

LEGIO VII AND THE GARRISON OF AUGUSTAN GALATIA*

When Augustus inherited the kingdom of Amyntas in or about 25 B.C. and created the Roman province of Galatia, he also inherited a substantial military problem. Despite Amyntas' efforts in a decade of warfare the tribes of the Isaurian and Pisidian Taurus, above all the Homonadenses, were still not finally conquered and posed a serious threat both to local security and to the routes of communication across southern Asia Minor.¹ One important element in the solution of this military problem was the foundation of the so-called Pisidian colonies in and around the areas still controlled by the tribesmen, manned by veterans from the armies which had fought out the civil wars of the triumviral period.² However, although colonies of veterans could be expected to contain the situation they were not designed to carry out a war of conquest, and for this, legions were used. Syme, who has done more than anyone else to illuminate the early history of Galatia, showed that there had been legions in the province on at least three occasions under Augustus: once in 13 B.C. when L. Calpurnius Piso was transferred from Galatia/Pamphylia, where he was governor, to Macedonia, certainly with a legionary force,³ once for the duration of the Homonadensian war, possibly in or about 4/3 B.C.,⁴ and once in A.D. 6 when M. Plautius Silvanus crushed an Isaurian revolt with troops which appear to have been transferred to Illyricum in the following year to help put down the Pannonian uprising.⁵ He concluded, however, that the troops used on these occasions had been brought into Galatia from elsewhere (Syria or Egypt) for the specific purpose of defeating the Tauric tribes, and that they were not stationed in the province.⁶ The case for a permanent legionary garrison was made by H.-G. Pflaum.⁷ He broadly accepted Syme's reconstruction of the military activity under Augustus, but adduced three reasons for believing that

* I am very grateful to Mr. E.W. Gray for his comments and criticisms of a draft of this paper.

¹ See, essentially, Barbara Levick, *Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor* (1967), chs. 2-3.

² For Antioch, Lystra, Cremna, Olbasa, Comama, and Parlais see Levick, *op. cit.*, *passim*; coins, identified and to be published shortly by H. von Aulock, show that Iconium was also an Augustan colony, as were Germa in Galatia and Ninica in Cilicia Tracheia (cf. *JRS* 64 (1974), 29); I have also argued that there were settlements of 'non-colonial *coloni*' at Attaleia, Isaura, Neapolis, and Apollonia from the Augustan period, see 'Roman Residents and Roman Property in Southern Asia Minor', *Acta of the 10th International Congress of Classical Archaeology, Ankara and Izmir 1973* (forthcoming).

³ *Klio* 27 (1934), 127-31; *Danubian Papers* (1971), p. 72; *Akten des VI Internationalen Kongresses für Griechische und Lateinische Epigraphik, München 1972* (*Vestigia* vol. 17, 1973), pp. 595-7. In the first article cited, and in *Klio* 30 (1937), 227, n.1, Syme demonstrated that Pamphylia was jointly governed with Galatia under Augustus.

⁴ *Klio* 27 (1934), 131-8; Levick, *op. cit.*, App. V. The ancient evidence does not specifically state that legions were used for this war but there is no doubt that they were.

⁵ Dio 55.28.2-3 and Vell. Pat. 2.113, elucidated by Syme, *Klio* 27 (1934), 139-43.

⁶ *Ibid.* 143-4; cf. *JRS* 23 (1933), 31, and *Anatolian Studies presented to W.H. Buckler* (1939), p. 331.

⁷ *Les Procurateurs équestres sous le haut-empire romain* (1950), pp. 16-19.

it had been conducted by a standing army. He cited a passage of Strabo describing a section of Cilicia Tracheia which had been part of the province of Galatia but had been handed back to native rule, which showed, as he claimed, that there was a military force stationed in Augustan Galatia:

εὐφρούς γάρ ὄντος τοῦ τόπου πρὸς τὰ ληστήρια καὶ κατὰ γῆν καὶ κατὰ θάλατταν . . . ἐδόκει . . . βασιλεύεσθαι μᾶλλον τοὺς τόπους ἢ ὑπὸ τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις ἡγεμόσιν εἶναι τοῖς ἐπὶ τὰς κρίσεις πεμπομένοις, οἳ μὴτ' αἰεὶ παρεῖναι ἔμελλον μήτε μεθ' ὅπλων.

