WHO BUILT THE ROMAN FARCTS?

This review aims to examine the relationship between the army and the construction of fortifications. Were the auxiliaries able to build their forts, which had to follow the principles of military architecture, or, as commonly understood, were the legionaries the ones really trained to build? The paper also aims to survey the evidence on the construction of Roman auxiliary forts, to pinpoint interpretation difficulties and, though it has no pretense to comprehensiveness, hopefully to provide a fair cross-section of the evidence.

The prevalent assumption concerning military constructions in the provinces is that the legionaries were the builders of most of the forts. The Roman army was self-sufficient inasmuch as possible, building roads, canals, aqueducts, defensive works, designing tools and weapons. However, we do not know who was in fact responsible for all the necessary work and how the principles of military architectural design were formulated and executed inside a Roman auxiliary fort. The appearance of the forts agrees with a general trend, therefore pattern identification is rather difficult. If such patterns existed, it would be much easier to recognise the builders. The buildings inside the forts appear to conform to a kind of rule concerning their plan, however, this is not the case with their internal details.

It is hard to assess the army’s degree of self-sufficiency, but one would imagine that it tried to ensure its needs. The legions surely did not fail to do so.

Most scholars believe that legionaries had a significant role in the construction of auxilia forts. However, the evidence should be reassessed, as the case of legionary military equipment discovered inside auxiliary forts shows.

THE BUILDING SYSTEM AND LEGIONS’ RANGE OF ACTION

Many scenes on Trajan’s Column depict legionaries as builders of fortifications (scenes xi; xiii; xvi; xx; lx; lxx; lxviii-lix; cxxvii-cxxix), but panels show them also harvesting grain (scenes cix-cx) or carrying out wood-clearing activities (scene xv), which is highly unlikely. Auxiliaries are usually ensuring protection. Are these representations only propaganda art? If not, why would they show legionaries armed and wearing lorica segmentata while building? However, as we shall see, legionaries will be the first involved in large building projects and the construction of the frontier defences even though certain auxiliaries were also involved.

When wondering about a central system related to constructions, T. Bechert concluded that a panel, some sort of advisors to the emperor, governor or legionary legate must have existed. Occasionally, when on inscriptions the emperor’s name is in the nominative or ablative, the emperor is the construction’s initiator.

* This work was supported by a grant of the Romanian National Authority for Scientific Research, CNCS – UEFISCDI, project no. PN-II-RU-TE-2011-3-0273.

1 Maxfield (1986, 64-72) has proven that lorica segmentata or even the gladius were also used by auxiliaries.

2 Cichorius 1900. See for construction scenes Coulston 1990, 39. 42: »construction scenes were concerned less with the actual activities than with advertising skill of the citizen troops«, or the idea that they used in the construction scenes a »few stock figures [...] which have their parallels elsewhere in Roman art«.

3 Ps.-Hyg. 24 records auxiliary troops as protection for the marines who built the roads.

4 With the exception of one man they wore tunicae when building a road: scene xcii.

5 This is based on the letters exchanged between Pliny the Younger and Trajan, and also the building inscriptions referring first of all to large construction designs, road construction, for instance, relying on »einer zentralen Baukommission« (Bechert 1971, 205ff.).
this being in fact the standard until the Flavians, the governor and the legate being executives only. The inscription at Risingham (RIB 1234), dated to the beginning of the 3rd century AD, proves that responsibilities separated at some point, the legionary legate representing the emperor directly, while the governor was responsible for auxiliary forts.

The issue of the command areas of legions (»Kommandobereiche der Legionen«) has been debated at length, however, no commonly accepted view has been reached. Most authors concluded that auxiliaries constructions as well, at least the important ones, are based on the legionary »Planungsbüros«. In 1973, D. Baatz argued that a sort of »Baubüro« must have existed for each legion when dealing with large construction plans, hence different styles must have developed. Accordingly, when auxiliaries wished or had to build something, they would depend on these »Baubüros«, which would decide how to proceed with the construction. Therefore, a specific style by auxiliaries could not have developed, since everything had to be supervised by legionaries. Later, A. Radnóti, followed by B. Oldenstein-Pferdehirt, suggested that the auxiliaries were not tactically independent and that they depended on a legion. Perhaps by the 2nd century the legions no longer had areas of influence, but they could have worked in different parts of the province, even two in the same place. This is now considered a false theory and there is a clear distinction of the areas controlled by the 22nd and 8th legions, one in the north and the other in the south of Upper Germany on the basis of the record of their praepositi and centurions. When referring to administrative and supply buildings, C. V. Walthew maintained that »because of their official character, [they] were more likely to have been based on drawing-office blueprints issued from Rome« and that a »greater freedom [...] was perhaps allowed«. Meanwhile, A. Johnson claimed that, although the auxiliaries were able to build, they had insufficient specialists and were involved only in less important construction designs; larger constructions, as for instance important buildings, were made in the fabrīca of a legion, where a standard plan of auxiliary forts was drawn up. A few years later they were partly contradicted by the same D. Baatz, who this time argued that the auxiliaries were tactically independent and one could not speak about areas of influence of the legions, even if the administrative role of the legionary legate was real and he would have decided, for example, which centurion would be the praepositus of a unit. Obviously, the auxiliā were subordinate to the legions, in situations of crisis, when certain auxilia were »assigned« to certain legions under the command of the highest rank. However, normally one cannot speak about »übergeordnete Legionen« or »parent legions«. On the contrary, more recently O. Stoll, agreeing with

---

6 Therefore, constructions are made upon imperial orders ex auctoritate imperatoris, according to Bechert 1971, 206 f. On the other hand, the same was supposed by the RIB editors because of the use of the genitive on milecastles’ building inscriptions along Hadrian’s Wall, RIB 1638.

7 The formula »iussu Alfeni Senecionis v(iri) c(larissimi) / co(n)s(ularis) curante Oclatinio Advento proc(uratore) / Augg(ustorum) nn(os) / auctoritate imperatoris« is being conclusive, according to Bechert 1971, 206. The same view in Reuter 1995, 46.

8 For a short history of the issue see Baatz 1989.

9 Quoting Birley (1961, 251 Hf.) and taking as example Hadrian’s Wall: Baatz 1973, 132. However, D. Baatz previously contradicted Drexel (1922), who argued that a special style developed on the Odenwaldlimes specific to Brittones Elantienses (Baatz 1973, 128-131).

10 With or without legionaries’ help, as proven by numerous legionary tiles found within auxiliary forts, according to Baatz 1973, 132.

11 Still Baatz (1973, 133 no. 364) suggested in a note that, although uncertain, it was possible that at some point the legionary »Baubüro« was supervised by the governor’s staff.

12 Radnótí 1974, 138. It is suggested that the term auxilia eorum proves that the auxiliaries belonged to the legions, Oldenstein-Pferdehirt 1984, 417. 429. For the history of this issue see Baatz 1989, 169.

13 According to Oldenstein-Pferdehirt 1983, 413 fig. 12.

14 Contra Wilson (1980, 45) who, a year prior, argued that »there is no evidence [...] of a rigid plan or fixed set of dimensions for any type of building [...] no such thing as an unalterable blueprint which any fort-builder had to follow«, see Walthew 1981, 18.

15 Auxiliaries’ ability to build is proven by a few inscriptions on Hadrian’s Wall and the training camps at Haltwhistle (on Hadrian’s Wall) and Llandrindod Common (Wales). However, the specialists were also from among the legionaries, according to Johnson 1987, 57 f. (and in the author’s first edition of 1983, 43 f.).

16 He brings as arguments the inscriptions where commanders of auxiliary troops supervised construction works at the governor’s disposal and, at least for Germany, where a legionary legate has never been named in inscriptions as responsible for buildings in an auxiliary fort (Baatz 1989, 170. 172).

17 I thank I. Piso for the explanations.
B. Oldenstein-Pferdehirt and A. Johnson, argued that auxilia belonged to those legionary »Planungsbüros« under whose authority they were, while fulfilling only an aid function (»Handlangerfunktion«). Nonetheless, views against the dominant role of the legions over the auxiliaries were fewer, although many authors suggested that the auxilia were decisive in the construction of their own fortifications. C. S. Sommer concludes in an appendix about the construction of forts in Roman Britain that »during the second and earlier third centuries the defences of a new fort will have been erected by legionary construction-groups, which as soon as their task had been fulfilled might have left the building site. This then was taken over by auxiliary troops to complete the building of the fort […] the probability is relatively high that the interior buildings were constructed by the first garrison«, but »it is possible that forts were erected entirely by an auxiliary unit«. The construction of the Antonine Wall followed a different pattern and »the forts seem to have been built almost completely by legionary soldiers«. However, when W. Hanson refers to the construction techniques, he states that »since structural details in general in the Antonine period indicate a marked reduction in complexity, we might be seeing the results of a shortage of skilled carpenters, possibly as the result of increased building activity by auxiliary troops«. But this seems to be also true for Hadrian’s Wall after Hadrian left during the construction process. W. Hanson maintains that, indeed, starting with the end of the 2nd and beginning of the 3rd century, auxiliaries increasingly placed more building inscriptions, are regularly but that these associated with reconstructions. Therefore, is the different epigraphic and archaeological evidence indicative of different pictures or not? Most likely there were no fixed rules in military architecture and even in the construction of a fort’s defensive circuit. Probably, a unified construction strategy has been applied in rare cases, as is the case with buildings on Hadrian’s or the Antonine Wall. There was an overall identifiable directive, a kind of standardisation, for Hadrian’s Wall, but there are also slight variations, meaning that the builders had a certain freedom of action. But is it true what C. S. Sommer states that auxiliaries were as capable of building forts and buildings in them as legionary soldiers; meaning they were not less skilled than the legionaries? If true, what is the evidence and who were those in charge, who led the auxiliaries in such a task? Why were the legionaries regarded as builders of the auxiliary forts, if someone else performed the task?

A STAFF OF TECHNICIANS: SURVEYORS AND ARCHITECTS

Agrimensores were a distinct social category and their presence in the army was manifest. The surviving manuals echo their importance and certain sources mention their proficiency.

---

18 Thus, clearly discernible »Legionstile« developed on Hadrian’s Wall, according to Stoll 1998, 220. However, the given example of a praefectus castrorum responsible, together with the governor, for the construction of a basilica at Syene (CIL III 6025 = AE 1944, 85) is, to my knowledge, unique.

19 Sommer 1984, 59. Similar is the impression after the same author’s analysis of the fort orientation in Germania and Raetia as a »unsystematische« method, without any implication of »Kommandobezirke« of the legions (Sommer 1988, 531).

20 The author later discusses the auxiliaries’ involvement in other projects, Sommer 1984, 591.

21 However, the author is not referring necessarily to the forts on the Antonine Wall (Hanson 1982, 172). At Castlecary »the standard […] is notably inferior« (Hanson 2009, 34).

22 Breeze 2009, 99. P. Hill also shows that »more time and trouble was expended on the latter« structures and »the impression is of poorly trained men working under either poor supervision or great pressure«, with few exceptions (Hill 1981, 20), and then »after a second break in construction there that the quality dropped markedly« (Hill 2004, 149). However, especially in the case of the gates there are signs that the stonemasons, probably legionaries, were really trained and later on there are signs of poor work where auxiliary labour of lower standard could have been used (Hill 2004, 136f. 151).

23 The author seems to favour legionaries as the main builders (Hanson 2009, 34).

24 For instance, having either architects (Evans 1994, 146) or officers in charge (Breeze 2009, 881.).

25 Sommer 1984, 60.

26 For this see Blume/Lachmann/Rudorff 1848; Thulin 1913; Campbell 1996; Campbell 2000; Dilke 1971; Dilke 1974. – Flaccus, a professional surveyor, mentions profesio nostra (T 98.9), Campbell 1996, no. 18.
The majority of military surveyors were soldiers embodied among the *immunes* responsible for surveying the ground for a fortification, colony or civil settlement\(^{27}\). It is possible that Trajan’s request addressed to Balbus, a civilian surveyor, had been made under emergency circumstances\(^{28}\) and it is more likely that those in charge of surveying a fortification were enrolled in the army\(^{29}\). Their skill was certainly one of the best, as the *Corpus Agrimensorum Romanorum*, a collection of texts comprising surveying standards in accordance with Roman laws and edicts in force, shows\(^{30}\). Consequently, surveyors’ activities were based on expressed rules established in compliance with laws, records and registers, maps, edicts, letters or other imperial decisions, definitions of territorial area and jurisdiction, lists of *subseciva* and the book of *beneficia*\(^{31}\). Evidently, military surveyors had to observe pre-established principles\(^{32}\). However, there is not a fixed system for each building inside a fort. There is no account regarding the surveying of a fort’s internal planning based on coherent rules and decisions, compared with the civil environment where everything was established by rules. The *lex Puteolana* from the 2nd century established, for instance, how large the spaces between the buildings or how large the walls and other similar principles should have been\(^{33}\). The same kind of rules survive in Justinian’s Digest or the Theodosian Code\(^{34}\).

