

H I S T O I R E



Sous la direction de  
Nathalie BARRANDON et François KIRBIHLER

Les gouverneurs  
et les provinciaux  
sous la République romaine



PRESSES UNIVERSITAIRES DE RENNES

## Provincial governors and auxiliary soldiers\*

Jonathan R. W. PRAG

It is a commonplace that provincial government under the Republic divides into three principal areas: military, judicial, and fiscal. Marcus Cicero, in a letter to his brother Quintus during his governorship of Asia Minor, begins by observing that Quintus is fortunate to be spared the first of these, and thereafter focuses most of his attention upon the other two.<sup>1</sup> In his prosecution of Verres, Cicero reserves the fifth and final speech of the second action for Verres' failure as a military commander of his province.<sup>2</sup> In his defences of M. Fonteius and L. Flaccus, their actions in relation to military forces are central considerations, confronted early on in both speeches.<sup>3</sup> Cicero's own governorship of Cilicia in 51/50 BC was likewise dominated by such matters.<sup>4</sup>

However, it is rather too easy to take this aspect of Republican imperial control for granted, without examining more closely how, in fact, it was carried out. In the examples cited above, Roman military forces (meaning legionaries) are either conspicuous by their absence, or else clearly inadequate to the task: Verres had none that we know of; they are not attested for Flaccus—or Quintus—in Asia; in the case of Fonteius, a garrison of two legions in Gallia Transalpina is generally assumed for this period, but not directly attested at the time of Fonteius himself; in Cilicia, Cicero commanded a severely depleted pair of legions that were wholly inadequate to his needs.<sup>5</sup> Already, at a much earlier stage in Roman provincial

---

\* I am grateful to Nathalie Barrandon and François Kirbihler for their invitation and hospitality; to the other participants at the conference for their valuable comments on the first version of this paper; and to Frederik Vervaeke for some typically precise observations. Some of the work for this paper was undertaken within the framework of the project directed by Dr E. García Ríaza, 'El Occidente romano durante la época republicana: modelos de integración de las comunidades indígenas' (HAR2008-02612).

1. Cicero, *Q. fr.*, I, 1, 4-5; cf. RICHARDSON J., "The Administration of Empire", CROOK J.A., LINTOTT A. and RAWSON E. (eds), *The Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. IX, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1994, p. 564-98, at p. 568.

2. Cicero, *2 Verr.*, V, 1; cf. *1 Verr.*, 13.

3. Cicero, *Flac.*, 27-33; *Font.*, 12-14.

4. See esp. Cicero, *Att.*, V, 18; V, 21; VI, 1; VI, 5; *Fam.*, XV, 1; XV, 2; XV, 4.

5. See e.g. BRUNT P.A., *Italian Manpower*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1987, p. 457-8 on Cicero and Cilicia (and esp. Cicero, *Fam.*, XV, 4 and *Att.*, V, 15, 1 "me nomen habere duarum legionum

government, the Senate had explored the possibilities of assigning (regular) *provinciae* without legionary forces—Sicily for one seems to have been without any such forces from at least the early second century and indeed may well have been so for much of the period between the first two Punic wars also, and there is little if any evidence for regular forces in, for example, Africa after 146 BC.<sup>6</sup> In part, this reflects the fallacy of attempting to draw up clear distinctions under the Republic between the “administration” of those regions that were regularly assigned as *provinciae* and those which were not<sup>7</sup>—a standing military force is neither necessary nor sufficient for the existence of a “province.” But it is also simply a consequence of the fact that other ways of maintaining military control were available to the Roman commander in the field; ways which, although little discussed in the modern literature are relatively widely attested in our ancient sources.

In the short study that follows, I shall approach this general subject by focusing on two particular topics which have received little attention to date: firstly the nature of provincial levies, that is levies conducted primarily in provinces by provincial governors; and secondly, evidence for local celebration of “Roman” military actions, both honours for commanders (including governors) and celebrations and rewards for the soldiers as a whole (including provincial auxiliaries).

## Provincial levies

There was of course no standing army under the Republic: soldiers, be they citizen legionaries, Latin and Italian *socii*, or *auxilia externa*, were levied at need, usually annually, although it is true that terms of service, especially overseas, became longer over the course of the Republic.<sup>8</sup> It is with the third of these categories, the *auxilia externa*, that this paper is concerned. During the last two centuries of the Roman Republic, the Roman state made use of troops from outside of Italy, i.e. from peoples who were not part of the Italian *socii ac nomen Latinum*. These soldiers can be classified under the semi-formal designation of *auxilia externa*, although the term is used with little regularity, and they are more usually described by our sources in diverse ways: typically by ethnic, e.g. “Aetolians,” and/

*exilium*”), and p. 465 on Fonteius (with the assertion that: “This *uir militaris* [...] must have had an army”).

6. For Sicily, PRAG J.R.W., “*Auxilia and gymnasia: A Sicilian Model of Roman Republican Imperialism*”, *JRS*, n° 97, 2007, p. 68-100, at p. 71-6; for Africa, BRUNT P.A., *op. cit.*, p. 451-2. Compare the important comments of KALLET-MARX R., *Hegemony to Empire*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1995, Part One, esp. p. 30-1 with reference to Macedonia. For the deliberate reduction of provincial forces in the early second century, see Livy, XXXI, 8, 8; XXXII, 1, 5; XXXII, 8, 5-8; XXXII, 28, 11; XXXIII, 26, 3-5; XLIII, 9, 1-3.

7. See the aposite remarks of RICHARDSON J., *op. cit.*, p. 564 and KALLET-MARX R., *op. cit.*, p. 11-29 on the essential absence of the concept of an organized province.

8. See BRUNT P. A., *op. cit.*, p. 391-415, 625-34.

or type of soldier, e.g. *funditores*.<sup>9</sup> Frequently their presence can only be inferred, or guessed at. The evidence exists to suggest that the use of these troops was extensive, but their existence is rarely acknowledged in modern discussions of the Roman army, and there is to date no systematic collection or analysis of the material as a whole.<sup>10</sup> Polybius makes no mention of them in his naturally Romano- and Italo-centric account of the levy, although he does note in his description of the typical Roman camp that: “Finally the spaces remaining empty to right and left next the *agger* on each side of the camp are assigned to foreign troops and allies who reinforce them at the appropriate time.”<sup>11</sup> In his prosecution of Verres, Cicero suggests that the model of the levy as applied to the Italian allies was likewise employed across the provinces:

“All expenditure on the [Sicilian] fleet, for grain, pay and everything else, each city has always entrusted to its own navarch, as a matter of habit. [...] This was done, as I say, repeatedly and always, not only in Sicily, but in all the provinces, and likewise for the pay and expenses of the allies and Latins, at the time when we were accustomed to employ *auxilia* from them.”<sup>12</sup>