Since the place was well suited to brigandage both on land and sea . . . it seemed preferable . . . that it should be ruled by kings rather than be subjected to the Roman governors who were sent to conduct judicial business and who could not always be on hand or bring an armed force with them.⁸

Pflaum argued that the last phrase, *μήτε μεθ' ὅπλων*, implies not that the province was ungarrisoned but that it was impossible to bring the garrison over the Taurus to control brigandage and disorders whenever they should occur. While this is a possible interpretation it is not the only or even the most natural one, and Syme himself used the same passage as evidence that there were no troops stationed in the province.⁹ Pflaum's second argument was the more general one that Augustus could not possibly have justified taking over Galatia as an Imperial province, unless it required a garrison, so soon after 27 B.C. when he had made a distinction between the unarmed provinces which were to be controlled by the senate and the military ones which fell under his direct rule.¹⁰ However, recent reappraisal of the position of the Emperor in the Roman system of government has shown that in practice the distinction between the Emperor's and the senate's provinces tended to be less clear than might appear at first sight,¹¹ and that the supposed republican sensibilities of the senate in 27 B.C. were far less important a factor in contemporary politics than has generally been supposed.¹² The burden of Pflaum's case, therefore, falls onto his final argument, that the name and number of Augustus' *legio XXII Deiotariana* show that it was created after 25 B.C.¹³ and raised in Galatia from the native levy of the old Galatian king, Deiotarus, in order to garrison the province. Although this simple assertion may be correct, it falls short of proving the case. *Legio XXII* is attested in Egypt by 8. B.C.,¹⁴ before the Homonadensian war, and there is no obvious reason why it should not have been transferred as early as 25 B.C.

However, although these detailed criticisms prevent Pflaum's argument from carrying complete conviction, there also appears to be a flaw in Syme's reconstruction which has gone unnoticed, and it seems to me intrinsically probable that Augustan Galatia was permanently garrisoned. It is the purpose of this paper to pursue the arguments in favour of this hypothesis a little further and

⁸ Strabo 14.5.6, 671.

⁹ *Klio* 27 (1934), 143 with n.1; *JRS* (1933), 24, n.72.

¹⁰ Strabo 17.3.25, 840.

¹¹ Fergus Millar, 'The Emperor, the Senate and the Provinces', *JRS* 56 (1966), 156-66.

¹² Fergus Millar, 'Triumvirate and Principate', *JRS* 63 (1973), 50-67, esp. 61 f.

¹³ For the date cf. Syme, *JRS* 23 (1933), 19-21. Deiotarus' native troops had been organized as two legions long before they came under direct Roman command (see Cicero *ad Att.* 6.1.14; *Bell. Alex.* 34) and had presumably passed to Amyntas before they were formally incorporated into the Roman Army.

¹⁴ *BGU* iv. 1104.

to attempt to identify the troops involved.

If we accept Syme's reconstruction of the Augustan campaigns as it stands, and no one has effectively questioned it, we are forced at the same time to accept a serious implausibility. In A.D. 7 M. Plautius Silvanus and Aulus Caecina fought the battle of the Volcaean marshes on the route into Pannonia from the east with five legions and auxiliary troops which they brought up 'ex transmari-nis provinciis', from overseas provinces.¹⁵ Plautius Silvanus was apparently using the troops which had fought in Isauria during the previous year.¹⁶ On Syme's hypothesis these had been transferred to Galatia from elsewhere to fight in Isauria and were now moved a second time to the Balkans without returning to their regular quarters in the interim. There is nothing impossible about this, but it is worth noting that only the chance event of an Isaurian war explains why they were moved from Galatia and not, say, from Syria to Pannonia. More disturbing is the case of L. Calpurnius Piso in 13 B.C. when precisely the same sequence of events took place, and legions were transferred from Pamphylia to Macedonia. On this occasion there is no evidence for a war in the Taurus in or shortly before 13 B.C., and Syme is forced to suggest that plans to crush the Homonadenses were in hand at precisely the moment when trouble flared up in Thrace in order to explain why troops from the Syrian or some other eastern garrison were then in Galatia/Pamphylia.¹⁷ Thus a projected campaign is postulated and the same coincidence invoked twice to explain the same phenomenon. Instead of this it is simpler and more natural to assume that there was a permanent garrison in Galatia, and that consequently it was not merely fortuitous but inevitable that troops should twice have to be transferred from Galatia to the Balkans in a time of crisis. This alternative explanation is not disturbed by Syme's claim that the garrison of Syria was depleted by one legion in 4/3 B.C., the conjectural date of the Homonadensian war.¹⁸ Even if we accept this date for the war (which hangs in part on the fact that one legion was allegedly absent from Syria at the time), it only explains the origin of a single legion in Galatia for a war which required two and perhaps even three.¹⁹ It therefore seems probable that legionary forces were stationed in Galatia throughout the period from 13 B.C. to A.D. 6, and probably earlier, except when they were called away by emergencies elsewhere, and that they may have been supplemented by an extra legion during the most important military campaign, the Homonadensian war. If these troops can be identified the argument from general probability can be clinched.