There is certain guidance on setting out a fort in Pseudo-Hyginus and Vegetius, but few remarks on the internal planning. They were probably copied from official documents. Nonetheless, surveyors’ manuals were based on definitions and explanations, emphasising advice and instructions, having a didactic final purpose\(^{35}\). According to their authors, the internal planning of a fort had to comply with certain rules. The space was set out for building plots, not for individuals. Yet, we do not know how definite the surveying principles were. It is certain, however, that every fort was unique in detail; therefore, many decisions may have met the good taste of the commander, centurions or the unit surveyor\(^{36}\). There is a clear distinction between the general rules or principles upon which the design process was based and the details expressed by each architect or mason as a matter of authenticity\(^{37}\). Surveyors were, as we learn from the *Corpus Agrimensorum Romanorum*, essential in setting out the fort and some of them in surveying a colony, as well\(^{38}\). Apparently, the buildings inside a fort mirrored the unit’s strength at the very moment of construction, but such a number is hard to estimate.

Evidently, governors had a staff composed of specialists at their disposal, at least starting with the 2nd century. It seems that these specialists (official and not private) existed only in provinces with legions; therefore, their majority must have been recruited from legionary soldiers\(^{39}\). Not in vain, Pliny asked Trajan for

\(^{27}\) Campbell 2000, passim.

\(^{28}\) After Sherk 1974, 546-549.

\(^{29}\) Some of them involved in civil projects, Campbell 2000. But sometimes even the emperor was involved in selecting the best place for a fort, see SHA Hadr. X:6, where Hadrian said: »locum castris caperet«.

\(^{30}\) Thulin 1913 and Campbell 2000, with comments in Campbell 1996, passim.

\(^{31}\) See Campbell (1996, 88 no. 55), where the author wrote about Agennius Urbanus, Hyginus I, Siculus Flaccus and Hyginus II in referring to these documents.

\(^{32}\) There is no proof that there were laws on the internal planning of the fort, as there were for urban settlements where the centuriation was made according to the laws for *limites or limes*, such as access roads described by Siculus Flaccus (T122.21-3). Nevertheless, this centuriation is also hard to identify in reality and numerous variables probably existed.

\(^{33}\) See Taylor 2003, 16. During the Flavian period a unit placed a boundary stone at Henchir Meskine according to the instructions of an existent cartographical document; see Laporte 1996, 740 no. 105.

\(^{34}\) The latter with the rules limiting the buildings’ height; see Taylor 2003, 61.

\(^{35}\) See Campbell 1996, 79.

\(^{36}\) The design of the building is not necessarily linked to the unit in garrison, but with the commander (or in the case of a fortress with praefectus castrorum or junior officers) the shape could have been changed not because of the replacement of the unit, but because of the replacement of the commander in charge; see the case of Housesteads in Hill 2004, 19.

\(^{37}\) Blagg 1982, 149.

\(^{38}\) Many of the ancient texts collected in *Corpus Agrimensorum Romanorum* were attributed to Sextus Iulius Frontinus, cos. III together with Trajan in AD 100, confirmation, if indeed so, of the importance of surveying and of those practicing it, according to Campbell 1996, 76. However, most of the surveyors were among the *immunes*; see Campbell 1996, no. 22.

\(^{39}\) However, Trajan answers Pliny at some point that »mensiores vix etiam is openibus, quae aut Romae aut in proximo fiant, sufficientes habeo« (Plin. epist. 10, 18, 3), therefore he might in fact be referring to civilians.
a libror or an architect for building a canal in Bithynia. Trajan, however, responded that he should ask the governor of the closest province (Moesia Inferior), although he previously argued, in relation to a different construction, that "Nulla provincia est, quae non peritos et ingeniosos homines habeat; modo ne existimes brevius esse ab urbe mitti, cum ex Graecia etiam ad nos venire soliti sunt," referring most likely to the civilians. When the city of Saldae (Mauretania Caesariensis) wanted to build an aqueduct they asked the legate of leg. III Augusta (CIL VIII 2728/18122 = ILS 5795) in the neighbouring province (Numidia) for a libror. The facts are quite interesting. First of all the governor asked the legate, then the libror in the person of Nonius Datus drew the plan and made the survey, returning later to the fortress. The governor thanked the legate, but, as they could not manage the task by themselves, the governor asked the libror again to supervise the construction of the tunnel. As the civilian workers made mistakes, Nonius Datus initiated a contest between the navy and Gaesati to finish the work. In the end Nonius Datus completed the job and the governor performed the opening. As far as we are concerned, it is important that the governor took responsibility without asking the emperor for help and that the technician was again only in the legions available over which the governor had no authority. Moreover, the auxiliary troops were available for work and acted most likely at his command.

According to the Libri coloniarum, soldiers' involvement in civil building projects, especially in surveying towns, is a fact. This is true for Frusino, Privernum or Casinum, for instance. It is assumed that building teams were involved in civil projects in the 1st century in Britannia, when they built public edifices as the result of an official policy.

Military architects are recorded among the soldiers of the Praetorian Guard and the fleet at Misenum, the former being named in inscriptions as architecti ordinati or architecti armamentarii imperatoris, architecti Augusti and the latter architectus classis or navalis. Several architecti are recorded in legions, but never in the plural. Hence, certain authors have supposed that each legion had only one architect. Only O. Stoll, when comparing them to the medici, supposed that there was an architectus ordinatus or an architectus discens (who was specifically trained); therefore, there were probably several architects in a legion.

Certainly, legionaries or teams of soldiers were specialised in different fields, however, little is known about the auxilia. It is agreed that architects, mensores or even builders (trained in building construction) were found among the immunes; however, there is insufficient evidence on the auxilia.
Hadrian «had mustered into cohorts specialists in building activities, even architects, after the example of the legions»\textsuperscript{50}, but this is probably referring to the gangs of specialists that accompanied the emperor on Hadrian’s Wall—and some of them may well have been civilians\textsuperscript{51}. Nevertheless, we have very few accounts regarding their presence in the auxilia. Most of them are related to artillery\textsuperscript{52}. There are only three cases recorded of an architect in connection with the auxilia, although they do not prove the existence of an architectus as a specialist enrolled among troop technicians. In the mid 2\textsuperscript{nd} century the inscription at Lucrezia (AE 1983, 380) proves that the prefect of coh. III Bracarum in Syria Palaeista was also an architect\textsuperscript{53}; hence one may suppose that he must have been involved in the building activities in the garrison’s fort. Valerius Perimus from Aquae/Baden-Baden (Lupa 8257) could have been an architect of a legionary cohort, thus confirming the theory of O. Stoll that there were several architects in a legion. Yet, why is the cohort number not mentioned? If it was an auxiliary cohort, why is its name not mentioned, especially since the inscription is dedicated in a civil environment and Valerius Perimus dedicates an altar to Minerva together with Vittalis lappidarius […] et sui lappidarii? Nonetheless, in case he was an auxiliary it is possible that lappidarii also belonged to the cohort\textsuperscript{54}. Thus, it is possible that Hermeros lappidarius recorded at Cristești (IDR-03-04, 133; Dacia), where an auxiliary unit was garrisoned, could have been among the auxiliaries as well. Another lappidarius is attested in a place named Aquae/Călan (CIL III 7895), again in Dacia, but he may well have been civilian. Among these specialists should be registered also the one from Micia (Dacia) remembered as M. Cocceius Lucius lappidarius) with a praenomen used instead of the cognomen (IDR-03-03, 141). Another lappidarius (CIL III 1601) is known again from Dacia, but without any indication of the provenience.

From Britain three architects are attested at Carrawburgh and Birrens on two altars and a statuette, without knowing if they were civilian or military and whether they were auxiliaries or legionaries\textsuperscript{55}. A similar architect is remembered on a stone from Gallia Narbonensis (CIL XII 186)\textsuperscript{56}. These very few accounts about the architects have led to the conclusion that they were not really responsible for the detailed planning and the execution of the buildings, but that they were more involved in artillery expertise\textsuperscript{57}. However, as we have seen, military architects were employed in civil projects, but none came from the auxiliaries or from the provinces without legions. Lately the authors dealing with Roman architects make a distinction between architectus and surveyor, the last a mere technician\textsuperscript{58}. It may be true that there was a central office where the architect, or architects, established a certain plan for certain buildings, but the rules were not at all rigid and those who executed the construction could have set their own standards through custom.

Technician or architect functions were not military career stages, specialists being recognised as such also after becoming veterans. C. Cuppienus was an architect while also cohort praefectus (AE 1983, 380), and Nonius Datus was still librator after becoming a veteran (CIL VIII 2728).

\textsuperscript{50} Namque ad specimen legionum militarium fabros perpendicularatores architectos genusque cunctum extruendorum moenia seu decurandorum in cohortes centuriaverat» (Epit. de Caes. 14, 5).
\textsuperscript{51} See MacMullen 1959, 215 no. 71.
\textsuperscript{52} Stoll 1998, 219.
\textsuperscript{53} Donderer 1996, 219 A 112. See also the discussions in Stoll 1998, 219-222.
\textsuperscript{54} Schallmayer (1989, 72) supposes that they were part of coh. VII Raetorum or coh. XXVI Voluntariorum mentioned on building inscriptions, and the latter even on tiles stamps dated to the end of the 1\textsuperscript{st} century. At Aquae/Baden-Baden joint work of the auxiliaries together with leg. I Adiutrix and leg. XI Claudia is also recorded, therefore Valerius Perimus and lappidarii may well have been from among the legionaries.
\textsuperscript{55} RIB 1542 (Carrawburgh); RIB 2091; RIB 2096 (Birrens). Some authors suggested that Amandus from Birrens could have been the same person as Valerius/Amandus attested as discens architectus at Iversheim in AD 209 (CIL XIII 7945), see Birley 1986, 66 no. 342.
\textsuperscript{56} For the formula architector see Donderer 1996, A 120.
\textsuperscript{57} The statement is meant for legionaries (Evans 1994, 148), but, if so, it should be true for auxiliaries as well.
\textsuperscript{58} The first concerned with theoretical, the latter with utilitarian matters, after Humphrey/Oleson/Sherwood 1998, 218. See also Evans 1994, 1431. 152-162 and Taylor 2003, 15.
Apparently, auxiliary units seem to lack real technicians, but they should have had surveyors. However, if there were just labourers and a handful of architects moving around to help anyone in need, or if there would have been a central building office, regular patterns would be easier to find. Nonetheless, in the end it was not essential who made the building plan, but who was building. In fact, the Romans were not interested in it either, hence the architect or technician who made the plan or set the duties was almost never mentioned, while the builders and those responsible were.

**LEGIONARY INVOLVEMENT IN AUXILIARY BUILDING PROJECTS**

Legionaries were definitely the main builders of the Empire. Evidently, they took part in large construction works, especially in the building of roads, canals, aqueducts, official buildings, temples or even towns. In civil settlements or military installations surveyors were also used for land disputes. An evocatus of leg. III Augusta, Nonius Datus, was employed, as we have seen, as *librator* at Saldae in Africa after a tunnel had been wrongly designed.

There is some evidence, especially in Britain, proving that legionaries built a series of forts or even the entire Hadrian’s Wall. However, most of the inscriptions with the names of the legions found inside the auxiliary forts record only the name of the legion, sometimes adding the name of the emperor, governor or centurion, but without any specification of what they had built. Many of these inscriptions were placed for the officers’ control, comparable to the distance slabs on the Antonine Wall.