Exactly the same model for levying naval forces, or extorting money in their place, was employed by Flaccus in Asia in the late 60s BC; Plutarch records M. Crassus doing something similar in Syria with land forces at the start of his Parthian campaign in 53 BC.<sup>13</sup>

However, we can refine this model somewhat, and identify several different categories of levy in relation to such *auxilia*. Firstly—and this goes hand-in-hand with the lack of Roman or Italian troops in regions outside Italy—tumultuary levies are widely attested in the provinces, in the face of

9. The key texts are: Festus, 16 L: “*Auxiliares dicuntur in bello socii Romanorum exterarum nationum [...]*”; Varro, *Ling.* V, 90: “*Auxilium appellatum ab auctu, cum accesserant ei qui adiumento essent alienigenae*”; Livy, XXII, 37, 7-8 (a view attributed to Hieron II in early 216 BC): “*Milite atque equite scire nisi Romano Latinique nominis non uti populum Romanum; leuium armorum auxilia etiam externa uidisse in castris Romanis; itaque misisse mille sagittariorum ac funditorum, aptam manum aduersus Baliares ac Mauros pugnacesque alias missili telo gentes.*”

10. I am currently preparing a monograph on *auxilia externa* in the Republic. In the existing literature, in addition to PRAG J.R.W., *op. cit.*, note: AFZELIUS A., *Die römische Kriegsmacht während der Auseinandersetzung mit den hellenistischen Grossmächten*, Copenhagen, Aarhus University, 1944, p. 90-8 who reviews the Livian evidence for 200-167 BC; HAMDOUNE C., *Les auxilia externa africains des armées romaines, III<sup>e</sup> siècle av. J.-C.-IV<sup>e</sup> siècle ap. J.-C.*, Montpellier, université Paul-Valéry Montpellier III, 1999, p. 7-104, who discusses the Numidian evidence in detail; CADIOU F., *Hibera in terra miles. Les armées romaines et la conquête de l’Hispanie sous la République (218-45 av. J.-C.)*, Madrid, Casa de Velázquez, 2008, p. 611-84, who discusses the Spanish evidence in detail; McCALL J.B., *The Cavalry of the Roman Republic*, London, Routledge, 2002, p. 100-13, on cavalry auxiliaries. The best overviews of Republican auxiliaries can be found in CHEESMAN G.L., *The Auxilia of the Roman Imperial Army*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1914, p. 7-11, and ILARI V., *Gli Italici nelle strutture militari romane*, Milan, Giuffrè, 1974, p. 25, n. 1. By contrast, HARMAND J., *L’Armée et le Soldat à Rome de 107 à 50 avant notre ère*, Paris, A. J. Picard et Cie, 1967, p. 41-51 largely repeats the misleading generalizations of Passerini, Marquardt, and others.

11. Polybius, VI, 31, 9.

12. Cicero, 2 *Verr.*, V, 60.

13. Cicero, *Flac.*, 27; Plutarch, *Crass.*, 17, 9.

military emergency.<sup>14</sup> Secondly, we see deliberate, one-off levies for specific campaigns. Arguably this second category has less to do with “provincial government,” and is more usefully considered in terms of Roman campaigning overseas (i.e. “big war”); this interpretation is suggested by the number of times we learn of a specific *Senatus consultum* authorizing a commander to undertake such a levy in order to supplement his forces for a specific campaign. The most famous example is that of Scipio Aemilianus recruiting for Numantia in 134 BC, but there are many other instances throughout the period.<sup>15</sup> It does not of course follow that such an *SC* preceded every levy, although strictly speaking the argument from silence cannot be used to insist upon this point (i.e. the fact that we know of non-tumultuary levies for which no *SC* is attested).<sup>16</sup> More significant is the *SC* of 171 BC directing Greek communities not to respond to demands from Roman commanders in the field, except in response to an explicit *SC*—such a measure both suggests that the practice was widespread, and that it regularly took place without explicit senatorial authority.<sup>17</sup> Of course, the dividing line between requests for troops consequent upon an emergency or a pre-planned action will often (and conveniently for the Roman commander) have been unclear. Thirdly, we find smaller scale, more regular defence forces. The naval levies referred to in the previous paragraph could be placed in this category: the levies in Sicily and Asia seem to have been repeated over a number of years, and both provinces show signs of the existence of squadrons protecting the coastlines (forerunners perhaps of the later provincial fleets?).<sup>18</sup> Needless to say, naval forces require some degree of regular maintenance and organization if they

- 
14. Appian, *Ib.*, 38, 156 (205 BC); Livy, XXXV, 23, 3-9 (192 BC), cf. XXXVII, 2, 8 (190 BC); XXXVII, 57, 5-6 (189 BC); XXXIX, 30, 7 (185 BC); XL, 30, 2 (181 BC); XLI, 5, 9-10 (178 BC); *Per.*, 1 (150 BC) cf. Zonar. 9.28; Diodorus Siculus, *BH*, XXXIV/XXXV, 2, 18 (c. 135 BC); XXXVI, 3-4 (104 BC); Appian, *Mithr.*, 11, 17 (89 BC); Velleius Paterculus, II, 42, 1-3 (75 BC); Caesar, *BG*, I, 7 (58 BC); *BG*, III, 20 (56 BC); *BG*, V, 1 (55/54 BC).
15. Livy, XXVII, 38, 9-12 (207 BC); XXXV, 2, 7-9 (193 BC); XXXVI, 1, 8 and 36, 4 (191 BC); XLI, 5, 5 (178 BC); XLII, 35, 4-6 (171 BC); Polybius, XXXIII, 11, 6-7 (154 BC); Appian, *Ib.*, 44, 182 (153 BC); *Lib.*, 112, 534 (147 BC); *Ib.*, 84, 365 (134 BC); Sallust, *BJ*, 43, 4 (109 BC); *BJ*, 84, 2-3 (108/7 BC); Diodorus Siculus, XXXVI, 3, 1 (104 BC); Appian, *Mithr.*, 94, 429 (67 BC); Cicero, *Flac.*, 27 (63 BC); *Fam.*, XV, 1, 5, XV, 4 (51 BC); Appian, *BC*, II, 34, 134 (49 BC).
16. E.g. Livy, XXXIV, 20, 2-3 (Spain 195 BC); Appian, *BC*, II, 8, 27 and Plutarch, *Caes.*, 12, 1 for Caesar in Spain in 61 BC; also the cases of Verres, Flaccus, and Crassus cited previously. There is no evidence of such an *SC* for the campaign against Aristonicus in 131 BC, but there is plentiful epigraphic evidence for local recruitment during that campaign (collected in PRAG J.R.W., *op. cit.*, p. 84).
17. Livy, XLIII, 17, 2; Polybius, XXVIII, 13, 11; XXVIII, 16, 1.
18. Cicero, *Flac.*, 32 for two squadrons, protecting respectively the coast north and south of Ephesus, cf. Cicero, *2Verr.*, I, 86-90 for a squadron of ten ships built by Miletus as part of a *classis populi Romani*; there were ten ships raised from local communities in eastern Sicily (Cicero, *2Verr.*, V, 63), and one could speculate that a comparable squadron existed in the west (cf. PRAG J.R.W., *op. cit.*, p. 80-1, and PINZONE A., “I socii navales siciliani”, CACCAMO CALTABIANO M., CAMPAGNA L. and PINZONE A. (eds), *Nuove prospettive della ricerca sulla Sicilia del III sec. a.C. Archeologia, Numismatica, Storia*, Messina, Di.Sc.A.M., 2004, p. 11-34, at p. 20-4). For provincial fleets in the Empire, SADDINGTON D.B., “The Origin and Character of the Provincial Fleets of the Early Roman Empire”, MAXFIELD V.A. and DOBSON M.J. (eds), *Roman Frontier Studies 1989*, Exeter, University of Exeter Press, 1991, p. 397-9.