Pflaum has already suggested that *legio XXII Deiotariana* was one of the garrison legions. This, as noted, is not proved. The argument from the legion's

¹⁵ Vell. Pat. 2.112.4.

¹⁶ Dio 55.28.2-3. See n.5 above.

¹⁷ *Klio* 27 (1934), 127-8 following J.G.C. Anderson in *JRS* 7 (1917), 235, n.2.

¹⁸ *Klio* 27 (1934), 137; Levick, op. cit., p. 213, citing Josephus, *AJ* 17.10.9, Οἰάρος δὲ ἐπειδὴ τὸ πρῶτον πυνθάνεται τὰ πεπραγμένα Σαβίνου γράψαντος πρὸς αὐτόν, δέισας περὶ τοῦ τάγματος δύο τὰ λοιπὰ ἀναλαβὼν (τρία γὰρ ἐπὶ Συρίας τὰ πάντα ἦν) κτλ.; *BJ* 2.3.1, Οἰάρος . . . ἐν τῶν τριῶν ἀπὸ Συρίας ταγμάτων, ὅπερ ἄγων ἤκεν, ἐν τῇ πόλει καταλείπει. However, Josephus does not seem to think

it unusual that there were only three Syrian legions at this date. Was this the normal garrison under Augustus? If so, *Legio XII Fulminata* or one of the other legions usually ascribed to Syria could have been the third Egyptian legion (cf. Strabo 17.1.2, 797; 2.30, 807).

¹⁹ *Klio* 27 (1934), 144-5; cf. Levick, op. cit., p. 214, who notes that the commander during the Homonadensian war, P. Sulpicius Quirinius, earned the *ornamenta triumphalia* by his victory, an honour only awarded for major campaigns.

name is not as powerful as it might seem since the title *Deiotariana* is not attested before the reign of Trajan, although it may date back as far as Claudius.²⁰ Under Augustus and Tiberius the legion's Galatian origin is not stressed and it is either not named at all or, more rarely, known as *legio XXII Cyrenaica*.²¹ It is not attested in Egypt before 8 B.C., but few military documents survive from the early Augustan period, and the argument from silence is not a strong one. Its companion legion, *III Cyrenaica*, which is believed to have been in Egypt throughout the reign of Augustus, is not mentioned in documents before A.D. 12.²² The argument that its recruits were mainly Galatians also does not prove that it had originally been stationed in Galatia. A much discussed inscription from Coptos in upper Egypt belonging to the early Empire contains the names and origins of soldiers selected from two legions.²³ One of these was certainly *III Cyrenaica*²⁴ while the other may have been *legio XXII*. In both cases the bulk of the recruits came from central Anatolia, within the boundaries of the province of Galatia, so if the argument from their origins is a valid one it applies with equal force to *legio III*.²⁵ Further, we know for certain that *legio XXII* was in Egypt by 8 B.C., some years before the Homonadensian war, the campaign for which the Galatian legions were most needed. There is no evidence for disturbances in Egypt to explain why *legio XXII* should have been transferred there away from Galatia where the security problem was more pressing. It is, therefore, preferable to suppose that both *legio III* and *legio XXII* had been stationed in Egypt from the early Augustan period, although both were manned with a high proportion of recruits from the newly annexed areas of central Anatolia.

Neither legion is on record in Galatia itself at any period under the Empire, but this is not true of another Augustan body, *legio VII*. Inscriptions of a veteran, T. Cissonius Ser.f. Serg.,²⁶ and a *miles*, L.Coelius L.f.Ani.,²⁷ have been found at Pisidian Antioch, a small Pisidian site has yielded another veteran, C. Iulius C.f. Pap.,²⁸ and Iconium has produced the grave-stone of M.Lollius M.f., buried by his fellow veteran P.Mestrius P.f. Maecianus,²⁹ a document, as Syme says, that can and should provoke various speculations.³⁰

Legio VII has been identified with a Caesarian legion recruited for the Gallic wars and settled after service in Campania. It was reconstituted by Octavian and fought at Mutina, Philippi, in the Perusine war, and in Sicily.³¹ The link between the triumviral period and the principate is tenuous, but it is probably to be identified with the Augustan *legio VII*. In the early Empire it was usually unnamed, but five early Julio-Claudian inscriptions, three from Italy and two from the Thracian Chersonese, give it the title *Macedonica*.³² It was established in

²⁰ J. Lesquier, *L'Armée romaine d'Égypte d'Auguste à Dioclétien* (1918), p. 49.