Generally, on Hadrian’s Wall there are three distinctive groups of building types, according to their overall dimensions. As a consequence, the forts in the same group with Halton Chesters, for instance, were considered probably to have been built by the legion as well. The construction techniques of Housesteads and certain milecastles point to leg. II Augusta as their builder. At Chesters stones inscribed with the names of several centuries were discovered, however, it is uncertain whether legionaries or auxiliaries built something inside the fort. The first inscription, which records the legions of Britain as builders in a fort, comes from Balmuildy (RIB 2191), but we do not know what they built. Another three inscriptions from Britain come from Corbridge, but this is not conclusive here, as this is a »strange« fort with legionary detachments forming the main garrison.

---

59 For instance Timgad, see Le Bohec 1989, 116 with notes.
60 See MacMullen 1959, 215 no. 72 or in general Campbell 2000.
61 Birley 1961, 251 ff.
62 As for instance the inscription from Halton Chesters (RIB 1427), many recordings on Hadrian’s Wall, from Germania (CIL XIII 6583; CIL XIII 6548; CIL XIII 6713; CIL XIII 7613a; CIL XIII 11757) and from Dacia (AE 1994, 1484).
63 The first were visible only at the beginning, as afterwards they were plastered over together with the Wall, after Birley 1961, 252 ff.
64 Cf. Breeze/Dobson 1969, 31 f. Maybe only the gate was rebuilt, as the inscription found in 1936 had »fallen from its position over the west gate«, after RIB 1427. Other building inscriptions found at Halton Chesters were set up by leg. II Augusta, leg. VI Victrix or leg. XX Valeria Victrix (RIB 1428-1431). The groups were recognised according to the gate’s position and shape. In the attempt to recognise a »house style« of architects, Evans (1994, 147 f.), quoting Davison (1989), shows that in the forts of leg. XX at Colchester, Wroxeter, Chester and Inchutihil there were alleyways between the barracks and the centurions’ quarters.
65 The groups were considered on the dimension basis of the barrack-blocks by Breeze/Dobson (1969, 32), an uncertain indicator.
66 Among others, leg. XX Valeria Victrix worked at the other milecastles, turrets and curtain walls in the central sector of Hadrian’s Wall, after Breeze/Dobson 1969, 32.
67 See, for instance, RIB 1478-1479. Most of the inscriptions on the Wall were also set up by legionaries.
68 There are quite a number of sources attesting to the legionary activity here and only three recordings of some auxiliary units, one for each of the following: *ala Petriana* (RIB 1172; tombstone); *coh. I Vardullorum* (RIB 1128; dedicatory stone) and *coh. I Lingonum* (RIB 1186).
The second and fourth legions were responsible for some of the forts on Hadrian’s Wall, but they were not necessarily in the vicinity of one another. Similarly, the spread of building inscriptions of the 8th and 22nd legions in Germania Superior, as already mentioned, does not indicate separate areas of action.

Much evidence from Tripolitania suggests that legionary vexillations were involved in the construction of *burgi or castella (centenariae)*. However, it is likely that they also formed the garrisons of those forts, so this is not relevant here. This is also the case of the fort at Bu Njem (Gholaia), where legionary vexillations set up building inscriptions recording two spectacular buildings. However, they were also the fort’s garrison, at least at some point. The same happened at Dimmidi after AD 198, when the *ala* left the fort and only the legionary vexillations remained in garrison there or possibly at Brigetio in Pannonia Superior (CIL III 3653).

**COMBINED WORKFORCE OF THE ARMY**

Joint work of legionaries and auxiliaries is also registered in civilian projects of all kinds. It is clear that the main task to build Hadrian’s Wall and especially the Antonine Wall was undertaken by the legions, but there is evidence for joint auxiliary involvement.

Auxiliaries participated beside legionaries in building constructions. The earliest and most impressive inscription of joint workforce is CIL III 6627, revealing that vexillations formed of 120 legionaries, 788 auxiliary infantry and 424 auxiliary cavalry participated in large building works in Egypt: «castra[m] aedificaverunt et refecerunt». Additional to various civil tasks they built the fort at Coptos.

Under Septimius Severus *ala I Pannoniorum* participated alongside *leg. III Augusta* and vexillations of *leg. III Gallica* in the construction of the fort at Dimmidi. Interestingly enough, the *curante* is the *ala praefectus* (AE 1948, 214). The entire *ala* was present there, hence it benefitted from the numerical advantage, this being the reason for which the cavalry troop was prioritised in the inscription. However, in the next inscriptions found at Dimmidi (CIL VIII 8796. 18021), even if Flavius Superus, the *praefectus alae*, remains *curator*, the *ala* is no longer among the builders, and in the next text even the prefect is omitted (AE 1939, 213; AE 1948, 217), so the *ala* may have already left. In other cases as well legionaries are subordinated to auxiliary troop commanders.

69 The second legion was responsible for the forts at Rudchester, Housteads, South Shields and Greatchester, and the sixth legion for those at Wallsend, Benwell, Halton Chesters, Chesters, Birdoswald, probably Stanwix and Bowness, after Breeze/Dobson 2000, passim.

70 The building inscription does not indicate clear areas of action for the legions (Oldenstein-Pferdehirt 1983, 413 fig. 11) and the *praepositi* are in charge of the *numeri* and sometimes they were *curam agentes*, but as commanders of an individual irregular unit when they built or rebuilt something on their own (CIL XIII 6502. 6592). Baatz (1989, 172 f.) makes it clear that the centurions and *praepositi* do not have anything to do with a legion’s action radius.

71 For example CIL VIII 3 or maybe CIL VIII 1 and AE 1987, 994. But the same could be true for the inscription of Dimmidi after the *ala* had probably left (AE 1939, 213; AE 1948, 217).

72 See also Saxer 1967, 106, 127.


74 AE 1939, 213; AE 1940, 153; AE 1948, 217.

75 See MacMullen 1959, 218. Probably in the baths at Aquae/Baden-Baden, see Schallmayer 1989, 35. 72 fig. 20. At Gholaia, a *numerus conlatum* participated in construction work beside legionary vexillations (AE 1972, 677). At Netherby the detachments of the *leg. II and XX* together with *coh. I Aelia Hispansorum* built a temple (CIL VII 964).

76 The inscription is dated prior to Antoninus Pius, when two legions were transferred to Egypt, and associated with the beginnings of the Empire (Augustus, Tiberius), when the road network in the area was developed, after Saxer 1967, no. 294.

77 Charles-Picard 1944, 45.

78 After ibidem 46.

79 Only legionary vexillations are *praetendentes Castellum Dimmidi* in the second inscription under the command of two centurions *praepositi* of the legionary detachments, but this is probably because the cavalry left for the Parthian campaign of AD 198, see Charles-Picard 1944, 46–48 nos 14–15. See also Saxer 1967, 106 nos 316-317.

80 Under Septimius Severus M. Caninius Adiutor Faustinianus *praefectus* of coh. *II Hamiorum* was *curante* for the buildings carried out by *vexillationes* of *leg. III* in Gebel, probably to establish a series of forts (IRT 868). At Netherby, where vexillations of *II Augusta* and coh. *I Aelia Dacorum* built a temple, the cohort tribune seems to be *curante* (RIB-01, 980). See also Saxer 1967, 129.
Elsewhere, legionary centurions appear as *praepositi* including the cohorts involved. One of the most interesting inscriptions is the one from Böhming (CIL III 14370,02), where legionary vexillations shared work with *auxilia*, first building the enclosure, while *coh. I Breucorum* built the tower-gates and the corner-towers.  

**Auxiliaries as Builders as Reflected in Inscriptions**

Occasionally, auxiliaries are the only ones involved in civil projects for building gates, towers, temples, baths, aqueducts or basilicas. The most interesting description is from the mid 2nd century, when Nonius Datus set the lines or the plan of the aqueduct at Saldae. The utilisation of the auxiliaries is not an exception, as during the reign of Hadrian, *coh. VIII Voluntariorum* built the aqueduct towers at Tilurium in Dalmatia (AE 1941, 54). As it was probably an easier task than to make a tunnel, they were able to manage the building by themselves. It would not have been dissimilar inside the auxiliary forts, but it seems that we have no proof for that. Another interesting case for the association of two auxiliary units for civil projects is the navy built the roads, while Numidian/Mauretanian and Pannonian horsemen protected them.

This work does not include inscriptions dedicated by auxiliaries, when unclear in relation to the building projects, although it is possible that a part of the records of construction works is obvious, so that the Romans could have recognised what was built, since the inscriptions were placed on the buildings' facades.

For us though, given that the find spots are not *in situ* or are completely unknown, it is impossible to assign them to specific buildings. This is the case for many legionary inscriptions, but these relate to large building works, and the inscriptions on Hadrian's Wall, for instance, were placed only as a control over the construction teams.

Out of 58 building inscriptions from auxiliaries, the structure built or rebuilt is mentioned in 38, or 64%, while in the majority of the rest only the predicate *fecit*/*fecerunt* is named, an indication that the inscription was set on the building itself. For these, the archaeological context would have been essential, but we have information for only a few of the discoveries.

One of the first buildings recorded to have been constructed by auxiliaries in the 1st century is a *praetorium* at Volubilis (Mauretania Tingitana), a »*s[o]lo composuit et fecit*« probably by *coh. Asturum et Callaecorum* (CIL VIII 21820). It fell under the jurisdiction of the unit commander, as it was not an official building, thus not needing the approval from central government. It would be interesting to know to which *praetorium* in which fort the inscription refers, Volubilis being the administrative capital of Mauretania Tingitana. The inscription states that by the mid 3rd century(?), a centurion, *praepositus* of a *numerus*, embellished a temple with statues (AE 1931, 113) with the aid of *coh. II Ulpia eq. c. R. sagittariorum*.

Another very early inscription recording auxiliaries as builders is AE 1991, 1251, according to which a cohort, possibly *coh. I Flavia Hispanorum*, built an *armamentarium* for *equites et pedites singulares*. This time, a cohort conducts the construction on behalf of the emperor, but under the jurisdiction of the governor; hence it was an official construction. The garrison of these *singulares* must have been somewhere in

---

81 Similar also at Pfünz and Ellingen, cf. Dietz 1983. See also Gnade 2010, 208.
82 AE 1941, 54; CIL III 1979; CIL VII 1003; CIL VII 287; CIL VII 445; CIL III 7450; AE 1944, 74; at Dura-Europos AE 1931, 113; CIL XIII 11758; CIL XIII 11759; Schallmayer 1989, 36 fig. 21; IDR-03-03, 47; Saxer 1967, 109 no. 332 (AE 1957, 176); IRT 896. – For the army as builder in urban space see Le Bohec 1992, 311-320; Horster 2001, 168ff.
83 Ps.-Hyg. 24.
84 See Horster 2001, 57. In the case of the inscriptions from North Africa, only 18% mention the building and only when it was new, since »one can see with one's own eyes what has been done« (Saastamoinen 2010, 156).
85 The troop was garrisoned in a fort far away from Cologne, see explanations in Eck 1990.
the *colonia* Claudia Ara Agrippinensium or nearby. However, it is hard to say why they did not build their own building. Possibly, like in other cases, they had other responsibilities at that time.\(^{86}\) The evidence on auxiliaries is regarded by many authors as insufficient, however, there is quite a number of building inscriptions set up by auxiliaries in a fort, when compared with those placed by legionaries. Probably between the two Dacian Wars (AD 102-105) coh. I Antiochensium constructed something on the direct order of the emperor (AE 1959, 309 = IDR-02, 14).

Among the earliest evidence that the auxiliaries built something in Britannia are dedications from the fort at Carrrawburgh, where coh. I Tungrorum dedicated an inscription to Hadrian\(^{87}\), and probably Benwell, where a detachment of the *classis* set up an inscription for Hadrian between AD 122 and 124\(^{88}\). At Carvoran a *centuria* probably built parts of the *vallum* on Hadrian’s Wall under the charge of a prefect (RIB 1820), but they could have been legionaries as well.

The fact that soldiers of coh. I Tungrorum and coh. I Aquitanorum built something prior to the mid 2nd century is proven by the dedication slabs (RIB 2155. 1550) discovered at Castlecary and Carrrawburgh\(^{89}\), while coh. VI Nerviorum was involved in the construction of the *principia* at Rough Castle during AD 142-143 (RIB 2145)\(^{90}\). This is the first mention of a building built by an *auxilia* in a fort, but we should not forget that earlier they built the *armamentarium* at Cologne and also the aqueduct towers in Dalmatia or a tunnel near Saldae. Another similar inscription was found at Gherla, recording that in AD 143 the emperor had built a structure through an *ala* in garrison, probably the headquarters (AE 1906, 112).