are to be in any way viable or effective. Certainly to be placed in this third category is the evidence for small, regularly maintained garrison forces found in several provinces. Some of these are (or became) at least partly honorific in character, while others are certainly temporary; but others again appear to be more permanent in nature—here it seems we do come close to some sort of standing force, and it is not “Roman.”<sup>19</sup>

Confirmation of such an approach to imperial control in the provinces can be detected in several elements of Roman organization of their hegemony. Roman concern to safeguard Italian recruitment is demonstrated in the terms of the treaty with Carthage of 241 BC, which prohibited Carthage from recruiting mercenaries from within Italy.<sup>20</sup> However, such concern with potential recruitment is not restricted to Italy: in Livy’s account of the terms of the Treaty of Apamea of 188 BC we find the explicit prohibition that: “King Antiochus shall not be authorized to hire soldiers from those peoples which are under the control of the Roman people, nor even to accept volunteers therefrom.”<sup>21</sup> Italian recruitment in the second century was organized through the *formula togatorum*, the development of which is usually thought to coincide with the catalogues of manpower requested for the tumultuary levy of 225 BC and famously reported by Polybius.<sup>22</sup> It is undeniable that the *socii ac nomen Latinum* were increasingly clearly distinguished from the *exterae nationes* in the second century in various ways.<sup>23</sup> However, it should be noted that the only explicit reference which we possess to the *formula togatorum* is that which is to be found in the epigraphic *lex agraria* of 111 BC, which states: “whichever Roman citizen or ally or member of the Latin name, from whom they [sc. the Romans] are accustomed to demand troops in the land of Italy, according to the *formula togatorum*.”<sup>24</sup> Beyond this text there are three passages of Livy which refer

19. Diodorus Siculus, IV, 83, 7 (cf. Cicero, 2*Verr.*, V, 124; *CIL*, X, 7258; *IG*, XIV, 355; *IG*, XIV, 282) for a garrison of 200 at Eryx in Sicily; other garrisons in Sicily: Cicero, 2*Verr.*, V, 51; 87; 133; auxiliaries used for temporary garrison duty, e.g. *OGIS*, 443 = *IGRR*, IV, 196 = *I.Ilion*, n° 73 (Ilion, 80/79 BC); regular garrisoning of Macedonia by auxiliaries: Livy, XLV, 29, 14 and cf. XLV, 30, 7; Polybius, XXXI, 8, 9; *SIG<sup>2</sup>*, 700; Cicero, *Pis.*, 84.

20. Polybius, III, 27, 4; Appian, *Sic.*, 2, 4.

21. Livy, XXXVIII, 38, 10: “*Milites mercede conducendi ex iis gentibus quae sub ditione populi Romani sunt Antiocho regi ius ne esto, ne uoluntarios quidem recipiendi.*”

22. Polybius, II, 23, 9-24, 16 for the *tumultus* of 225 BC. On the *formula togatorum* see especially BRUNT P.A., *op. cit.*, p. 545-8; ILARI V., *op. cit.*, p. 57-85; LO CASCIO E., “I *togati* della ‘formula togatorum’”, *Annali dell’Istituto Italiano per gli studi storici*, n° 12, 1991-1994, p. 309-28 (p. 325 on 225 BC).

23. See e.g. the formulation of the *lex repetundarum* of 123/2 BC, CRAWFORD M.H., *Roman Statutes*, London, 1996, I, n° 1, line 1: “... *quoi socium no]minisue Latini exterarumue in nationum quouie in arbitratu ditione potestate amicitia[ue populi Romani...*” (“... from whomever of the allies] or of the Latin name or of the foreign nations, or from whomever within the discretion, sway, power or friendship [of the Roman people...]”). On the Italian allies in the second century, see BISPHAM E., *From Asculum to Actium*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2007, p. 113-60.

24. CRAWFORD M.H., *op. cit.*, I, n° 2, lines 21 and 50: “*quei cetius Romanus sociumue nominisue Latini, quibus ex formula togatorum milites in terra Italia inperare solent*” (both lines are damaged, but the text is fully restorable between the two).

to the levying of soldiers from the *socii ac nomen Latinum* explicitly *ex formula*, and a fourth which employs closely parallel language.<sup>25</sup> As E. Lo Cascio noted in a discussion of the significance of the term *togatus*, the *lex agraria* text contains the additional qualification “*in terra Italia*,” and unless the *formula togatorum* also included *socii* outside of Italy, then arguably such a phrase appears redundant.<sup>26</sup> Scholars, including E. Lo Cascio, have however been reluctant to explore this apparent redundancy. I do not wish to deny what seems to be undeniable, namely that the regular practice of recruitment in the second century involved distinct and regular recruitment from the specifically Italian allies as standard, alongside citizen legionary recruitment, and that such recruitment was conducted in accordance with whatever precisely was denoted by the *formula togatorum*. However, E. Lo Cascio’s suggested explanation of the term *togatus*, together with the passage from Cicero’s *Verrines* quoted above, opens additional possibilities. E. Lo Cascio offers the plausible explanation that the term *togatus* signifies those of an age to perform military service (i.e. wearing the gown of manhood) and not currently performing military service (i.e. wearing civilian dress). In other words, it has the generic meaning of “those available for military service” (the point being that it must be extendable to all Italians, including the Italiotes, contrary to what, e.g., Mommsen believed).<sup>27</sup> If this is accepted, then there is in fact little to hinder a broader application of the *formula togatorum*, at least in principle, to all Roman recruitment, and it would be perfectly in line with the widely attested practice of local recruitment overseas by the Romans, already alluded to above. Such parallelism is explicitly asserted in the above-quoted passage of Cicero: “This was done, as I say, repeatedly and always, not only in Sicily, but in all the provinces, and likewise for the pay and expenses of the allies and Latins, at the time when we were accustomed to employ *auxilia* from them.” On this interpretation, it is the chronological priority, scale, and annual regularity of Italian recruitment, in contrast to the less regular, often smaller scale, local service for local campaigns overseas of the *externae nationes*, which is responsible for the evolved situation with which we are familiar from the second century BC, where *formula togatorum* is used customarily in relation to the Italians and the Italians constitute a standard 50% (or more) of the Roman field army.