²¹ Ibid., pp. 41 f.

²² *AE* (1910), no. 207.

²³ *CIL* III.6627 = *ILS* 2483.

²⁴ C.Sossius of Pompeiopolis who belonged to the legion whose members are listed in the first column of the inscription is separately attested as a member of *legio III* (*CIL* III.6591).

²⁵ H.A. Sanders, 'The Origins of the

Third Cyrenaic Legion', *AJPPhil.* 112 (1941), 84-7, remarks on this fact.

²⁶ *CIL* III. 6826.

²⁷ *CIL* III. 6827.

²⁸ G.E. Bean, *Anatolian Studies* 9 (1959), 93.

²⁹ *IGR* III, no. 1476.

³⁰ *Historia* 13 (1964), 108, n.12.

³¹ Levick, op. cit., p. 201.

³² *CIL* X. 1711, 4723, 8241; III. 7386; *AE* (1938), no. 141.

Dalmatia in or soon after A.D. 9, in the wake of the Pannonian uprising,³³ and remained there until it was transferred to upper Moesia by Claudius, after earning the new titles *Claudia Pia Fidelis* for loyalty during the revolt of Scribonianus.³⁴ It is not at all clear where the legion was stationed before the Pannonian revolt. Wilkes suggests that it had belonged to the army of Moesia and was brought into Pannonia by Aulus Caecina in A.D. 6.³⁵ This, however, is no more than a guess which is not supported by any evidence from Moesia itself. Ritterling had previously adduced one of the inscriptions from the Thracian Chersonese and argued that it had been stationed in Macedonia.³⁶ This is more plausible, but the inscription he cites and the second text found later in the same area, which both seem to relate to building works carried out by the legion,³⁷ do not prove that it was permanently stationed there. It could have been brought to Macedonia by L. Calpurnius Piso to fight the Thracian war.³⁸ This had been a major campaign, lasting three years, involving a setback before the final triumph, and earning Piso the *ornamenta triumphalia* in 11 B.C. Substantial forces were clearly required for the war, and when Piso came from Galatia/Pamphylia to take over the command he certainly brought an army with him.³⁹ If so, there is no objection to the suggestion that *legio VII* was one of the legions which accompanied him, that it acquired the title *Macedonica* as a result of the successful campaigns, and put up the buildings in the Chersonese during or immediately after them.

The Galatian evidence makes excellent sense in the light of this reconstruction. It has been widely held that *legio VII* was one of the two legions which originally sent colonists to Pisidian Antioch.⁴⁰ The evidence cited is a coin of Vespasian with the legends LEG V and LEG VI[I] accompanying two legionary standards and an eagle, and the inscriptions mentioned above. However, the coin and the inscriptions do not all point in the same direction. T. Cissonius Ser.f. Serg. was a veteran and can, if need be, stand as one of the original colonial settlers of Antioch. L. Coelius L.f. Ani., on the other hand, was a serving soldier at his death, who had not earned his place in the colony. Moreover, his tribe was not the Sergia, into which all the colonists of Antioch were enrolled,⁴¹ and his patronymic, L.f., suggests that he was not a Roman citizen by birth but a native who had received his own Roman *praenomen* and *nomen*, and a father's *praenomen* identical to his own, when he was en-

³³ J. Wilkes, *Dalmatia* (1969), pp. 95 f. There is no evidence for the precise date of the legion's arrival in Dalmatia, but a large number of soldiers and veterans (listed in the Table below) are known from early in the reign of Tiberius, and there is no doubt that the legion had been stationed there since the end of the Pannonian revolt.

³⁴ Wilkes, loc. cit.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 93. He suggests that the eastern legions were *IV Scythica* and *V Macedonica*.

³⁶ *RE* xii. 1615–6, cf. 1250 s.v. *legio*; *CIL* III.7386; cf. G. Alföldy, *Historia* 13 (1964), 174.

³⁷ *AE* (1938), no. 141.

³⁸ So Syme, *JRS* 23 (1933), 23, n.67.

³⁹ For this war see Dio 54.34.6 f.;

Vell. Pat. 2.98; Livy, *Periocha* 140; Seneca, *Ep.* 83.14; discussed by Syme, *JRS* 23 (1933), 24 and 27; *Klio* 27 (1934), 122 f.; *Danubian Papers* (1971), pp. 44 and 65; and *Akten. . . München* (1973), pp. 595–7, where he argues that the so-called 'titulus Tiburtinus' commemorates Piso's career, with a truncated reference to this war. E.W. Gray has pointed out to me that Piso's approach frightened off the hostile Bessi at once, implying that he brought an army with him.