From that point on, inscriptions dedicated by auxiliary troops are increasingly numerous. In the mid 2nd century, a cohort built a basilica at Syene in Egypt (CIL III 6025). Although the emperor is the »client«, the builders were the governor and, for the first and single time mentioned in connection with an auxiliary troop, the *praefectus castrorum*, the *curator* being a legionary centurion who was most likely also the troop commander. But this could have also been a civil building, the basilica having been constructed in the Egyptian city.

Under Marcus Aurelius construction works were carried out in the fort of Aalen under the direct responsibility of the governor, who is mentioned as the *curator*, while the *valetudinarium* from Stojnik seems to have been constructed without the need of approval from central government (CIL III 14537). *Sub cura* of a legionary centurion, most likely the *praepositus* of the *numerus* involved, coh. I Helvetiorum together with *Brittones* and *numerus* Aurelianenses built something at Öhringen (CIL XIII 6542. 6543). In AD 182, *pedites singulares* rebuilt the wall and the gates of the fort at Ellingen with the permission of the governor (AE 1983, 730)\(^{91}\).

*Armamentariae* are rebuilt in AD 197 at Roomburg (CIL XIII 8824) and in AD 238-244 in Lanchester (RIB 1092), the first with the commandant and the latter with the governor as *curator*.

Under the extraordinary command of Aelius Emeritus, decurion of *ala* I Pannoniorum, a *praepositus* of the »expeditionary« force of coh. II Flavia Afrorum and *numerus* collatus built a *praesidium* at Si Aioun in Tripolitania in AD 198 (ILAfr 9 = AE 1986, 704)\(^{92}\). This was followed by the building of a *nova praetentura* at Timziouin (CIL VIII 22602; Mauretania Caesariensis), a *castellum* at Qasr el-Hallabat (Kennedy 2000; Arabia),

---

\(^{86}\) *Leg. VIII Augusta* built something at Osterburken probably for the *numeri*: CIL XIII 6578. 6582.

\(^{87}\) Davies 1967.

\(^{88}\) However, it is not certain that this was a building inscription or just a dedicatory stone. However, it has been used by many archaeologists as one of the first pieces of evidence of building activities by auxiliaries (RIB 1340).

\(^{89}\) Davies (1967, 109 no. 25) asserted that it could have been possible that the unit built something at Carrawburgh and Brough-on-Noe more or less at the same time, but under different prefects.

\(^{90}\) See Davies 1967, passim. For the building activities in Britain and a suggested table of the building inscriptions from inside the province’s forts see Sommer 1984, 58-60.

\(^{91}\) Dietz 1983, 497-500.

\(^{92}\) Le Bohec (1986, 233-241 especially 240), when discussing *numerus* conlatus (*collatus*), argues that it was a sort of vexillation formed of soldiers from *auxilia* of Tripolitania and which was used for special circumstances.
and a centenarium at Qasr Duwayb (AE 1950, 128; Africa Proconsularis). In AD 263 the auxiliary troops in the same area built the fort of the coh. VIII Fida (CIL VIII 22765 = AE 1895, 17)”93. Some of the building inscriptions from Tripolitania at the end of the 2nd and the beginning of the 3rd century prove the involvement of auxiliaries in various constructions, sometimes beside vexillations of leg. III Augusta, other times by themselves, especially after the legion was disbanded in AD 238. Another burgus was built at Khirbat in Arabia (CIL III 88). As we can see, all of the fortifications were reduced in size and were located in the southern and eastern provinces, but it is important that the auxiliaries were allowed to build entire forts or fortlets. In three cases the curator is the commander of the troops, in two the governor and at Talalati the emperor himself. Curiously enough, only in the latter case are we dealing with the term castrum.

Concerning auxiliaries’ involvement in the erection of the defences and towers, the earliest inscription recording them seems to be from Racovita in Dacia in AD 140 (CIL XIII 13796). There are also four inscriptions recording the building or rebuilding of the defences, and one also of the portae, from the turn of the 3rd century. Coh. III Sygamborum built in AD 198-199 the wall of the fort at Taraess/Tatilti (AE 1995, 1790; Mauretania Caesariensis)94. A few years later, the caesipes defensive circuit of Bumbesti (CIL III 14485a; Dacia) is reconstructed by coh. I Aurelia Brittonum, also under the supervision of the governor. These two were carried out under the direct supervision of the governors (AE 1995, 1790; CIL III 14485a) and the other two from Britannia on his orders, but under the charge of the troops’ commander (CIL VII 269; RIB 1234). In the latter case the gates and the wall were a solo restituit. Interesting is the inscription from Zugmantel (CIL XIII 7612) which records only the ethnicon of a unit (Treverorum) without any other indication in the dedication for Severus Alexander, where the building of the wall is recorded a solo95.

Principia, mentioned for the first time in AD 142, are also referred to as an object of rebuilding within forts in three other cases, each time beside other structures. It is first mentioned beside the praetorium at Aalen in AD 208 (AE 1989, 581)96, then beside the armamentarium at Lanchester (RIB 1092) and the balneum at Birdoswald (RIB 1912). Only in the first case was work carried out directly by the governor, in the other two curante is the troop commander, but under the governor’s authority. Aedes and the basilica as seemingly separate structures were reconstructed at Reculver in AD 225-230 (RIB 3027), probably under the responsibility of the governor, strangely without mentioning the emperor.

Basilicas of the principia or the baths are recorded four times during the 3rd century, in three cases together with other structures mentioned above (RIB 605. 1091. 3027). In the first recording, early in the 3rd century, it is mentioned alone in an interesting inscription from Dacia (CIL XIII 1343). This is an account of a joint action by some of the province’s auxiliary troops97.

The first record of an armamentarium is, as noted, from AD 100, but then in AD 197 another one was rebuilt under the authority of the governor, but with the commandant in charge as curator (CIL XIII 8824), and then together with the principia in the quoted RIB 1092 inscription.

The next buildings of importance as mirrored by the inscriptions are the baths, which are mentioned six times, but in only two instances alone. The earliest record is from Germania Superior, where the numerus Brittonum Elantiensium restored one in AD 158 (CIL XIII 6498); in Dacia the governor together with the commander curator were again responsible for the rebuilding of baths fin two cases (CIL III 1374; IDR-03-
The other three records have already been mentioned in connection with principia and basilica (RIB 605, 1091, 1912). Brittones built the wall and carried out some restorations of the baths in another two undated instances (RIB XIII 6502, 6592). The other two types of buildings recorded on inscriptions are in two cases the praetorium at Birdoswald and Aalen (RIB 1912; AE 1989, 581) and in one the valutudinaria at Stojnik (CIL III 14537). The latter is dedicatory, but as long as it registers the hospital of coh. II Aurelia Nova, we may suppose that it was attached to the building itself.

Other structures mentioned twice in AD 220 (CIL VII 1044) and AD 235 (CIL VII 1046) in relation with construction activities are ballistaria, both in the same fort of High Rochester under the governors and sub cura the commandants in charge. Even if they are not contemporaneous, they are very similar in formula. Finally, the last known involvement of the auxilia concerned the water supply of Öhringen (CIL XIII 11758, 11759). For the first altar we do not know the unit, but at the instruction of the governor the water pipes were made per a centurion of leg. VIII, probably the praepositus of the unit in garrison. In the latter the cohort built a new aqueduct in the praetentura for the baths. In both cases the governor is directly the curato, probably together with the commander of the unit in garrison.

Legions built occasionally instead of auxiliaries. They did so, not because of the incapability of the latter, but because legionary construction teams were most likely generally involved in large construction programmes. For instance, we know that Brittones Elantienses rebuilt essential parts of the baths at Neckarburken in AD 158, building a new aposis, reconstructing the vaulted roof and the boilers. A few years later (in AD 185-192) leg. VIII Augusta probably built (CIL XIII 6578, 6582) the defensive wall for the extension of the fort at Osterburken, where Brittones would form the garrison. In principle, the builders were the ones available, either legionaries or auxiliaries.

CONCLUSIONS

According to the amount of evidence we may no longer argue that auxiliaries were engaged in the construction of less important buildings; for important ones one required qualified legionary staff, as maintained by A. Johnson. From over 60 inscriptions gathered here, a clear result is that the auxiliaries were the builders of the forts themselves and only in a few cases was this carried out by the legionaries. The latter appear either when they were garrisoned in the neighbourhood or when large construction programmes were to be instituted. In principle, the same is true for the combined workforce of legionaries and auxiliaries. In two cases, the task force of both types of units is involved in the construction of forts and in one case in the construction of defensive circuits and gates.

The majority of building inscriptions dates from the reign of Septimius Severus. Not by accident, Cassius Dio is severe in judging his building programme and his willingness to put his name on buildings only restored by him, »as if he had erected them himself from his private funds«. Yet this does not mean that other emperors had no building programmes, one only has to consider Trajan, but especially Hadrian and Antoninus Pius, too. Hadrian, for instance, was the most active builder in the provinces, but probably his reluc-

98 The altar was found in a well from the principia, see Stoll 1992, cat. no. 42 III 4.1.
99 Johnson 1987, 57.
101 See Fraser 2006.
tance to inscribe his name on his buildings, except the Temple of Trajan (SHA Hadr. XIX, 9), was determinant for the relative lack of building inscriptions inside the forts as well. Anyway, the chronological sequence of building inscriptions does not necessarily reflect the realities of building activity, for there were maybe quite a number of projects completed without any building record. The question nevertheless remains, who decided the internal planning of a fort and the building’s construction and design? D. Baatz has shown that in Germania Superior the responsibility for the decision to build or rebuild lay with the governor and/or with the troop commander and not with any legionary legate. It is true that the emperor himself, the governor or the unit’s commander, who is sometimes the praepositus (centurions) of the auxiliary troops, could have been in charge of the building operations, as most of the building inscriptions regard them as curatores of the operation. Obviously, the supreme authority for the construction was the emperor, as it is possible that some of the requests to construct something reached him directly. The intervention of the emperor or the governor has been proven in a few cases of frontier installations, as in the case of Hadrian’s Wall and the straight line of the limes in Germania Superior. A few early inscriptions from Britannia record constructions built by auxiliaries for the emperor (RIB 2145. 2155; Davies 1967). The dedications are simple, similar to those placed by legionary vexillations, and are most likely connected with large construction works in Britannia under Antoninus Pius. As already noted the case of Dacia is special. Of nine building inscriptions placed by auxiliary troops, four mention the emperor in the nominative. Two of them (IDR-02, 14; AE 1906, 112) record Trajan and Hadrian respectively as the builders per the troops in garrison. Evidently, the emperor was interested directly in what was built, and constructions seem to have been erected following the emperor’s direct order. Even more interesting is that in the same year, in AD 205, the emperor appears as a donor rather than builder of a basilica for the ala in garrison at Sláveni and of some other, unmentioned structure (IDR-02, 499; CIL III 13800 = IDR-02, 496). To my knowledge this is the only known specific case in a fort. In the other two cases from Micia, the baths are rebuilt, but under the charge of the governor and sub cura of the unit’s commandant. Besides, most interesting are the building inscriptions found at Porolissum, where the emperor is the only recorded person and he might have been personally involved (AE 1958, 230; ILD 660). The only other case we know comes from Mauretania Caesariensis, where at castellum Dianense the emperor had examined the walls (AE 1895, 17).

This illustrates the character of both provinces and their importance for the central government. In two cases the inscriptions were probably dedicated on the occasion of the direct presence of Trajan and Caracalla in the province Dacia, and they might be dated to AD 105 and 213-214. However, those were maybe the constructions made clearly at the direct order of the emperor.