As E. Lo Cascio went on to note, this would mean that what was of interest to Rome was, precisely, a list of those available to bear arms in any particular community, which in turn entails the need for a system of

25. Livy, XXII, 57, 10 (216 BC); XXVII, 10, 2-3 (209 BC); XXIX, 15, 6 and 12-13 (204 BC); XXXIV, 56, 5-6 (193 BC, this last without explicit mention of a *formula*).

26. LO CASCIO E., *op. cit.*, p. 315; cf. BISPHAM E., *op. cit.*, p. 61-2, 114. It is worth at this point recalling MOMMSEN’s comments about the significance and application of the term *socius*, in MOMMSEN T., *Droit public romain*, Paris, E. Thorin, 1889, VI, 2, p. 285-90.

27. LO CASCIO E., *op. cit.*, p. 322-3.

local census. In this context it is worth noting the existence of local civic census in some of the provinces, attested in the case of Sicily and Bithynia. Although this is only explicitly mentioned in relation to taxation, given that one of the primary functions of a census for any community is detailing available manpower, it is perhaps legitimate to speculate over whether the known existence of local censuses in some provinces served to provide the basis for local recruitment. In the case of Sicily at least, it was island-wide and to some extent supervised by the governing Roman magistrate. However, it must be acknowledged that there is no explicit mention of this aspect in any of the surviving references to Republican-era local censuses.<sup>28</sup>

Roman concern for local recruiting in the provinces is furthermore explicitly attested to both by the existence of requirements to provide troops and by exemptions from such provision. It is a repeated feature of Roman settlements with Iberian communities in the first half of the second century BC that they are obliged to provide troops; subsequently, we see some Spanish communities gaining exemptions from this from the Senate.<sup>29</sup> Already in the late third century the Sicilian city of Tauromenium obtained a clause in its treaty with Rome that exempted it from providing soldiers (the unavoidable implication being that such demands were expected); and in the first century their treaty contained an exemption from providing a ship, in contrast to that of Messana which formally required a ship from the city.<sup>30</sup> The provision of ships is attested from a variety of communities across the Mediterranean, as well as southern Italy, in the second century.<sup>31</sup> It should further be noted that the principle of supplementary provincial recruiting came to be extended to Romans resident in the provinces, not just from colonies, but also those resident individually.<sup>32</sup> In part this reflects a natural preference for veteran troops over untried local forces: the negative ideological discourse regarding such foreign troops is widespread in our

28. For Sicily, see Cicero, *2 Verr.*, II, 131-139; Bithynia-Pontus, Pliny the Younger, *Ep.*, X, 79-80 and 112-115. On the local census in the provinces (but without reference to military contributions), see MARQUARDT J., *De l'organisation financière chez les Romains*, Paris, Ernest Thorin, 1888, p. 235-7, 273; LE TEUFF B., "Les recensements dans les provinces de la République romaine: aux origines de la réforme augustéenne", BARRANDON N. and KIRBHILER F. (dir.), *Administrer les provinces de la République romaine*, Rennes, Presses universitaires de Rennes, 2010, p. 195-215, esp. 200-210 on Sicily, Bithynia-Pontus, and Asia. MOMMSEN Th., *op. cit.*, IV, p. 81-2 for the general point concerning the direct relevance of the census to military service.

29. Livy XL, 34, 9; XL, 47, 10; Appian, *Ib.*, 48, 201; 52, 218. Obligation and subsequent exemption in Appian, *Ib.*, 44, 182-3.

30. Appian, *Sic.*, 5; Cicero, *2 Verr.*, V, 50. MOMMSEN denied that such exemptions from military service on land existed (in contrast to naval exemptions), as part of an account which, like almost all those who have followed him, minimized the extent of non-Italian service in Rome's armies (MOMMSEN Th., *op. cit.*, VI, 2, p. 306 n. 2).

31. E.g. Livy, XXXVI, 42, 1; XLII, 48, 7.

32. Livy, XLI, 5, 9-10 and Caesar, *BG*, III, 20 for Gallic colonies (also *BG*, VII, 65 for *euocati* in Transalpinga); Cicero, *Att.*, V, 18, 2; *Fam.*, XV, 1, 5 in Cilicia in 51 BC (cf. BRUNT P. A., *op. cit.*, p. 227-33). Compare the Italian resistance on Delos in 88 BC, Athenaeus, V, 214d-215b; and Sallust, *BJ*, 21, 26 and 47 for resident *togati* / *Italici* in the Jugurthine war.



sources, both in relation to loyalty and effectiveness. In part it must also reflect the wider general practice of using *auxilia* and of local recruitment.<sup>33</sup>

## Provincial celebration

All of the above has significant implications for the relationship between Roman officials and provincials, since in this regard the provincial governor occupies a role equivalent to that of the consul at Rome, both overseeing recruitment and leading the subsequent campaign.<sup>34</sup> One should not assume this always to be a negative relationship, either: there are examples of magistrates being unpopular for not undertaking a levy, and local disarmament was rarely popular nor always carried through.<sup>35</sup> Local militarism hardly disappeared with the advent of Roman rule, and military service doubtless provided not only an important outlet for such elements in society, but also a valuable potential means of integration and incorporation.<sup>36</sup>

Aspects of this relationship can be seen in the honours set up for provincial governors and their subordinates. Honorifics are frequently erected by soldiers, or their communities, in honour of their immediate commander—most often a native commander, although reference to the overall Roman authority is sometimes included.<sup>37</sup> Roman *legati*, or other junior officers, are sometimes directly honoured in this way, as the commanders in the field of such troops.<sup>38</sup> Strikingly, so far as I am aware, we lack examples of direct honours of this sort for a senior Roman magistrate; this may be no more than a function of our (lack of) evidence, or else it may reflect soldiers' or citizens' concern with honouring their immediate commanding officer rather than the more remote overall commander.<sup>39</sup>

33. Some negative assessments of *auxilia*: Livy, XLIV, 20, 6; Appian, *Ib.*, 48, 201-203; Memnon, *FGrHist*, 434, F22, 6-8; Appian, *Mithr.*, 19, 74-5; Frontinus, *Strat.*, II, 7, 3; II, 7, 8; Cicero, *Fam.*, XV, 1, 5; *Att.*, V, 18, 2; VI, 5, 3; Caesar, *BG*, III, 20.

34. See already the consideration of provincial auxiliaries specifically in relation to the model of *clientela* in YOSHIMURA T., "Die Auxiliartuppen und die Provinzialklientel in der römischen Republik", *Historia*, n° 10, 1961, p. 473-95. YOSHIMURA aimed to expand on a perceived omission in the classic account of BADIEN E., *Foreign Clientelae*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1958 (in which see esp. p. 39 and 272).

