the auxilia under Augustus to the effect that exact figures could not be given for the auxiliary forces of that period: καὶ συμμαχικά καὶ πεξών καὶ ἵππεων καὶ ναυτών ὀσαδήποτε ἡν· οὐ γὰρ ἔχω τό ἄκριβες εἴπεται.
220. LIX,20,7; LX,15,2.
cohorts in operation under Augustus. So does Josephus (p. 119). Tacitus (p. 104) and Suetonius (p. 116) ascribe administrative action on auxiliaries to Augustus. Yet the local contingent and the tribal chieftain are still very much in evidence in 69 A.D. The need for extra troops in a crisis was not met by the ordinary professional auxilia – even gladiators had to be used when no other forces were available.

It should now be clear that it is often possible to distinguish a professional element in the Roman auxilia of the early imperial period from the surviving literary record. This could now be compared with the epigraphical evidence in the hopes of tracing some features of the historical development of the non-legionary forces.
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