102 Or some of the records were on wooden tablets, see Birley 1961, 255.
103 As proven by the inscriptions where the auxiliaries rebuilt part of the baths at Neckarburken: [...] iubente [...] leg(ato) Aug(usti) pr. pr [...] but with curam agente [...] (centurione) [...] (CIL XIII 6498; Schallmayer 1984, 453-457; Speidel 1986) and the other inscriptions where the commandant of the troop is directly responsible, Baatz 1989, 172.
104 See Evans 1994, 145.
105 Governors should have had a certain freedom, see Breeze 2009, 88. Even if, C. Popilius Carus Pedo (Alföldy 1983) was not responsible for the new limes (Speidel 1986, 310), the shape suggests the intervention of a high-rank person.
106 For cases where the emperor is mentioned in the nominative see Horster 2001, 39-45 or Saastamoinen 2010, 137-139.
107 For the civil environment see Horster 2001, 49 and Saastamoinen 2010, 138.
108 Marcu 2011, passim.
109 The inscription from Dacia is dated to AD 213, but Caracalla might have arrived at Porolissum earlier than the beginning of AD 214 as recorded in Cass. Dio 78, 16, 7, as he did not pay much attention to Dacia anymore (implying, maybe, that he did earlier). Caracalla might have visited Dacia at the end of AD 213, but it is not sure that he spent the winter at Sirmium. For the dates of emperors’ travels see in detail: Halfmann 1986, 184. 223.
110 The emperor’s involvement in building the forts is mentioned in CIL VIII 22765 and confirmed by SHA Hadr. X, 6, from where we learn that Hadrian, among other military things, »locum castris caperet«.
The emperor is mentioned in the nominative in other inscriptions as well, the curato, however, is the governor (AE 1995, 1790; CIL III 14485a; IRT 00880?). The few inscriptions from Africa are similar, as they do not refer to constructions and the emperor appears as the builder. However, per legionem, as the governor is mostly referred to, occasionally appears as the dedicator. Yet, constructions are not mentioned, owing to the fact that the emperor’s image was important.

In other cases the governor only is mentioned, while the curator is the troop commander (CIL III 1374; CIL XIII 8824; RIB 1092). A single case specifies that the governor, the curator being yet again the troop commander, performed work in accordance with the emperor’s instructions. Options in assigning works are not accidental, but were made according to the structures to be constructed. Hence, where the emperor built with assistance of the governor, we are dealing with the question of whether constructions are mentioned, including the restoration of the defensive circuit or the construction of a fortlet. Instead, when the troop commander is the curator, structures are in two cases the baths and a basilica and in one case an armamentarium.

In general, the appointed authority seems to have been the governor and many of the constructions within auxiliary forts were made either under his authority or his direct care, the emperor being the »client«. Thus, in 48% of the cases, the governor was the authority in charge, who appears as the curator of the constructions. Nevertheless, in 52% of the cases the curator is the commander of the garrison troop, while the governor was always mentioned in additional. Therefore, for constructions within forts a sort of approval was required, even when performed under the commander’s supervision and not directly by the governor.

We do not doubt that actually the garrison commander was always the curator, however, the inscriptions’ form, and definitely the legal procedure depended on the type of construction made.

Except in a few cases, when the governor was the curator and the commander was seldom mentioned, the structures built were as follows: the fortification itself, the defensive circuit and gate, the principia, the aedes, the armamentarium, the ballistarium and the aqueducts. However, when the curator was the commander, the structures were most often baths and basilicas, in three cases a praetorium and in one a horreum. In the basilica’s case, it is most likely not the structure belonging to the principia, but one belonging to the baths as mentioned in connection with them. In two cases they seem to have been autonomous buildings: The first is at Syene, which is a special case, since the building concerned was not inside the fort; the inscription only mentions the governor, who had carried out the work. The second case most likely concerned a basilica exercitatoria (CIL III 1343).

There seem to be some more exceptions to this rule, i.e. the patterns observed above. The most interesting case is when the combined workforce of legionaries and auxiliaries built the defensive circuit and gate-towers at Böhming in AD 181, and the curatores are in both cases the vexillation and cohort commanders, centurions of leg. III Italica (CIL III 14370,02). The governor is only mentioned in passing; hence he most likely had not the same authority over the legions as over the auxiliaries. In the following cases of a combined workforce the governor is the builder, but per legionary vexillationes, while the curator is the prefect of the ala as a part of the activities setting up the limes in Numidia together with the legionary vexillations, all under the command of the ala prefect.

Concerning the auxiliaries individually, in only one case was a praesidium (most likely a fortlet) built sub cura of a decurio (ILAfr 00009), and a burgus ex fundamento (CIL III 88) was constructed under the care of a tribune, but upon a governor’s orders, probably as they were small-sized fortifications. It is similar with the burgus from El Kantara erected by a numerus (CIL VIII 2494). By the middle and end of the 3rd century troop

---


112 However, from the early 3rd century onwards, the governor of Numidia was also the legate of the legion, after Mattingly 1995, 84.
commanders appear as *curatores* on the restoration of *principia*, once together with *armamentaria*, and this seems strange. Yet, in the first case (RIB 1092) the emperor appears in the nominative and the governor carried out the works. It is thus possible that the authority over most important constructions is increasingly transferred to the auxiliary troop commanders, as mentioned above, and as indicated by the second inscription dated to the beginning of the 4th century (RIB 1912). We must mention here the inscription recording that a *praepositus* built something at his own expense before the end of the 3rd century, but *sub cura* of the governor (AE 1980, 960).\(^{113}\) Thus, this might have well been a temple, as supposed by Y. Le Bohec\(^{114}\).

Except for the fort itself (which is rarely mentioned), the defensive circuit, the *principia* with its annexes, baths and in one case only a *horreum*, other buildings are not referred to in building inscriptions. Additionally, the *praetorium* is mentioned three times and the *valetudinarium* once, the latter, however, not as a building construction, but as the property of coh. II Aurelia Nova (IMS-01, 116). Aqueducts appear three times and *balistaria* twice. In the first case, the *praetorium* might be regarded as the private construction of the cohort prefect (CIL VIII 21820), though in the second case, rather oddly, the commander’s headquarters are mentioned first, together with the *principia* and the *balneum* (RIB 1912). However, this is a late inscription which represents an exception to the pattern observed above.

In conclusion we find that not all constructions required the approval of the central government, consequently there is no information relating to the construction of workshops, barracks, stables or other secondary buildings within forts. They are most likely built directly by the commander through the troop he led. This is precisely why these building plans must have varied considerably. On the other hand, civil inscriptions rarely mention utilitarian, industrial or rural constructions either.\(^{115}\) Therefore, it might not be a problem of authorisation, but simply of propaganda, advertising or habit, soldiers bragging only where everyone could see the inscriptions. Nevertheless, the obvious distinction between the authorities supervising certain constructions may be suggestive.

Those who prepared the building designs were obviously the architects or surveyors, but the soldiers in garrison performed the actual job. Although some sort of control was exercised, there were no centralised »Planungsbüros«, hence the extremely high diversity of the plans. The same must have occurred in the case of civil buildings, since Nonius Datus, a *librator* under Antoninus Pius in *leg. III Augusta*, said: »I decided (that the work) should be done according to the plan which he gave to the procurator Petronius Celer« (CIL VIII 2728). Some of the ancient drawings and drafts have survived.\(^{116}\) Therefore, the plans had been previously drawn by specialists and then sent to the authorities, emperor or governor. We may infer that, when the buildings were made *sub cura* of the governor, the specialists in the staff of the governor drew up the plans, but this is not always necessary, as it is not the case with Nonius Datus, who prepared the plan himself and sent it to the governor who, however, dedicated the final work. Nonetheless, when this is the case, we are dealing, as already mentioned, with the most important structures in the fort, most of the times built by the auxiliaries on their own. 

Troop commanders are proven as builders by the involvement of a *praefectus cohortis*, responsible for construction projects in a *colonia* in Asia (AE 1973, 501). Besides, one of the prefects we know had been an *architectus*.\(^{117}\) We cannot chronologically establish whether at some point commanders’ authority increased, except for the latest inscriptions, when the commander was included as a *curator* for a *principia* (RIB 1912). The transfer of the command of the troops from provincial governors to military commanders will have been an effect of Diocletian’s administrative reforms, the reason for which building inscriptions became increasingly rare.

---

113 Although the restoration is not certain, for only $S/[A...]$ is preserved.

114 See Le Bohec 1986, 234.

115 See Horster 2001, passim; Saastamoinen 2010, 56.

116 Taylor 2003, 28ff.

117 For military involvement in civil constructions see MacMullen 1959, 215 nos 72-74.
Cohorts erected the majority of building inscriptions dedicated by auxiliary troops. Of 52 examples, only nine were placed individually by an *ala*, of which four were from the same *ala*, garrisoned in the fort at Aalen, and the another two were placed by the *ala* at Slăveni. Therefore, we have epigraphic evidence for the participation in building activities by only five individual cavalry units. *Alae* are recorded twice more working alongside cohorts in other constructions. Therefore, cavalry troops could undoubtedly be involved in building activities, but they had other tasks compared to the infantry.

In Dacia, and most likely elsewhere, records also provide evidence for the specialisation of certain auxiliary troops, for instance in manufacturing tiles, but the same cannot be said about constructions. Most probably, as shown by the evidence, the person involved in the dynamics of design in a fortress was the *praefectus castrorum* and in the case of the auxiliaries the commandant or the centurions/decurions. Tacitus describes how a *praefectus castrorum* was killed while commanding cohorts engaged in building forts (*Tac. ann. 12, 38*). Probably the plan of a building and regulations were decided in his office. The plans were theoretically simple in design, and should, therefore, have implied the same design methods for many buildings. But this is an assumption that cannot be proven. Most likely, an architect was not always necessary, the construction being often made according to a rule described by E. Evans as that of »successive proportions«. But how did they put such a task into practice, regarding the problems connected not only with the plan, but also with the proportions of length, width and height? There were pre-established rules most likely recorded within manuals, buildings layouts being undeniably similar. However, »a system of permutation within clearly defined parameters« leads to »a considerable variety«. This also results from a modular analysis of buildings, and, although the 12 p.M. module seems to be universally used in *auxilia* forts, there is a considerable variance, which would account for different construction teams. But this still needs to be proven by many other examples. Where differences in the design of the same building type existed, there is a strong probability that the centurion had the final decision, while the commandant’s decision regarded only the area allotted. This could have been the case at Buciumi (Dacia) during the Trajanic phases. On the other hand, it is quite interesting to observe the much more typical barrack buildings of the legions in a fortress. Thus, it is possible that the design was the prerogative of centurions and military surveyors with a greater cosmopolitan background. The first result would be the variability in the internal planning and the difficulty to establish patterns or find standard units of measurement, even in the same fort like at Crawford, Valkenburg or Hesselbach, or, in Dacia’s case, in each construction phase at Bu-