35. Anger of those in Narbonensis at blocking of the levy, Dio Cassius, XXXVI, 37, 2. Displeasure at disarmament: Livy, XXXIV, 17, 5-12; XXXIX, 2, 1-2; 3, 1-3; 54, 3; XL, 16, 6; 41, 5; Caesar, *BG*, II, 32.

36. For the continuance of local militarism in the Greek East, see MA J., "Fighting *poieis* of the Hellenistic World", VAN WEES H. (ed.), *War and Violence in Ancient Greece*, Swansea, The Classical Press of Wales, 2000, p. 337-76; for the example of Republican Sicily see further below, and PRAG J.R.W., *op cit.*, esp. p. 96-9.

37. E.g. *Syll.*<sup>3</sup>, 744; *SEG*, XV, 254; XLIV, 867. For a preliminary examination of Republican auxiliary command structures, see PRAG J.R.W., "Troops and commanders: *auxilia externa* under the Roman Republic", *ἄριος—Quaderni di Storia Antica*, n.s. 2, 2010, p. 1-11.

38. E.g. *I.Délos*, 1855-1858; *SEG*, XXXVII, 760.

39. Cf. FERRARY J.-L., "De l'évergétisme hellénistique à l'évergétisme romain", CHRISTOL M. and MASSON O. (eds), *Actes du X<sup>e</sup> congrès international d'épigraphie grecque et latine, Nîmes, 4-9 octobre 1992*, Paris, Publications de la Sorbonne, 1997, p. 199-225, at p. 207 (after Habicht) for the point

It is equally possible that some of the honorifics for provincial governors which we do possess were put up as a consequence of such actions, but without explicit mention of the reason in the inscription itself.<sup>40</sup> Provincial magistrates do however become the target of local anger in the face of military failure.<sup>41</sup> By contrast, it is usually the senior magistrate in a *provincia* who is honoured when a community is relieved from the burden of providing troops.<sup>42</sup> This sort of honour is familiar, reflecting the power of the Roman governor to confer, protect, deny, or ignore privileges for local communities. Such honours should be linked to the rise of provincial patronage, and the reciprocal relationships that evolve between provincial communities and provincial authorities in the granting of privileges and patronage and the expectation of honours and support (not least with reference to the *repetundae* court, which became the primary forum for claims against magistrates in this and other areas of activity).<sup>43</sup>

Magistrates can also exploit and develop these relationships themselves, above all with individuals from the local élite, and most obviously through the provision of rewards for service. Rewards take two main forms: material rewards, and the granting of Roman citizenship. The latter has generally received greater attention, not least in the discussion of provincial *clientelae*, and it is on the former that I shall concentrate here, as being less studied and reflecting a more immediate relationship between governor and provincials, commander and soldiers.<sup>44</sup> Material rewards for provincial auxiliaries present

---

that honours in this period were commonly linked not to the person/rank but to the individual's actions regarding the place in question.

40. As exemplified by the honours for M. Minucius Rufus, cos. 110 and proconsular governor of Macedonia 109-106 BC, which reflect his military victories in Thrace: *BE*, 1934, p. 230 (Europus) and *Syll.*<sup>3</sup>, 710 (Delphi); the "inscriptions" (plural) from Demetrias, which are repeatedly cited in the modern literature as *IG*, IX, 2, 1135; *BE*, 1954, 136a; and *BE* 1955, 152 (e.g. BROUGHTON T.R.S., *Magistrates of the Roman Republic*, Atlanta, American Philological Association, III, 1986, p. 144), and which are said to be more examples of the same, are in fact a single fragmentary epigram (*IG*, IX, 2, 1135) for an unknown individual which includes the words ἐξέβηλες Γαλάταν, and which J. and L. ROBERT subsequently noted could hypothetically apply to Minucius (comments in *BE* 1954, 136a; 1955, 152).
41. E.g. Livy, *Per. Oxy.*, LIV (Q. Servilius Caepio threatened in Spain, 139 BC); Sallust, *Cat.*, 19, 3 (Cn. Calpurnius Piso killed in Spain, 64 BC; cf. Asconius, 92C; Dio Cassius, XXXVI, 44, 5); compare Cicero, *2Verr.*, V, 100-101 (Verres' discomfort in Syracuse after a pirate victory, 71 BC).
42. E.g. *Syll.*<sup>3</sup>, 700 (Lete in Macedonia honours M. Annii for protecting the region without levying further troops, 119 BC); *SEG*, XLVI, 1565 (Alexandria Troas honours Pompeius Magnus, late 60s BC); FERRARY J.-L., "Les inscriptions du sanctuaire de Claros en l'honneur de Romains", *BCH*, n° 124, 2000, p. 331-76, at p. 351-4, notes that the honours for Q. Cicero set up by the city of Colophon were most likely inspired partly by his exemption of the cities of Asia from naval contributions (Cicero, *Flac.* 33; cf. *Q. fr.*, I, 1, 26).
43. On this theme, see especially FERRARY J.-L., *De l'évergétisme*, *op. cit.*, p. 209-11.
44. On the reward of citizenship see Cicero, *Balb.*, *passim* and esp. 5-6, 22-4, 26, and the list of individuals at 50-51. Compare the material collected in O'BRIEN-MOORE A., "M. Tullius Cratippus, Priest of Rome", *YCS*, n° 8, 1942, p. 25-49 at 38-49 and in BADIEN E., *op. cit.*, p. 302-8; KNAPP R.C., "Provincial prosopography in the West", *AncSoc*, n° 9, 1978, p. 187-222 takes the approach to its extreme. The *Asculum* inscription of Cn. Pompeius Strabo is the best-known example, albeit from the potentially atypical context of the Social War: *ILLRP*, 515; CRINITI N., *L'Epigrafe di Asculum di Gn. Pompeo Strabone*, Milan, Vita e Pensiero, 1970.

an interesting contrast with the *socii ac nomen Latinum* of Italy. The latter participated in triumphs in Rome and received a share, usually an equal share with citizen legionaries, of the booty.<sup>45</sup> Provincial *auxilia externa* on the other hand are almost never attested as participating in a triumph at Rome—indeed, the only certain exception would seem to be the three Epirote charioteers who participated in the campaign against Aristonicus at the end of the 130s BC in Asia, and who “having conquered him with the spear, | they led him to Rome, these men sprung from the Bouchetioi | and from long-native Oxylos.”<sup>46</sup> The one other partial exception, the *SC de Asclepiade* of 78 BC, whose three honorands were clearly present in Rome at the time of the decree and were permitted to sacrifice on the Capitolium, illustrates why this should be so: the majority of the rewards granted to the three Greek naval captains for their service in the “Italic war” relate to their property and juridical status at home; for non-citizen soldiers, resident in the provinces, local material and juridical rewards are of much more immediate benefit.<sup>47</sup>