⁴⁰ E. Ritterling, *ZfN* 38 (1928), 56–8; M. Grant, *From Imperium to Auctoritas* (1946), p. 250; Levick, op. cit., pp. 58 and 200.

⁴¹ Levick, op. cit., p. 78.

listed.⁴² On any reasonable interpretation L.Coelius L.f. Ani. was an Anatolian, recruited into *legio VII*, who died during service. The Pisidian C.Iulius C.f. Pap. clearly falls into the same category, although he had reached veteran status, and the inscription from Iconium can be explained in the same way, a fact which leads to a further valuable deduction. The veteran M.Lollius M.f. should be a native recruit who owed his name to the first governor of Galatia Marcus Lollius,⁴³ enlisted, therefore, within a year or two of 25 B.C. He died at Iconium after serving his full term, which was at least twenty-five years to judge by the parallel cases of other veterans of the legion at this period.⁴⁴ This is an important piece of information since it shows that his tombstone can hardly pre-date A.D. 1 and makes it almost certain that the legion was still in Galatia at that time.⁴⁵ His colleague, P.Mestrius Maecianus, was probably another native recruit equipped with a false patronymic, but sufficiently romanized to acquire a *cognomen*, perhaps by adoption into a *gens Maecia*, or perhaps by imitation of the Roman colonial families of Iconium.

On this reconstruction *legio VII* was stationed in Galatia from the governorship of M.Lollius. Local recruits were enlisted and it remained in the province until 13 B.C. when it accompanied L.Calpurnius Piso to Macedonia and fought the *bellum Thracicum*. Its success earned it the title *Macedonica*, but it returned to Galatia where it was still needed first against the Homonadenses and then against the Isaurians in A.D. 6. In A.D. 7 it was transferred again, to Pannonia, and did not return to the east.⁴⁶

⁴² Cf. the native soldiers of *legio VII* occurring in Dalmatia and listed in the Table below who all conform to this pattern.

⁴³ For the governorship of Lollius see R.K. Sherk, *The Legates of Galatia from Augustus to Diocletian* (1952), pp. 19–20; *PIR*² V, 83: L. no.311. Cf. the M.Lollii M.f. from Ancyra in the list of legionaries from Coptos (n.23).

⁴⁴ None of the veterans listed in the Table below had served less than twenty-five years, and some had done over thirty.

⁴⁵ There is a bare possibility that M. Lollius and P.Mestrius Maecianus had spent most of their service outside Galatia and returned to their home town after they had been paid off. However, neither seems to have had a family to return to, and this is a very forced interpretation of the facts.

Another Augustan inscription from Asia Minor refers to the legion. This is a stone dated to A.D. 1, set up by a Lydian community in honour of C.Aemilius Geminus, centurion of *legio VII*, for his bravery and the favour he had shown to a member of the community, Marcus Antonius (J. Keil and A.v.Premmerstein, *Bericht über eine zweite Reise in Lydien*, *DAkWien* 54 (1911), 98, no.192 = V.Ehrenberg and A.H.M.Jones, *Documents illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius*² (1955), no.361.

⁴⁶ It is tempting to interpret all the evidence relating to *legio VII* in Galatia as connected with the garrison and to argue that its veterans did not colonize Antioch. T.Cissonius Ser. f. Serg. would then be a member of one of the original colonial families (clearly linked with the veteran of *legio V* T.Cissonius Q.f., *CIL* III.6825) who had followed the example of native recruits and joined the local legion. The coin evidence can also be questioned. The photographs show no clear trace of the figure I after the V in the second legionary title, although this has always been printed as LEG VI [I] (E.Ritterling, *ZfN* 38 (1928), 56–8; A. Krzyzanowska, *Monnaies coloniales d'Antioche de Pisidie* (1970), pl.I). One could argue that this legend also simply read LEG V, or, accepting the reading VII, that the coin commemorated the Augustan garrison of Galatia (see p. 60 for the possibility that *legio V* acted as a second garrison legion) not the original colonial settlement. However, the more natural interpretation of the inscription and the coin should probably be retained and this temptation resisted. If so it is clear that *legio VII* was stationed in the province where the bulk of its veterans had settled. This may stimulate some reflection, see p. 307.