118 Marcu 2004, passim.
119 See Veg. mil. 2, 10. Considering Agricola’s building ability Breeze (1981, passim) concludes that the task of surveying the campsite and pitching camp was carried out, within a legion, by the tribunes and centurions, quoting Polybius (6, 26 and 41) and Vegetius (2, 10), who record the duties of the *praefectus castrorum*. Among them are included the setting out of the fortress and the inspection of the tents and rooms of the soldiers in a temporary camp. Probably in a permanent fort the situation was not much different. The same author (1981, 18) concludes that the design of the entrances in the marching camps in Scotland was carried out by a *praefectus castrorum* or even by various *praefecti castrorum*, each of them using »different defensive devices and possibly [...] different innovations«, rather in the same way that the various legionary engineers on Hadrian’s Wall employed slightly different plans. Fronto also emphasised the importance of the commands capacity to decide, maybe the design of a construction as well (Frontin. aqu., prae. 2), who »was reluctant to depend solely on the advice of subordinates«, see Campbell 1996, 76. Probably, the preference for *pes Drusianus* or *pes Monetalis* in the same fort, but in different construction phases, depended on the buildings’ designers as well. However, the distinction between the two types of measurements in the same fort during the same chronological period is rather interesting, after Walthew 1981, 15. The same in the case of Colonia Ulpia Traiana (Xanten) where in Insula 3 have been used both types of pedes, yet the construction phases could have been »slightly« different, see Bridger 1984, 97-98. Evans (1994, 153) argues that such differences are most likely due to different tools used by different building teams. C. J. Bridger argued ten years earlier the significance and yet the lack of different measuring-rods discoveries, stressing the importance of tools and building materials for understanding the builders, Bridger 1984, 98.
120 [...] where in each successive element is related to a previous one, cf. Evans 1994, 154.
121 Ibidem 163.
122 The author stressed the »apparent eccentricities in the planning of military buildings«, Walthew 2005, 294.
123 Marcu 2009, 44f.
124 See Walthew 1981, 16. Unfortunately, detailed information in the case of Dacia’s forts is scarce.
ciumi. Most of the internal buildings may not have necessarily complied aesthetically to the attributes of the architects, even if other architectural principles were used. Therefore, one cannot believe that an architect was always required, the auxiliaries being able to handle whatever came up. The existence of skilled soldiers is confirmed also by the graffiti at Drobeta mentioning a miles Aurelius Mercurius in command of some soldiers of coh. I Sagittariorum 125, and the one discovered at Caernarfon, where a soldier from an auxiliary unit worked in the brickyards of leg. XX 126. Moreover, the auxiliaries could have had their own brickworks, as it was the case at Großkrotzenburg. Nonetheless, those who planned the internal design of the forts were the surveyors, but under the command of the chief in charge (tribune, praefectus or centurion/decurion) using blueprints drawn up by architects, libratores or whomever. But the builders on the spot were the soldiers themselves and that is where inaccuracies emerged 127. There were certainly specialists in construction projects, maybe even architects and technicians would have been needed at least for the gates or large buildings such as the principia or baths, where the architectural problems to be solved were greater. However, it was not a hard task to erect the defensive wall and like the legionaries auxiliaries had working groups of masons, but the gates were a complicated matter, and therefore, many of them have been built by legionaries, as we can observe on Hadrian’s Wall. 128 Nevertheless, there were instances when the legionaries erected the vallum and auxiliaries the gates and towers, as at Böhming in Raetia (CIL III 14370,02), although under the command of a legionary centurion. Clearly for special buildings, there was a need for more than a technician, because he probably would not have been capable of supervising the building of, for instance, the supposed tetrapylon at the, fort at Romita 129. However, the auxiliaries could have built special buildings like the baths, as we have seen for instance, in the case of the Brittones Elantienses, alone or together with legionaries. We should note that whenever we are dealing with irregular units, the design of the fort or fortlets was atypical, proving that the real builders were always the soldiers in garrison. Different in organisation they had probably distinct needs, therefore the forts’ layout was unique in each case. The main advantage of this method was that it provided the self-sufficiency of the auxiliaries. Nevertheless, we still do not know entirely where the auxiliaries practiced their skills and how they applied the rules 130, but it is obvious that auxiliaries were, as well as the legionaries, independent, solving their problems in various situations, erecting both forts and buildings, based not only on rule of thumb, but sometimes on fine judgements. There are many questions still unanswered and they need new epigraphic and archaeological discoveries. I hope that I have managed to set out the discrepancies between fact and theory in the auxiliaries’ building activities. Differences in building practices between legionaries and auxiliaries and among individual auxiliary units remain to be tested by further detailed analysis of constructional techniques, since the complexity of Roman military planning is extensive.
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126 RIB 2491.96.
127 These occurred also because of the instruments, see Evans 1994, 149 ff. Builders were different from those who decided the development of a construction. This is discernible when Hadrian, who decided the design of the Wall, departed in the middle of the building process, which led to changes and a reduction in the standards of craftsmanship, see Hill 2004, 140-146. – Breeze 2009, 99.
129 See Franzen/Matei/Marcu 2007, 164 ff.
130 Even in the case of legionaries it is hard to understand where and how they were trained, i.e. in the legion or in civil practice activity, see Donderer 1996, 57-61.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>date AD</th>
<th>fort enclosure</th>
<th>gates</th>
<th>towers</th>
<th>principia</th>
<th>aedes</th>
<th>basilica</th>
<th>armamentarium</th>
<th>praetorium</th>
<th>balneum</th>
<th>horrea</th>
<th>valetudinaria</th>
<th>aqueduct</th>
<th>ballistarium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41-99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>CIL III 13796 =</td>
<td>= CIL III 13796</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AE 1984, 667</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142-143</td>
<td>RIB 2145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL III 6025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL XIII 6498</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL XIII 14537</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>CIL III 14370,02 =</td>
<td>= CIL III 14370,02 =</td>
<td>= CIL III 14370,02 =</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>AE 1983, 730</td>
<td>= AE 1983, 730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL XIII 11757</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL XIII 1374</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL XIII 8824</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>AE 1986, 704</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198-199</td>
<td>AE 1995, 1790</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>CIL III 14485</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IDR-02, 499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205-207</td>
<td>RIB 1234 = =</td>
<td>RIB 1234</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205-208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL VII 269</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RIB 1909</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197-211</td>
<td>CIL VIII 22602</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213-214</td>
<td>Kennedy 2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214-216</td>
<td>CIL VIII 2494</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL VII 1044</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225-230</td>
<td>RIB 3027 = =</td>
<td>RIB 3027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IDR-03-03, 46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222-235</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL XIII 11758</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL VII 1046</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>RIB 1091 = =</td>
<td>RIB 1091</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238-244</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL VII 1046</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244-246</td>
<td>AE 1950, 128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>AE 1895, 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263-268</td>
<td>RIB 605 = =</td>
<td>RIB 605</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297-305</td>
<td>RIB 1912 = =</td>
<td>RIB 1912</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375</td>
<td>CIL III 88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL XIII 6502</td>
<td>CIL XIII 6592</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab. 1 Chronologically different attestations of the structures inside the forts.
CATALOGUE OF THE INSCRIPTIONS IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

Part 1: The emperor as a builder

1. AE 1958, 230
   Dating: AD 213
   Province: Dacia
   Location: Moigrad/Porolissum (RO)
   Imp(erator) Caes(ar) M(arcus) Aur(elius) Antoninus / Pius Aug(ustus) Felix / Part(h)i / cus maximus pontifex / maximus Brit(tanicus) / maximus trib(unicia) pot(estate) / XVI imp(erator) II co(n)s(ul) IIII p(atер) p(atriae) proco(n)s(ul) fecit

2. ILD 660 = AE 1944, 51
   Dating: AD 213
   Province: Dacia
   Location: Moigrad/Porolissum (RO)
   Imp(erator) Caes(ar) M(arcus) Aur(elius) Antoni / nus Pius Aug(ustus) Brit(tanicus) max(imus) trib(unicia) potes(tate) / XVI imp(erator) II co(n)s(ul) IIII p(atер) p(atriae) proco(n)s(ul) fecit

3. CIL VIII 8701 = D 6887
   Dating: AD 194
   Province: Mauretania Caesariensis
   Location: Mechtet Melloul / Castellum Dianense / Guellal (DZ)
   Imp(erator) Caesar M(arcus) / Aurelius Severus / Alexander [I]nvictus / Pius Felix Aug(ustus) muros / castell(i) Dianense per colonos eiusd / m kastelli / p(rovinciae) CLXXXXV

Part 2: Datable inscriptions. Legions

1. CIL III 953 = IDR-03-04, 230 = ILD 431 = AE 1944, +42 = AE 2000, 1258
   Dating: AD 138-128
   Province: Dacia
   Location: Hoghiz (RO)
   Imp(eratori) Caes(ari) divi Traian(i) Parthic(i) filio / divi / [Ner(ae) nep(oti) Traia(no) Hadria(no) Aug(usto) pontif(ici) m(aximo) / [trib(unicia) potes(tate)] — p(ater) p(atriae) vexillatio leg(ionis) XIII G(eminiae) sub Tib(erio) Cl(audio) / ?Constante ?proc(uratore) Aug(usti) pro leg(ato) ?(curam) a(gente) Antonini[ian[o ?c(enturione)]

2. RIB 2191 = RIGlasgow 22
   Dating: AD 139-143
   Province: Britannia
   Location: Balmuildy (GB)
   [Imp(eratori) Caesarii divi Traian(i) Naebiae] / [Dec(istis) equitum sub Cur(ato) Leg(ions) VI] / Q(uinto) Lollio Urbico / leg(ato) Aug(usti) pr(o) pr(aetore)

3. CIL VII 473 = RIB 1149 = AE 1947, 128
   Dating: AD 163
   Province: Britannia
   Location: Corbridge / Corstopitum (GB)

4. RIB 1137 = CSIR-GB-01-01, 59 = AE 1912, 199 = AE 1914, 188
   Dating: AD 162-166
   Province: Britannia
   Location: Corbridge / Corstopitum (GB)
   [Sol(us Invictus)] / vexillatio leg(ionis) VI Vic(tricia) P(iae) / Fidelis f(ecit) / sub cura Sex(ti) / Calpurni Agriclo / lae leg(ati) Aug(usti) pr(o) pr(aetore)

5. AE 1939, 213 = AE 1940, +143 = AE 1948, 218
   Dating: AD 198
   Province: Aegyptus
   Location: ?

Part 3: Datable inscriptions. Combined workforce of the legions and the auxilia

1. CIL III 6627 = CIL III 14147 = D 2483 = IGLAlexa 179 = Bosch 49 = AE 2001, 2048
   Dating: ante Antoninus Pius’ reign
   Province: Aegyptus
   Location: Mons Claudianus (ET)
   [Coh(ors) quarta] / [centuria] Longi / C(aius) Marcius
   Valerius C(aius) f(ilius) Pol(lia) Anc(yrarus) / [centuria]
   M(arci) Corneli / M(arci) Iulius M(arci) f(ilius) Pol(lia)
   Valerius C(aius) f(ilius) Pol(lia) Anc(yrarus) / [centuria]
   Lucius Domitius Aper / sum(ma) centuriones tres / f(iunt)
   Maximi / [centurio] C(aius) Iulius Montanus // [centurio]
   Her(odicus) / coh(ors) septima // Alarum trium dec(uriae)
   Hordiioni / C(aius) Romanius C(ai) f(ilius) Fab(ius)
   Maximus / [centuno] C(aius) Iulius Montanus / [centuno]
   L(ucius) Domitius Aper / sum(ma) centuriones tres / f(iunt)
   s(upra) s(criptae) coh(ors) septem / [centuriae]
   decem / eq(uites) unus et sexaginta mil(ites) septingenti
   octoginta et octo per eosdem qui supra scripti sunt / Apollonos Hydraeum(!) a(n-te)
   septimum K(alendas) Ianuar(ias) / compasi K(alentis)
   i uedonos / eq(uites) unus et sexaginta mil(ites) septingenti
   coh(ors) septem / [centuriae]
   8. CIL III 3653 = RIU-03, 771 = D 775 = AE 1999, 1264. c
   Dating: AD 370
   Province: Pannonia Superior
   Location: Esztergom/Brigitio (H)
   Iudicio principali dominorum nostrorum / Valentini
ekens et Gratiani / principum maximorum dispositione
etiam / illustris viri utriusque militiae magistri / equites
   comitis Foscanus praepositus / legionis primae martiorum
   una cum / militibus sibi creditis hunc burgum / cui nomen
   commercium qua cause et factus / est a fundamentis
   et construxit et / ad summam manum operis in diebus
   XXXVIII / consulatus / divi nostri Gratiani Augusti bis / et
   Probi viri clarissimi fecit pervenire

2. CIL III 14370,02 = CIL XIII 4 p 69 = D 5338 (p 185) =
   IBR 291 = AE 1899, 195
   Dating: AD 181
Province: Raetia
Location: Böhming (D)
Imp(eratori) Caes(ari) Luc(i)io Aur(elio) Antonin(n)
o / Aug(usto) [(Commodo)] Armeniaco
Parth(i)co / Germ(anico) Sarm(atico) trib(unica)
post(estate) VI co(n(uli)) III p(atri) p(atriae) / Spic(o) Ceri(e)ae
leg(ato) Aug(usti) pr(o) praetore vexillarii / leg(ionis)
III It(a)iae vi kullum fecerunt c(uram) a(gente)
l(itio) / l(ulino) c(enturione) leg(ionis) III It(a)iae item
portas cum / tumbr(ibus) III perfec(tas) ab Aelf(fo) Forte
[etc.]
[3. AE 1948, 214
Dating: AD 195
Province: Numidia
Location: Messad / Castellum Dimmidi (DZ)
Imp(eratori) Caes(ari) L(ucio) Septimio Severo Pio
Pertinaci Aug(usto) Arab(ico) Adiabenico Part(hico)
maximo p(atri) patriae pont(ifici) max(imo) trib(unica)
potestate VI / [imp(eratori) XI co(n(uli)) II procons(uli)
[etc.]
[4. CIL VIII 8797b = AE 1940, 141 = AE 1948, 215
Dating: AD 197
Province: Numidia
Location: ‘Ain el Msad, Mechta (DZ)
Imp(eratori) Caes(ari) L(ucio) Septimio Severo Pio
Pertinaci Aug(usto) Arab(ico) Adiabenico Part(hico)
maximo p(atri) patriae pont(ifici) max(imo) trib(unica)
potestate VI / [imp(eratori) XI co(n(uli)) II procons(uli)
[etc.]
[5. CIL VIII 3 = IRT 895
Dating: AD 222-235
Province: Africa Proconsularis
Location: Al Qaryah ash Sharqiyah, Gheriat el-Gharbia (LY)
Imp(eratori) Caes(ari) M(arco) Aurel(io) / Sev(er)
[etc.]
[3. IDR-02, 14 = ILD 51 = AE 1959, 309
Dating: AD 103-105
Province: Dacia
Location: Drobeta Turnu Severin / Drobeta (RO)
Imp(eratori) Caes(ar) di[vi] Nerva Traianus / [etc.]
[4. RIB 1340
Dating: AD 122-124
Province: Britannia
Location: Benwell / Condercum (GB)
Imp(eratori) Caes(ar) Traiano / Hadr[i]a(n)
Aug(usti) / A(ulo) Platorio Nepote leg(ato) Aug(usti) pr(o)
[etc.]