The general dynamic is even more clearly illustrated by the highly unusual case of T. Albucius, governor of Sardinia *c.* 106 BC.<sup>48</sup> Albucius triumphed in his province, after a campaign conducted wholly with local auxiliaries (although one should perhaps allow for a little Ciceronian exaggeration), and was subsequently refused a *supplicatio* by the Senate back in Rome.<sup>49</sup> It is important to be clear about the sequence of events in this case (i.e. that the provincial “triumph” preceded the refusal of a *supplicatio*) because this enables one to see that the motivation for the local triumph was not the failure to triumph in Rome, but a desire—or need—to triumph with the local troops.<sup>50</sup> Attestations of such provincial

45. On Italian participation see ILARI V., *op. cit.*, 140–42, and PFEILSCHIFTER R., “The Allies in the Republican Army and the Romanization of Italy”, ROTH R. E. and KELLER J. (eds), *Roman by Integration: dimensions of group identity in material culture and text*, Portsmouth RI, *JRA Suppl.*, n° 66, 2007, p. 27–42, at 31 and 36–8.

46. *SEG*, XXXVI, 555, lines 9–11: ὄν κρατήσαντες δορί | Ῥώμην ἄγουσιν οἶδε Βουχετίων ἄπο, | βλαστόντες Ὀξ[ύλ]ου τε τοῦ παλαιχθονος (with the correction of MERKELBACH R., “Epirotische Hilfstruppen im Krieg der Römer gegen Aristonicos”, *ZPE*, n° 87, 1991, p. 132, who capitalizes the word Ῥώμην); see further *ISE*, III, n° 147.

47. *IGUR*, n° 1; see the comments of SHERK R.K., *Roman Documents from the Greek East*, Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1969, p. 131 and 154 n. 14 on the potential numbers of such local beneficiaries of this sort of reward and the local resentment this could incur.

48. The date of Albucius’ governorship is uncertain, but Cn. Pompeius Strabo’s quaestorship in his service is most probably to be placed in 106 BC (see esp. BADIAN E., “Three Non-Trials in Cicero”, *Klio*, n° 66, 1984, p. 291–309 at 306–9). BRENNAN T.C., *The Praetorship in the Roman Republic*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2000, II, p. 476 is certain that Albucius was there for more than one year (probably 107–106 BC), although he offers no explanation—the assertion is presumably a deduction from Cicero’s (very) unusual use of “*propraetore*” in *Prou. Cons.* 15 (cf. *MRR*, I, p. 560), in contrast to his more normal practice of referring to a provincial governor as “*praetor*”; whether the variation supports the inference of prorogation in the province seems questionable.

49. See Cicero, *Prou. Cons.*, 15 and *In Pisonem*, 92; sources for Albucius’ subsequent prosecution, generally assumed to be *de repetundis*, in ALEXANDER M.C., *Trials in the Late Roman Republic, 149 BC to 50 BC*, Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1990, p. 34–5, n° 67.

50. The sequence is clear in Cicero, *Prou. Cons.*, 15, and clarified by BRENNAN T.C., *op. cit.*, II, p. 476 with nn. 3–4.

“triumphs” are very rare. Suetonius reports that Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus (cos. 122 BC), “having vanquished the Allobroges and the Arverni in his consulship, rode through the province on an elephant, attended by a throng of soldiers, in a kind of triumphal procession.”<sup>51</sup> This sort of activity can be linked to another development of the period, namely the erection of victory monuments on the field of battle, which is traditionally said to begin with the trophies erected in Gaul by Q. Fabius Maximus and the same Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus, c. 121 BC.<sup>52</sup> The practice of provincial trophies seems to have been picked up rapidly by later commanders, including Marius, Sulla, Pompey, and Lucullus—as well as by lesser figures such as L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus in Macedonia, whom Cicero compares directly with Albuicius.<sup>53</sup> Modern assessments of such monuments typically view them as symbols of oppression: “These were concrete vehicles of dominance and subjugation, which made it clear to provincials exactly who their new master was.”<sup>54</sup> However, if (some of) the provincials were themselves participating in the campaigns which these monuments commemorated, this picture must be modified. The example of Sulla at Chaironeia highlights this very clearly: Sulla erected two trophies at Chaironeia, one of which, Plutarch reports, recorded in Greek that Homoloïchos and Anaxidamos distinguished themselves; earlier in his account, Plutarch records the actions of a detachment of Chaironeians in Sulla’s service.<sup>55</sup> Not only is the erection of a trophy on the battlefield in honour of these Chaironeians now confirmed by its actual discovery, but Plutarch goes on to record what is commonly omitted in modern accounts, that: “The festival in honour of this victory was celebrated by Sulla in Thebes, where he prepared a stage near the fountain of Oedipus. But the judges were Greeks invited from the other cities, since towards the Thebans he was irreconcilably hostile.”<sup>56</sup> In other words Sulla, like

51. Suetonius, *Nero*, 2: “at in consulatu Allobrogibus Aruernisque superatis elephanto per provinciam uectus est turba militum quasi inter sollempnia triumphii prosequente”. As E. PAIS noted (*Fasti Triumphales Populi Romani*, Rome, Dr. A. Nardecchia, 1920, p. 204, n. 1): “il trionfo provinciale di Cn. Domizio prova che il caso di Albuicio non era isolato e che Cicerone, secondo il suo costume avvocatesco, gravava la mano.”

52. Strabo, IV, 1, 11; Florus, I, 37, 4-6. The link is suggested by BRENNAN T.C., *op. cit.*, II, p. 834 n. 4, who however omits the Suetonius passage and does not consider the further parallels which follow below.

53. Marius near Mutina, *Obsequens*, 70; Sulla at Chaironeia, Appian, *Mithr.*, 45, 176; Plutarch, *Sulla*, 19, 9-10; Pausanias, IX, 40, 7 (and see further below); Pompey in the Pyrenees, Strabo III, 4, 19; Pliny, *NH*, III, 18; ARCE J., “Los trofeos de Pompeyo ‘in Pyrenaei iugis’”, *AEspA*, n° 67, 1994, p. 261-8; Lucullus, Plutarch, 36, 6; Piso in Macedonia, Cicero, *In Pisonem*, 92 (and cf. *Prou. Cons.*, 4).

54. So WELCH K., “Introduction”, DILLON S. and WELCH K. (eds), *Representations of War in Ancient Rome*, New York, Cambridge University Press, p. 1-26 at 13; Welch is expanding upon HÖLSCHER T., “The transformation of victory into power: from event to structure”, *ibid.*, p. 27-48 (at p. 33 describing such monuments as “concrete means of subjugation”).

55. Plutarch, *Sulla*, 19, 9-10 for the trophy; 17, 10-18, 2 for the Chaironeians’ participation (and Appian, *Mithr.*, 41, 159 for Sulla’s mixed forces more generally in this period).