The recruiting pattern of the legion under Augustus fits well into this scheme. Many early veterans are on record, mainly in Dalmatia. For the sake of convenience they are tabulated below. They form a striking group and have rightly attracted comment.⁴⁷ The vast majority are first-generation legionaries from the native communities of the eastern empire, above all Galatia and Macedonia, who had obtained the citizenship and a false patronymic at the time of their recruitment. Many of these veterans were buried in the neighbourhood of Narona, where they had been settled by A.D. 14 in a community called the *pagus Scunasticus*.⁴⁸ They are unlikely to have been discharged before this date, and in any case cannot have retired from service before A.D. 9 when the legion was first stationed in Dalmatia. The earliest possible recruit from this group at Narona is L.Domitius L.f. Ani. of Milyas who had served thirty-three years before his retirement, and cannot therefore have joined the legion before 19 B.C. (thirty-three years before A.D. 14). Most of the veterans will have been recruited later than this, in particular M.Sosius M.f. Fab. of Sebasto [polis], a city which was not founded before 3/2 B.C.⁴⁹ They were enlisted, then, during the period when the legion was stationed in Galatia, and campaigned briefly in Macedonia. The origin of the soldiers reflects this. Although a certain proportion comes from Italy and the West (Forum Cornelii (2), Florentia, Ticinum, Arretium, Verona, and Augusta Praetoria), the great bulk is from Galatia (Laranda, Conana (3), Milyas (2), Amblada, Ninica, Isinda, Clistinna,⁵⁰ Cormasa, Pessinus (4), Phazimon, Sebaste,⁵¹ and Sebastopolis) or from Macedonia (Philippi (2), Alorum Dyrrachium, Heraclea,⁵² and Dentum⁵³). It seems natural that the legion should have drawn a large proportion of its native recruits from the provinces where it was stationed.

The names which the new legionaries took include a high proportion of unusual Italian forms and also demand an explanation. They led Cuntz to suggest that the legion had originally been constituted by Antony during the 30s B.C. and that the names had been derived from the legates who had acted as his recruiting officers.⁵⁴ However, as we have seen, this is chronologically impossible and the hypothesis fails to explain the source of all the names used.⁵⁵ Further inquiry is hampered by the fact that we know little in detail about recruiting and naming procedures for *peregrini* who joined the legions, and any explanation must therefore be largely speculative. The C.Iulii, who took their

⁴⁷ O.Secek, *Rb. Mus.* 48 (1893), 602 f.; O.Cuntz, *JOAI* 25 (1929), 70 f.; R.Syme, *JRS* 23 (1933), 30; A. Betz, *Untersuchungen zur Militärgeschichte der römischen Provinz Dalmatien* (1939), pp. 11–12; G.Forni, *Il reclutamento delle legioni da Augusto a Diocletiano* (1953), pp. 61 f.; G. Alföldy, *Historia* 13 (1964), 167–79.

⁴⁸ *AE* (1950), no.44, noted and explained by Alföldy, loc. cit., 172–5 and Wilkes, op. cit., pp. 112–13.

⁴⁹ See H.Dessau, *ZfN* 16 (1906), 339; B.Head, *Historia Numorum*² (1911), p. 449.

⁵⁰ Not otherwise on record but the form of the name can be compared to places in Pisidia such as Cotenna and Etenna.

⁵¹ Possibly the city refounded by Pythodorus of Tralles at the old site of Cabeira/Diospolis (Strabo 12.3.31, 557), although this did not become provincial territory until the reign of Nero.

⁵² Perhaps Heraclea Lyncestis, but this is not absolutely certain. There were a few recruits from Bithynia/Pontus (e.g. C.Licinius C.f. Fab. from Sinope) and Heraclea Pontica is also possible.

⁵³ Like Clistenna Dentum has not been located, but the name is typically Thracian, cf. L.Detschew, *Die thrakischen Sprachreste* (1957), pp.125–6 for several comparable forms.

⁵⁴ *JOAI* 25 (1929), 70 f.

⁵⁵ None of Antony's legates was called Ancharenius, Baebius, or Riccius.