Part 4: Datable inscriptions. Auxilia

1. CIL VIII 21820 = ILM 43 = IAM-02-02, 821 = D 9175 =
IAM-S, 821 = AE 1891, 115 = AE 1966, 605
Dating: AD 41-99
Province: Mauretania Tingitana
Location: Ain Schkour / Volubilis (MA)
[etc.]
AE 2007, +105
Dating: AD 103-105
Province: Dacia
Location: Drobeta Turnu Severin/Drobeta (RO)
[etc.]
[3. RIB 1340
Dating: AD 122-124
Province: Britannia
Location: Benwell/Condercum (GB)
[etc.]
Dating: AD 136-138
Province: Britannia
Location: Carvoran/Magnis (GB)
(Centuria) Silvani / vallavit / p(edes) CXII sub / Flavi(vio)
Secundo / [praefecto]

6. Davies 1967
Dating: AD 122-142
Province: Britannia
Location: Carrawburgh/Brocolitia (GB)
Tvnr[gr] / fec

7. RIB 2155 = RGlasgow 18 = CSIR-GB-01-04, 80
Dating: AD 142
Province: Britannia
Location: Castlecary (GB)
Pio p(atri) p(atriae) / coh(ors) I / Tungro / rum fecit m iliaria)

8. RIB 2145 = D 9176 = AE 1904, 29
Dating: AD 142-143
Province: Britannia
Location: Rough Castle (GB)
Aug(usto) / [Pio] p(atri) p(atriae) / coh(ors) I / Ner[iorum]
pr[i] / [nc]pia fecit

9. RIB 1550 = AE 1947, 129
Dating: Hadrian’s reign
Province: Britannia
Location: Carrawburgh/Brocolitia (GB)
[ver]o leg(ato) / [Aug(usti) pr(o) p(rae)tor] coh(ors) / Aquit / [anorum]
feicit / [sub 3]io Nepote / [praefecto]

10. CIL VII 1041 = RIB 1276
Dating: AD 139-142
Province: Britannia
Location: High Rochester/Bremenium (GB)
Aug(usto) / Pio p(atri) p(atriae) / sub Q(uinto) Lol[l(o)
Urbico / leg(ato) Aug(usti) / pro prae( tore) / coh(ors) / Ling(onum) / eq(uitata) f(eicit)

11. AE 1906, 112
Dating: AD 143
Province: Dacia
Location: Gherla (RO)
[Imp(erator Caesari) divi] Hadriani fil(ius) / divi / [Traiani
P]artherc nepos divi / [Nerva pr]onepos Tit(us)
Ael[ius] / [Hadrianus Ant]oninu Aug(ustus)
[Pius] / [tribunica] potest(ate) / [coh]s(uli) III p(ater)
P(aetribalae) / [fecit per ala]m II Pannoniorum

12. CIL III 6025 (p 1213) = D 2615
Dating: AD 140-147
Province: Aegyptus
Location: Aswan/Syene (ET)
Imp(erator) Caesar(e) Tit[o] Aelio Hadriano / Ant(onio
Aug(usto) Pio p(atre) p(atribus) / coh(ors) I / Flavia] Cilicium
eq(uitata) basilicam fecit per / C(aium) Avidium Heliodorum
praefectum) / [Titum] Flavium Vergili(anum)
prefectum) castr(orum) / cura agentis Statilius Tauro
[centurione] leg(ionis) II Traiana F(ortis) / curatorem
coh(ortis) eiusdem

Dating: after AD 171-172
Province: Raetia
Location: Aalen (D)
Aug(usto) / Pontifici / [tribunicia] / [potestate]
[Imp(erator) Caesari] L(uicoc) / Aurelio Vero
Aug(usto) / [Armenia] to trib(unicia) pot(estate) III
[Imp]eratori Ill(ovi) / [coh]s(uli) II sub / cura Bai P[luden] / [bis
procuratoris] per ala]m II / Flam(aviam) M(illiarium) P(iam)

Dating: after AD 171-172
Province: Raetia
Location: Aalen (D)
co[n]i(n)si / II / [feci]t / [al(a)] / Fl/[lavia] M/[illiarium] P(inum)

15. AE 1989, 584 = AE 1995, +45
Dating: after AD 171-172
Province: Raetia
Location: Aalen (D)
/ L(ciuco) / VI / sub / / curs / praetor provinciae Raetiae

16. IMS-01, 116 = D 9176 = AE 1901, 24 = CIL III
14537
Dating: AD 179
Province: Moesia Superior
Location: Stojnik (SRB)
Vulus / dinarium / coh(ortis) II Aur(eliae) / novae
[i[liaria] equitatae] / c(ivium) / R(onorum)
T[itus] Bebenius / us / lustus / praef(ectus) / Imp(erator)
C[(ommodo)] / Il et Vero II co[n]is

17. CIL XIII 6542 (4, p 100)
Dating: end of Marcus Aurelius’ reign
Province: Germania Superior
Location: Öhningen/Vicus Aurelius (D)
Liberoru[mque] [3]/[3] eiuv[3]/[3] Ne(m(es)] P(ublio) Cor(nello)

18. CIL XIII 6543 (4, p 100)
Date: ending of Marcus Aurelius' reign
Province: Germania Superior
Location: Öhringen/Vicus Aurelius (D)

19. AE 1983, 730
Date: AD 187
Province: Raetia
Location: Ellingen (D)

20. CIL XIII 11757 = AE 1912, 00122
Date: AD 189
Province: Germania Superior
Location: Öhringen/Vicus Aurelius (D)

21. CIL XIII 1374 (p 1402) = IDR-03-03, 45 = AE 2004, +1208
Date: AD 193
Province: Dacia
Location: Vetel/Micia (RO)

22. AE 1975, 870
Date: AD 197
Province: Africa Proconsularis
Location: Remada/Tilibari (TN)

23. CIL XIII 8824 (4, p 145) = D 9178
Date: AD 197
Province: Germany Inferior
Location: Roomburg (NL)

Date: AD 198
Province: Africa Proconsularis
Location: Si Aoun/Praesidium (TN)

Date: AD 198-199
Province: Mauretania Caesariensis
Location: Taraess/Tatilti (DZ)

26. CIL III 1343 (p 1402) = IDR-03-03, 45 = AE 1972, +487
Date: AD 1978, +705
Province: Dacia
Location: Vetel/Micia (RO)
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27. CIL III 14485a = D 9179 = IDR-02, 174 = ILD 92 = AE 1987, 839
Dating: AD 201
Province: Dacia
Location: Bumbeşti-Jiu (RO)
Imp(erator) Caes(ar) L(ucius) Septimius Severus Pius
Pertinax Augustus Arab(icus) / Adiab(enicus) Part(hicus)
Antoninus Pius Felix Aug(ustus) trib(unicia) potestate
IMP(erator) XI et / IMP(erator) Caes(ar) M(arcus) Aur(elius)
Antoninus Pius Felix Aug(ustus) trib(unicia) potestate
III muros cesp(itios) / castro ru(m) coh(ortis) / A(ug)ulus
reliae Brittonia(m) Antoniniana(e) vetustate
dilapsos / lapide eos restituerunt per Octavium Iulianum legat(um) ipso / pr(o) pr(aetore)
28. CIL III 13800 = AE 1896, 62 = IDR-02, 496 = AE 1998, 40
Dating: AD 201
Province: Dacia
Location: ?
Antoninus Pius Felix Aug(ustus) trib(unicia) potestate
IMP(eratori) Caesari L(ucio) Septimio Severo Pio / Pertinaci et M(arco) Aurelius
Antoninus Pius Felix Aug(ustus) trib(unicia) potestate
XI et / IMP(eratori) Caesari M(arcus) Aurelius
Antoninus Pius Felix Aug(ustus) trib(unicia) potestate

29. IDR-02, 499 = ILD 130
Dating: AD 201
Province: Dacia
Location: Slăveni (RO)
[Imp(erator) Caes(ar) L(ucius) Sep(timius) Severus Pius]
[Septimio Severus Pius]
[Severo Pio]
IPM(erator) Caes(ar) L(ucius) Sep(timius) Severus Pius
Pertinax Augustus Arab(icus) Adiab(enicus) Part(hicus)
Parthicus max(imus) pontif(ico) trib(unicia) potestate
XI et / IMP(erator) XI et / IMP(erator) Caes(ar) M(arco) Aur(elius)
Antoninus Pius Felix Aug(ustus) trib(unicia) potestate
III muros cesp(itios) / castro ru(m) coh(ortis) / A(ug)ulus
reliae Brittonia(m) Antoniniana(e) vetustate
dilapsos / lapide eos restituerunt per Octavium Iulianum legat(um) ipso / pr(o) pr(aetore)
30. RIB 1234 = D 2618 = CSIR-GB-01-01, 295
Dating: AD 205/207
Province: Britannia
Location: Risingham / Habitancum (GB)
[Imp(eratoribus) Caes(aribus) L(ucio) / Sept(imio) Severo] / [Severo Pio]
Imp(eratoribus) Caes(aribus) L(ucio) / Sept(imio) Severo
Severo Pio / Pertinaci et M(arco) Aurelius
Antoninus Pius Felix Aug(ustus) trib(unicia) potestate
IMP(eratoribus) Caes(aribus) L(ucio) / Sept(imio) Severo
Severo Pio / Pertinaci et M(arco) Aurelius
Antoninus Pius Felix Aug(ustus) trib(unicia) potestate

31. CIL VII 269 = RIB 722 = CSIR-GB-01-03, 107 = AE 1967/70, 328
Dating: AD 205/207
Province: Britannia
Location: Aalen (D)
Imp(eratori) Caesari L(ucio) Septimio / Severo / Pio Pertinaci
Aurelius A(ntoninus) / Pio Felici Augusto et Publio
S[I] / [[[Getae nobilissimo Caesari]]] vallum cum / braccio caementicum [fest virtibus] / V Nervio[ru] m sub cura L(ucio) 

32. RIB 1909 = CSIR-GB-01-06, 267 = IDR-02, 496 = AE 1995, 40
Dating: AD 201
Province: Britannia
Location: Aalen (D)
Imp(eratori) Caesari L(ucio) / Pertinaci et M(arco) Aurelius
Antoninus Pius Felix Aug(ustus) trib(unicia) potestate
IMP(eratoribus) Caes(aribus) L(ucio) / Sept(imio) Severo
Severo Pio / Pertinaci et M(arco) Aurelius
Antoninus Pius Felix Aug(ustus) trib(unicia) potestate

Dating: AD 201
Province: Raetia
Location: Aalen (D)
[Imp(erator) Caesari L(ucio) / Pertinaci et M(arco) Aurelius]
Antoninus Pius Felix Aug(ustus) trib(unicia) potestate
IMP(eratori) Caesari L(ucio) / Pertinaci et M(arco) Aurelius
Antoninus Pius Felix Aug(ustus) trib(unicia) potestate