56. CAMP, J., IERARDI M., MCINERNEY J., MORGAN K. and UMHOLTZ G., “A trophy from the battle of Chaironeia of 86 B.C.”, *AJA*, n° 96, 1992, p. 443-55; Plutarch, *Sulla*, 19, 11-12 (cf. SANTANGELO F.,

Domitius Ahenobarbus before him, engaged in a local form of celebration as well as erecting victory monuments, and the role of his local troops was highlighted and rewarded in this way. Sulla's actions at Thebes, in turn, belong in a sequence of local victory celebrations by Roman commanders in the Hellenistic manner, identified by Jean-Louis FERRARY: L. Aemilius Paullus' celebrations at Amphipolis in 167 BC; P. Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus at Carthage in 146 BC; M. Perperna at Pergamum in 129 BC, and L. Licinius Lucullus at Ephesus in 71 BC.<sup>57</sup> It is surely significant that in all these cases we know of the participation of *auxilia externa* in the campaigns.<sup>58</sup> There are two further instances which it is tempting to place in this general framework, one more speculative, the second more certain. The first is the dedications of L. Mummius in Greece and elsewhere in 146 BC, since in this case too we know that Mummius employed *auxilia*, and that he sent spoils to Pergamum in recognition of this.<sup>59</sup> The second is Cicero's *bête noire*, C. Verres, whose use of auxiliaries we have already noted (and see further below). Verres was the recipient of a *foris*, i.e. a triumphal arch, in the forum of Syracuse, adorned with an equestrian statue of himself and one of his naked son—the first known example of a Republican arch honouring living individuals.<sup>60</sup> As with Albius, this must have been in anticipation of ultimately foiled triumphal hopes, and should be understood firmly in the context of Verres' actions, using local forces, against both pirates and the threat posed by Spartacus and the slave-uprisings.<sup>61</sup> Cicero's treatment of the arch amongst the variety of statues and honours apparently extorted from the Sicilians by Verres undoubtedly obscures its original context: "he [Cicero] does not allow for

*Sulla, the Elites and the Empire*, Leiden, Brill, 2007, p. 48). MacKAY C.S., "Sulla and the Monuments: Studies in his Public Persona", *Historia*, 49, 2000, p. 161-210 at 169-71 argues unconvincingly that the monument in question is only a personal dedication put up by the Greeks. The second Chaironeia monument recorded by Plutarch has also now been discovered, but remains unpublished.

57. FERRARY J.-L., *Philhellénisme et impérialisme*, Rome, École française de Rome, 1988, p. 564-5. For Paullus, Livy, XLV, 32, 8-33, 7; Dio Cassius, XXXI, 8, 9; Plutarch, *Aem.*, 28, 7-8; Scipio Aemilianus, Livy, *Per.*, LI; Appian, *Lib.*, 135, 642; Perperna, *I.Priene*, 108, l. 223-230; 109, l. 91-94; Lucullus, Plutarch, *Luc.*, 23, 1; Appian, *Mithr.*, 83, 376.
58. Paullus' auxiliaries: Valerius Maximus, V, 1, 1d; Livy, XLIV, 36, 8; XLV, 14, 8-9; Polybius, XXIX, 14-15; Plutarch, *Aem.*, 15-16; Justin, 33, 1, 2; Sicilians served in Scipio's navy at Carthage in 146 BC and were rewarded subsequently, Cicero, *2Verr.*, V, 124-125 (cf. FERRARY J.-L., *op. cit.*, p. 578-88); Perperna, see esp. SEG, XXXVI, 555 and the material in PRAG J. R. W., *Auxilia and gymnasia*, *op. cit.*, p. 84; Lucullus, Appian, *Mithr.*, 77-79, 84, 87; Memnon, *FGrHist*, 434, F28, 4 and F38, 3 (and cf. F36, 4 for naval forces).
59. For Mummius, the texts are conveniently collected and discussed, in this general perspective, by YARROW L., "Lucius Mummius and the Spoils of Corinth", *SCI*, 25, 2006, p. 57-70; for the participation of *auxilia* and consequent sending of spoils to Pergamum see Pausanias, VII, 16, 1-2 and 8.
60. Cicero, *2Verr.*, II, 154; DE MARIA S., *Gli archi onorari di Roma e dell'Italia romana*, Rome, "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, 1988, p. 326-7, n° 107.
61. Verres' triumphal ambitions, Cicero, *2Verr.*, V, 5, and observe the more positive note in Sallust, *Hist.*, IV, 32 M; cf. BERRENDONNER C., "Verrès, les cités, les statues, et l'argent", PITTIA S. and DOUBOULOZ D. (eds), *La Sicile de Cicéron, Lectures des Verrines*, Besançon, Presses universitaires de Franche-Comté, 2007, p. 205-27 at 214.

the possibility [which he doubtless understood all too well] that honours served an internal function in the relationship between cities and governor"; and, we might add, between soldiers and commander.<sup>62</sup>

Although explicit testimony is relatively, and unsurprisingly, scarce, auxiliaries were certainly on occasion materially rewarded in the same military fashion as Roman and Italian troops with *dona militaria*, in *contione*, in the aftermath of battle.<sup>63</sup> Livy records an instance after the battle near Sycurium in Greece in 171 BC, when the disgraced Aetolian *duces* were sent to Rome for punishment, whereas: "The Thessalians were praised before an assembly (*pro contione laudati*), and their leaders (*duces*) were also awarded presents for valour (*uirtutis causa donati*)."<sup>64</sup> Cicero scathingly describes Verres giving out rewards to *Siculi potentissimi nobilissimique*, in *contione* at Syracuse in 71 BC, after a campaign against pirates—but for all Cicero's cynicism (he implies that Verres' intent was to deter them from testifying against him), the instance makes very clear sense alongside the extensive evidence for regular Sicilian service under Roman command, and the material evidence for local Sicilian celebration of military activity, visible in inscriptions, sculptural monuments, and coins.<sup>65</sup> Cicero himself was acclaimed *imperator* in Cilicia for his capture of Pindenissum in late 51 BC, by an army over half of which was made up of provincial auxiliaries, including the tetrarch Deiotarus; he then proceeded to spend five days plundering the region, celebrated the Saturnalia with the soldiers, before giving all the *praeda* (captives excluded) to his troops—although he does not specify further, it is inconceivable that this distribution did not include his auxiliaries.<sup>66</sup> With the cases of Albucius and Verres in mind, it is notable

62. WALLACE-HADRILL A., "Roman arches and Greek honours: the language of power at Rome", *PCPS*, n° 36, 1990, p. 143-81, at 154-6.

63. For the general practice, PINA POLO F., *Las contiones civiles y militares en Roma*, Zaragoza, Universidad de Zaragoza, 1989, p. 206-8.