Soldiers and Veterans of *Legio VII*

Reference	Find spot	Name	Origin	Age	Status	Years of service
<i>CIL</i> III. 6826	Antioch	T.Cissonius Ser.f. Serg.	-	-	veteran	-
<i>CIL</i> III. 6827	Antioch	L. Coelius L.f. Ani.	-	-	<i>miles</i>	-
<i>IGR</i> III. 1476	Iconium	M.Lollius M.f.	-	-	veteran	-
<i>IGR</i> III. 1476	Iconium	P.Mestrius P.f. Maecianus	-	-	veteran	-
<i>A.S.</i> (1959), 93	Cormasa?	C. Iulius C.f. Pap.	Cormasa	-	veteran	-
<i>B.D.</i> (1903), 130	Tilurium	L.Fabius C.f. Serg.	Conana	-	<i>miles?</i>	-
<i>CIL</i> III. 9733	Delminium	Q.Baebius Q.f. Serg.	Conana	45	<i>miles</i>	20
Betz, p.66	Bigeste	L.Oppius L.f. Serg. Segninus	Conana	-	veteran	-
<i>CIL</i> III. 2709	Delminium	T.Ancharenus T.f. Serg.	Laranda	45	<i>miles</i>	22
<i>CIL</i> III. 8487	Bigeste	L.Domitius L.f. Ani. Aquila	Milyas	-	veteran	33
<i>CIL</i> III. 8487	Bigeste	C.Domitius L.f. Ani. Aquilius?	(castrensis)	-	?	20
<i>CIL</i> III. 8488	Bigeste	L.Herennius L.f. Pap.	Milyas	60	veteran	30
<i>BD</i> (1908), 79	Tilurium	C. Iulius C.f. Fab.	Ninica	39	<i>miles</i>	17
<i>CIL</i> III. 9737	Delminium	C. Longinus C.f. Cor.	Amblada	40	<i>miles</i>	21
<i>BD</i> (1913), 14	Salona	M. Titius M.f. Serg.	Isinda	35	<i>miles</i>	10+
<i>CIL</i> III. 9736	Delminium	C. Iulius C.f. Ult.	Clistinna	40	<i>miles</i>	18
<i>CIL</i> III. 1818	Narona	L. Riccius L.f. Vel.	Pessinus	60	veteran	-
<i>CIL</i> III. 1818	Narona	L. Atilius L.f. Vel.	Pessinus	-	veteran	-
<i>Jabrb. Alt.</i> (1908), 110	Narona	T. Varius T.f. Vel.	Pessinus	50	veteran	29
<i>CIL</i> III. 2710	Delminium	Cn. Domitius Cn.f. Vel.	Pessinus	44	veteran	25
<i>B.D.</i> (1914), 66	Salona	L.Arruntius	Phazimon	55	veteran	-
<i>CIL</i> III. 2048	Salona	T.Sabinus T.f. Fab.	Sebaste	56	veteran	32
<i>CIL</i> III. 8493	Bigeste	M.Sosius M.f. Fab.	Sebastopolis	-	veteran	-
<i>CIL</i> III. 9734	Delminium	L.Cornelius L.f. Fab.	Heraclea	33	<i>miles</i>	12
Betz, p.66	Bigeste	C.Licinnius C.f. Fab.	Sinope	50	veteran	27

<i>B.D.</i> (1914), 65	Salona	Q. Ignienus Q.f. Ani. Ferox	Troas	-	-
<i>CIL</i> III. 1493	Tilurium	M. Perennius -f. Volt.	Philippi	-	-
<i>CIL</i> III. 2717	Tilurium	L. Valerius L.f. Volt.	Philippi	35	15 miles
<i>CIL</i> III. 9741	Tilurium	M. Vibius M.f. Aem.	Dyrrhachium	30	7 miles
<i>W.M.B.H.</i> (1912), 132	Bigeste	M. Livius M.f. Pal.	Alorum	50	26 veteran
Betz, p.66	Bigeste	C. Valerius C.f.	Dentum	-	- veteran
<i>CIL</i> III. 2716	Tilurium	Q. Oppius Q.f. Pol.	Forum Cornelii	30	7 miles
<i>CIL</i> III. 14931	Tilurium	C. Lartinius C.f. Pol.	Forum Cornelii	34	16 miles
<i>CIL</i> III. 8723	Salona	C. Asurius	Florentia	35	14 miles
<i>CIL</i> III. 9712	Tragurium	L. Vegnonius L.f.	Florentia	-	- veteran
<i>CIL</i> III. 14932	Tilurium	Q. Marcus Q.f. Corn. Bassus	Beneventum	-	17 miles
<i>CIL</i> III. 9738	Tilurium	Q. Murrius Q.f. Serg.	Augusta Praetoria	35	6 miles
<i>CIL</i> III. 2913	Iader	Sex. Atilius Sex.f. Pap.	Ticinum	-	- veteran
<i>CIL</i> III. 9939	Asseria	Q. Magius C.f. Publ.	Verona	50	25 veteran
<i>B.D.</i> (1904), 197	Salona	C. Pinarius Scarpus	-	-	- veteran
<i>CIL</i> III. 1813	Salona	M. Heredius M.f. Pal.	-	-	- veteran
<i>CIL</i> III. 2033	Salona	Q. Hortensius Q.f.	-	-	- veteran
<i>CIL</i> III. 2071	Salona	-	Arretium?	-	- -
<i>CIL</i> III. 9742	Tilurium Pol.	Aesc. ?	-	7 miles

Abbreviations:

Betz = A. Betz, *Untersuchungen zur Militärgeschichte der römischen Provinz Dalmatien* (1939).

