

... und die ...

... und die ...

... und die ...

... und die ...

... und die ...

Paul A. Holder, *Studies in the Auxilia of the Roman Army from Augustus to Trajan*. British Archaeological Reports. International Series 70, Oxford 1980. 352 pages, 11 plates.

A 1978 Manchester Ph. D. thesis rushed into print, this work consists of eight separate studies: 1. Unit Strength and Organization. 2. Unit Nomenclature. 3. Individual and Unit Awards for Valor. 4. Citizenship and Latin Status. 5. Citizen Units. 6. The Equestrian Officer Career. 7. Centurions, Decurions and Principales. 8. Recruitment. There are enough worthwhile new observations to make this a valuable book even though it fails in its goal: 'a comprehensive survey is required to take in all aspects and to produce a balanced study like Cheesman achieved. The studies offered here are intended to redress the balance'. It is difficult to see how a book on the auxilia could do just that when it breaks off at mid-point (with the reign of Trajan), and when it considers neither the use of the auxilia in warfare and frontier defense, nor their equipment and conditions of service, all of which has been studied at least as unevenly as the topics taken up by the author.

In detail, the book raises numerous questions. Are letter forms really 'very important' in dating first-century tombstones? (p. 3) Is a unit 'recorded as quingenary' (p. 6. n. 6) if it is found on a diploma that registers no milliary signs at all? Can one deduce the strength of a regular centuria from the number of men and centurions in a detachment (p. 7) without taking into account those who remained at base (*remansores*, CIL VI 225; cf. supernumerary centurions, ILS 2452). Is the fact that Galba called a legion *Galbiana* an argument against his calling an *ala Sulpicia*? (p. 16; Trajan gave his nomen to one legion, his cognomen to another) Should *ala I Thracum Mauretana* not be classed with units having an added name to distinguish them from other units of similar ethnic origin and number? (p. 19, cf. *ala I Thracum Augusta* of neighbouring *Gerasa*) Does the fact that *cohors I Thebaeorum* and *cohors II Ituraeorum* are part of a series really exclude them from being candidates for identity with *cohors Facundi, Rufi Nigri*? (p. 22; the author's own preferred candidate, *cohors I Lepidiana*, is also part of a series as its serial number shows, and it has the disadvantage of not being known in Egypt)

For *alae* and cohorts named after their commanders (p. 21) the very important Papyrus Vindob. L. 135 (*Zeitschr. Papyrol. u. Epigraphik* 36, 1979, 109) must now be added: it shows that the genitive form is still in use in A. D. 27. The suggestion that the Syrian *ala I Ulpia Singularium* and *II Ulpia Auriana* derive from Raetian counterparts (p. 18) is convincing. H. wishes to make two separate units out of *ala I Flavia praetoria singularium c. R.* (p. 25) and when a diploma contradicts this by giving *ala praetoria c. R.* the title *singularium* that fact is brushed aside as an 'error' – whose error? *Vexillation* commands were given not only to equestrian officers (p. 80) but also to legionary centurions (AE 1975, 951), in the same way as legionary centurions could be made prefects of auxiliary cohorts. Whether *cohors II Italica* recruited peregrines in the Julio-Claudian period is doubtful (p. 66): *Proculus Rabili f. Col. Philadelp* may have been a Roman citizen.

Exactly why *cohors II Campestris* should be a citizen cohort is not demonstrated (p. 66), but H. may be right considering *cohors Scutata* a citizen cohort, for one of its soldiers indicates his voting tribe. Breaking off the study with Trajan's reign leads to a curious error: 'in the Flavio-Trajanic period this was changed and *decurions* could only act as temporary commander – *praepositus* – of their unit (not a different one)' (p. 89). This is contradicted by ILAfr. 9, showing a *decurio alae* serving as *praepositus cohortis* in A. D. 198. To the legionaries who became *decurions* of the *alae* add no. 681, important because it provides the continuity from Caesar's promotions of this kind. Table 8, 12 wrongly suggests almost all Egyptian recruits served in non-Egyptian *auxilia*. A Cappadocian soldier (no. 3073) should be included among recruits from the area of modern Turkey (p. 116). The only tombstone discussed as coming from Asia (p. 158) is not from that province; by contrast, CIL III 370 from Asia is omitted.

The dates assigned to the inscriptions are often unreliable, at times demonstrably wrong: no. 272 (cf. p. 163) has a long history of controversy over its dating and the consequences to be derived therefrom, yet H. bypasses all this; his suggestion of a Trajanic date (because *Dis Manibus* is written in full) is flatly contradicted by another inscription on the same page of the CIL (VI 32785) which definitely dates to Hadrian's reign or later.

The list of inscriptions (241 ff. – why called 'prosopography?') is useful as the only available collection of early documents of the *auxilia*. Obsolete readings: 1892 (TAM II 485); 761 (AE 1967, 359); 232 (MAMA VIII 327); 1661 (Seyrig, *Ant. Syr.* 2 add); 1431 (Bernand, *Koptos* 133). By contrast, H. will be right in keeping the reading *Cullonius* of CIL V 5006 (no. 201) which I had suggested to change to *Gallonius* (*Germania* 51, 1973, 172 f.). The stone is not lost as one may presume after the CIL, a photograph is published as fig. 114 by P. Chisté, *Epigraphi Trentine dell' età Romana* (1971) no. 135 which makes the reading *Cullonius* preferable, confirmed also by a second document for that name (Chisté no. 145). – Fabricated texts: 761 (AE 1967, 359) and 1571 (p. 56, n. 11 – the photograph contradicts H.'s reconstruction). The flaws in the texts and dates are serious, for H. often bases his contentions directly on the documents, bypassing previous research. The eschewing of other scholars' observations is most notable where H. deals with transfers of legionaries to leading ranks in the *auxilia* (p. 86 ff.) which has been discussed by such eminent scholars as A. v. Domaszewski, G. L. Cheesman, and K. Kraft; by concealing their insights H. leaves the reader essentially uninformed about the subject.

This book, then, is not an authoritative survey of the field, whether in scope or in reliability. Nevertheless, it contains some fresh insights and thus is useful to the specialist. P. A. Holder is to be congratulated for it.