Dating: AD 201
Province: Raetia
Location: Aalen (D)
[Imp(eratori) Caesari L(ucio) / Pertinaci et M(arco) Aurelius]
Antoninus Pius Felix Aug(ustus) trib(unicia) potestate
IMP(eratori) Caesari L(ucio) / Pertinaci et M(arco) Aurelius
Antoninus Pius Felix Aug(ustus) trib(unicia) potestate
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max(imo) pont(fici) max(imo) / [trib(unicia) pot(estate) XVI co(n)s(uli) III] [imp(erator) XII] proco(n)s(uli) p(atri) p(atiae) et / [imp(eratori) Caes(ari) M(arco)] [Aurelio Anton[ino Pio Fel(ici)] / Aug(usto) trib(unicia) p(ot)estate] XI co(n)s(uli) III imp(eratori) II proco(n)s(uli) s(uli) et / [P(ublio) S(ertio) M(ilia)] / [Getae Caes(ari)] al(a) II Fl(avia) M(milliaria) p(ia) f(idelis) pr(ae) to[rii]m cum pr(incipii) ve[tustat]e / conlap[sis restituit sub cura 3] / A[Culiani c]larissimi vi(r) leg(ati) Augg(ustorum) pro praet(ore)]

Dating: AD 1989
Province: Raetia
Location: Aalen (D)

36. CIL VIII 22602 = CIL VIII 22603 = CIL VIII 22604 = D 5850 = AE 1892, 116 = AE 1893, 105
Dating: AD 197-211
Province: Mauritania Caesariensis
Location: Timziouin (DZ)

37. Kennedy 2000, 93
Dating: AD 2012/214
Province: Arabia
Location: Qasr el-Hallabat (HKJ)

38. CIL VII 1044 = CIL VII 1045 = RIB 1280 = AE 1938, 117
Dating: AD 220
Province: Britannia
Location: High Rochester/Bremenium (GB)

39. RIB 3027 = AE 1962, 258
Dating: AD 210-220 or 225-230?
Province: Britannia
Location: Reculver/Regulbium (GB)

40. IDR-03-03, 46 = AE 1903, 66
Dating: AD 222-235
Province: Dacia
Location: Vețel/Micia (RO)

41. CIL XIII 7612
Dating: AD 223/233-234
Province: Germany Superior
Location: Zugmantel (D)

42. CIL XIII 11758 = D 9179a (p 192) = AE 1912, 123
Dating: AD 231
Province: Germania Superior
Location: Öhringen/Vicus Aurelius (D)

43. CIL VII 1046 = RIB 1281 = CSIR-GB-01-01, 298
Dating: AD 235
Province: Britannia
Location: High Rochester/Bremenium (GB)
44. CIL VII 621 = RIB 1553
Dating: AD 237
Province: Britannia
Location: Carrawburgh/Brocolitia (GB)

Imp(erator) Caes(ar) M(arcus) Antonius Gordianus P(ius)
F(elix) Invictus / Aug(ustus) Germanicus Persicus maximus
pontifex / maximus tr(ibunicia) p(otestate) XII co(n)s(uli)
V(s) / P(ater) p(atriae) / praef(ectus) castra coh(ortis)
VIII fidae opportuno loco a solo instituit / operantibus fortissimis
militibus suis ex limi / te Tripolitano

45. RIB 1091 = D 2620
Dating: AD 238
Province: Britannia
Location: Lanchester/Longovicium (GB)

Im(perator) Caes(ar) M(arcus) Antonius Gordianus P(ius)
F(elix) Invictus / Aug(ustus) Germanicus Persicus maximus
pontifex / maximus tr(ibunicia) p(otestate) XII co(n)s(uli)
V(s) / P(ater) p(atriae) / praef(ectus) castra coh(ortis) / VIII fidae
opportunum loco a solo instituit / operantibus fortissimis
militibus suis ex limi / te Tripolitano

46. RIB 1092 = D 2621 = AE 1991, 1142
Dating: AD 238-244
Province: Britannia
Location: Lanchester/Longovicium (GB)

Imp(erator) Caes(ar) M(arcus) Antonius Gordianus P(ius)
F(elix) Invictus / Aug(ustus) Germanicus Persicus maximus
pontifex / maximus tr(ibunicia) p(otestate) XII co(n)s(uli)
V(s) / P(ater) p(atriae) / praef(ectus) castra coh(ortis) / VIII fidae
opportunum loco a solo instituit / operantibus fortissimis
militibus suis ex limi / te Tripolitano

47. CIL XIII 11759 = AE 1912, 124
Dating: AD 241
Province: Germania Superior
Location: Öhringen/Vicus Aurelius (D)

In(honorvm) Vicus Aurelius (D)
[In] h(ononem) d(omus) [d(ivino)] / [Nymphis
perennibus / aquam Gordianam / co(horti) / Septimiacum]
Belgarum) Gordi / a[nae]e multo tempor(e) / intrem
issam sub cu / r(a) [3]ani (c) / s(u)lar(is) / C(aius) lur(ius)
Roga[t(nus)] e[ius] / R(omanus) / praef(ectus) / co(hortis)
ves (V(milia)] D / CC[JC]CVII qu(um) s(alare) / in(st)u(it) 3 / in
præ[enturum(?) 3] / set(?) in balin[eum] de / c[icata pr(ide)]
Non(as) / Dec(embres) Impr(erator) d(omino) n(ostro)
Gor / di aug(usto) II et Po / mpeiano co(n)s(uli)

51. AE 1980, 960
Dating: AD 283-284
Province: Numidia
Location: Kherbet ouled Arif/Lambiridi (DZ)

Inv(ictissimis) dd(ominis) nn(ostris) Aurel(iis) C(arino et
Numeriano) / 3 Prospe(c[tu]) / praef(ositum) aeq(uitum!)
alae) p(rimae) P(ann(oniorum)] cum commilitonibus / et
ae(quitus) n(umeri) collati s(ula) pec(unia) fec(it) / sub
cura Pompeii / [3 M(arcus) Aurelius Dec(jim)u[s p(rae]s(es)
(p)rovinciae) N(umidiae)

52. RIB 1912 = IDRE-01, 240 = AE 1930, 114 = AE 1931, 82 = AE 1990, 665
Dating: AD 297-305
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Part 5: Datable inscriptions. Numeri

1. CIL III 13796 = D 9180 = IDR-02, 588 = ILD 152 = AE 1895, 65
   Dating: AD 140
   Province: Dacia
   Location: Racovița (RO)
   Imperator Caesare Tito Aelio Hadriano Antonino Aug(usto) Pio trib(unicia) potentat(ate) III co(n)s(ulatum) III / castra n(umerus) burg(ariorum) et vered(ariorum) quod angustae / tenderet duplicato valli pede et in / positae turribus ampliavit / per Aquilam Fidum proc(uratum) Aug(usti)

2. CIL XIII 6498
   Dating: AD 158
   Province: Germania Superior
   Location: Neckarburken (D)
   Fortunae Britto / nes Elantienses ba / lineum vetustate / con-labsum adiec / ta concha et cama / ris opere figlino res / tititis item vasis / novis positis iubente / Calpurnio Agricola / leg(ato)

Part 6: Undatable inscriptions. Auxilia

1. CIL XIII 7761 = Lehner 4 = AE 1899, 193 = AE 1900, +72 = AE 1937, 230
   Province: Germania Superior
   Location: Niederbieber (D)
   [I]n h(onorem) d(omos) d(ivinae) / in [3] n(umeri)

2. Schallmayer 1989, 36 fig. 21
   Province: Germania Superior
   Location: Baden-Baden / Aquae (D)
   coh(ors) XXVI / Vol(untariorum) c(ivium) R(omanorum) [f] ecit
Part 7: Undatable inscriptions. *Numeri*

1. CIL XIII 6502 = RSO 4
   Province: Germania Superior
   Location: Mudau (D)
   Fortunae sac(rum) / Brittones Trip(utienses) / qui sunt sub cura / T(itii) Mani T(itii) f(iliii) Pollia / Magni S(i) nope / [(centurionis) leg(ionis) XXII P(rimigeniae) P(iae)] F(idelis) o(pus) p(erfectum)

   2.1. Province: Germania Superior
   Location: Walldürn (D)

***Part 8: Architectus et lapidarius***

   Province: Umbria (Regio VI)
   Location: Lucrezia/Pisaurum (I)
   [C(aius) Cup[pi]enus C(ai) f(ilius) Pol(lia) / [Terminalis] praef(ectus) coh(ortis) III Bracarum [in Syri(a) Pa]l(aes[tina] praef(ectus) fab(rum) archi(tectus) / signum marmor(eum) ex v(oto) t(estam)ento] fieri / poniq(ue) iuss(it) / nomine suo et O(c[tavia] Pollae uxor(is) ex HS X / Octavia Cn(aei) fil[iae] Poll[i]a acc(epito) loc(i) d(ecretu) d(ecurionum) ex pec(unia) / sua sc(u=O)>l(m) mar(moribus) et lacu(nibus) ceteroq(ue) opere adormavit)

2. Lupa 8257
   Province: Germania Superior
   Location: Baden-Baden/Aquae (D)
   Minervae / Val(eriuse) Perimus / arc(hitectus) c(ohortis) et / Vittalis lapid[ari]us / idari(us) ex vot[t]o / et sui lapidarii

3. RIB 2091 = D 4718 = CSIR-Gb-01-04, 12
   Province: Britannia
   Location: Birrens/Blatobulgium (GB)
   Brigantiae s(acrum) Amandus / arch(h)itectus ex imperio imperat(um) [f(ecit)]

4. RIB 1542
   Province: Britannia
   Location: Carrawburgh/Brocolitia (GB)
   Minervae / Quin[t]us / arch(itectus) / v(otum) s(olvit) / lib(ens) m(erito)

5. CIL VII 1065 = RIB 2096 = D 4744 (p 183) = CSIR-GB-01-04, 13
   Province: Britannia
   Location: Birrens/Blatobulgium (GB)
   Deae / Harimel / lae sac(rum) Ga / midiahus / arc(h)itect(us) v(otum) s(olvit) l(ibens) l(aetus) m(erito)

6. CIL XII 186 = ILN-02-A, 21
   Province: Gallia Narbonensis
   Location: Antibes/Antipolis (F)
   Sex(tus) lul(ius) Cae[3] / arch(itectus) or[]

7. IDR-03-04, 133 = AE 1967, 401
   Province: Dacia
   Location: Critești (RO)
   Hermeros Lapidarius f(ecit)

8. CIL III 7895 = IDR-03-03, 6
   Province: Dacia
   Location: Călan/Aquae (RO)
   Diogenes / [l]apidarius

9. CIL III 1365 = IDR-03-03, 141 CIL III 1365 = IDR-03-03, 141
   Province: Dacia
   Location: Vețel/Micia (RO)
   Victoriae / Aug(ustae) et Geni / o colleg(i) / eiuss(/l) M(arcus) Coc / cei Luci / us lapidarius d(onum) d(edit)
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Who built the Roman forts?
Wer baute die römischen Militärlager?

Was die Errichtung der Lager betrifft, gewinnt man den Eindruck, dass dies größtenteils von Legionären bewerkstelligt wurde, obschon die meisten Argumente dafür auf den innerhalb der Hilfstruppenlager gefundenen Legionsziegelstempeln basieren. Viele Inschriften beweisen aber das Mitwirken einer großer Anzahl von Auxiliartruppen. Dieser Beitrag versucht, die Quellen zu skizzieren und die Bauinschriften der römischen Provinzen zusammenzustellen, um endgültig zu entscheiden, ob Auxiliartruppen nur als Assistenten fungieren.

Übersetzung: C. Bridger

Who built the Roman forts?

When dealing with the construction of forts, one gains the impression that this was a task generally carried out by legionaries, although most arguments for this are based upon legionary tile-stamps found within auxiliary forts. Many inscriptions, however, prove the involvement of a large number of auxiliary troops. This paper attempts to outline the sources and collate the building inscriptions of the Roman provinces, in order to decide conclusively whether the auxiliaries merely functioned as assistants.

Traduction: Y. Gautier