B.D. = *Bullettino di archeologia e storia dalmata*.

Jabrb. *Alt.* = *Jahrbuch für Altertumskunde*.

W.M.B.H. = *Wissenschaftliche Mitteilungen aus Bosnien und der Hercegovina*.

praenomen and *nomen* from the Emperor, and M.Lollius present no problem. Some of the others may have taken their names from the legion's Italian officers who enlisted them, but another possible source could have been the colonial families which had flooded into south Galatia. Thus T.Ancharenus T.f. of Laranda could have derived his name from the colonial Anchareni of Antioch, Iconium or Lystra,⁵⁶ and we can compare the Galatian Sex. Munatius Sex.f. who enlisted in *legio XXII* and might have been associated with the Munatii of Antioch.⁵⁷ It would be over-ambitious to attempt to link up the commoner names in this way and it is clearly impossible to trace the origins of all the rarer forms. However, since many of the recruits came from the areas where there were no Roman colonies, and since the inscriptions which have survived in the colonies themselves preserve only a small proportion of the full repertory of Italian names in use there, we should not expect to be able to do so.

Syme, in his reconstruction of the military activity in Augustan Galatia and of the transfer of troops from the east to the Balkans in 13 B.C. and A.D. 7, assumed that two legions were always involved.⁵⁸ Although not attested by any direct evidence this was a reasonable conjecture, and it encourages one to speculate on the identity of the second legion. Only *legio VII* is clearly attested in Galatia itself, and the problem therefore, does not admit of so secure a conclusion. However, by far the most appropriate candidate is *legio V Macedonica*. This was the only other legion with the title *Macedonica*, which it must surely have also earned on Piso's Thracian campaign. In confirmation of this we may note that the early veterans of this legion whose names and origins are on record came from Macedonia like many of their counterparts in *legio VII*.⁵⁹ It could either have been stationed in Macedonia before and after Piso's campaign, or have been brought with him from Galatia. The first possibility cannot by any means be excluded, but the alternative would be instructive and illuminating. *V Macedonica* was almost certainly a later name for the Republican *V Gallica*, the legion which had colonized Pisidian Antioch.⁶⁰ It has already been shown that *legio VII* was stationed in the same province, and probably in the same area, as the chief colony, Antioch, where its veterans were settled. If the same was true of *legio V* it can only have been deliberate policy to station the legions and their veterans alongside one another, inevitably giving them a greater sense of corporate identity and coherence, and ensuring that soldiers who had completed their service enjoyed an easy transition to their new status as veterans.⁶¹

If the conclusions reached above can be accepted, it is apparent that Galatia was the permanent home of one and possibly two legions from 25 B.C. to A.D. 6, and among the eastern provinces ranked close behind Syria and Egypt in

⁵⁶ Cf. Levick, *op. cit.*, p. 66, n.8; L.Robert, *Noms indigènes dans l'Asie Mineure gréco-romaine* (1963), p. 43.

⁵⁷ Cf. Levick, *op. cit.*, p. 201, n.2; Syme, *JRS* 23 (1933), 18 and 29 f.; *Danubian Papers*, p. 72.

⁵⁸ The main argument on which this assumption rests is that of the five legions which fought the battle at the Volcaean marshes, three constituted the garrison of Moesia, and two the troops brought from Isauria by M.Plautius Silvanus. However, the Isaurian uprising was not a major

revolt, and one legion could have been stationed in Macedonia.

⁵⁹ *CIL* III.14492; IX.6159; cf. *AE* (1960), no.128.

⁶⁰ See Levick, *op. cit.*, pp. 200 f.

⁶¹ Cf. the remarks of Ritterling, *RE* XII. 1239 s.v. *legio*: 'scheint meist der Grundsatz festgehalten zu sein, die Veteranen der in verschiedenen Provinzen stehenden Legionen in einer innerhalb oder in der Nähe der Garnisonsprovinz gelegenen Kolonien anzusiedeln.'

military importance. Asia Minor was never immune from disturbance, internal or external. As early as 50 B.C. it had been defended by two legions under the command of Deiotarus,⁶² and Vespasian was to install a comparable force along the Euphrates frontier. In the interim, conditions had not changed so much that Augustus could afford to ignore the danger.

Christ Church, Oxford

STEPHEN MITCHELL

⁶² See n.13 above.