64. Livy, XLII, 60, 8-10. Compare, e.g. Livy, XXIX, 35, 5 (rewards granted to Massinissa, his officers and troops after Zama); XXXVIII, 23, 11 (praise of Attalus in *contione* by Manlius Vulso). For further examples of rewards in the Republican period, see MAXFIELD V.A., *The Military Decorations of the Roman Army*, London, Batsford, 1981, p. 126-7. MACKEY C.S., *op. cit.*, p. 169 n. 27 asserts that such rewards are only attested jointly with citizenship, as in the Asculum inscription (*ILLRP*, 515), but this ignores the literary evidence which contradicts that claim, and his discussion is limited to the problematic case of *Syll*<sup>3</sup>, 744, which records honours of an uncertain type (could be either material and/or citizenship) for an Aetolian in the service of Sulla.

65. Verres giving rewards in *contione*, Cicero, *2 Verr.*, III, 185-187. Examples of Sicilian celebrations of military activity: epigraphic, *SEG*, XXXVII, 760; sculptural / monumental at Segesta, BECHTOLD B., "Una villa ellenistico-romana sull'acropoli sud di Segesta", *Atti delle seconde giornate internazionali di studi sull'area elima*, Pisa, Scuola Normale Superiore, 1997, I, p. 85-110 (also in PUGLIESE CARRATELLI G. (ed.), *The Western Greeks*, Milan, Bompiani, 1996, p. 636); at Tyndaris, SPIGO U. (ed.), *Tindari. L'area archeologica e l'antiquarium*, Milazzo, Rebus Edizioni, 2005, p. 73-4, fig. 3; numismatic, see e.g. the summary in FREY-KUPPER S., "Appendice I. I ritrovamenti monetali", BECHTOLD B., *La Necropoli di Lilybaeum*, Rome, "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, 1999, p. 394-457, at 411-14. Fuller discussion and further examples in PRAG J.R.W., *Auxilia and gymnasia*, *op. cit.*, p. 98-9.

66. Title of *imperator*, collection and disposal of booty, and the Saturnalia, Cicero, *Att.*, V, 20, 3-5; make-up of Cicero's army, see esp. *Att.*, V, 18, 2, VI, 1, 14, VI, 5, 3, *Fam.*, XV, 1, 5, XV, 4, 3.

that all these elements of celebration are omitted by Cicero in his letters to M. Porcius Cato and to the Senate.<sup>67</sup>

### Provincial governors as local military commanders

If an imperial power has any intention of remaining in a region, then military action has local significance which extends well beyond the phases of initial conquest. It is undeniable that Rome, in maintaining control over, and protecting, its imperial domain, made use of local troops. Indeed, it should be clear that Rome made use of such local forces considerably more frequently than is usually acknowledged—the evidence for local levying is sufficient to establish the point, although it can be greatly supplemented by the evidence for actual participation on the battlefield (not discussed here). Local levying, at the direction of the senior Roman authority in the region, naturally creates a set of interactions between Roman authority, local elite, and wider population, that can be both positive and negative—the same is of course true of Roman levying in Italy—and those relationships are, to some extent, reflected in the surviving honorifics for Romans and others that we find in the provinces.<sup>68</sup> Evidence of attempts to recognize, develop, or even exploit, the ensuing relationship is provided by the examples of celebration and reward discussed in the second part of this paper. Such actions derive their models from not only Roman but also local practices, and so operate in multiple directions when considering dynamics of acculturation, as for example in the Roman adoption of Hellenistic modes of celebration. Although it is true that such actions also provide a very clear channel for the development of relationships between Roman and local elites, which on occasion one might choose to characterize as *clientela*, in this respect also, the currents of influence and power may in fact be multi-directional. The extent to which the Roman provincial governor was in fact at the potential mercy of those able to provide provincial forces is well illustrated by the events of 88 BC in Asia;<sup>69</sup> Roman governors were not simply engaging in self-aggrandizing triumphalism, but rather there was a need to offer local rewards (which might well not be looked upon favourably at Rome), which a Roman governor would ignore at his peril. In his letter to Quintus in Asia, Cicero emphasizes the complexity of satisfying the competing interests of the provincials and the *publicani*; satisfying the competing interests aroused by military affairs was surely no less difficult.<sup>70</sup>

67. As noted by BRENNAN T. C., *op. cit.*, p. 833 n. 3.

68. PFEILSCHIFTER R., *op. cit.*, esp. p. 35, challenges the usual view that Italian allied service was a channel for integration.

69. REYNOLDS J., *Aphrodisias and Rome*, London, Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies, 1982, n° 2 and 3 (Q. Oppius and Aphrodisias) can stand as examples.

70. Cicero, *Q. fr.* I, 1, 32.



Sous la direction de

Nathalie BARRANDON et François KIRBIHLER

## Les gouverneurs et les provinciaux sous la République romaine



LE COLLOQUE tenu à Nantes en mai 2010 a permis d'affiner la connaissance de l'administration concrète des provinces de la République romaine par la prise en compte simultanée des textes littéraires, des inscriptions et de l'archéologie, avec un souci de casser les divisions géographiques entre l'Est et l'Ouest de ce qui devenait un empire territorial. Cet ouvrage regroupe en quelques grands thèmes les articles de spécialistes des provinces romaines.

Les relations entre les autorités romaines et les cités provinciales, principalement leurs élites, ont été privilégiées pour guider une réflexion commune concernant l'administration de l'empire. Si les premières contributions analysent des prérogatives traditionnelles mais peu étudiées des gouverneurs, recrutement de soldats auxiliaires provinciaux et activités religieuses romaines, voire la réalité de la présence des représentants de Rome dans un cas particulier, la Grèce balkanique, d'autres articles précisent la communication entre les cités passées sous la domination romaine et le Sénat romain ou les processus de fondation de cité par des gouverneurs, en Hispanie et dans le Pont. Des enquêtes ayant pour objets les clientèles ou la sociabilité apportent un regard neuf sur les Cornelii Balbi en pleine ascension ou sur le cérémonial d'accueil et les réceptions réunissant gouverneurs et provinciaux. Enfin quatre études de la documentation attachée à des personnalités romaines soulignent les contrastes d'une époque souvent troublée : s'il exista d'une part les proconsulats encensés de Mucius Scaevola et Servilius Isauricus en Asie, l'analyse d'autre part des réquisitions du blé sicilien par Verrès et la discussion relative à l'authenticité des Lettres grecques de Brutus rappellent l'existence de gouvernements moins respectueux des provinciaux.

Il en résulte une image renouvelée des relations entre les gouverneurs et les provinciaux de l'époque républicaine.

*Nathalie BARRANDON et François KIRBIHLER sont respectivement maîtres de conférences aux universités de Nantes et de Nancy 2.*

En couverture : *Inscription de Claros en l'honneur du proconsul d'Asie Q. Cicéron.*

Illustration : F. Jacob. Cliché : L. Robert



Réseau des Universités  
OUEST ATLANTIQUE

Publié avec le soutien  
de l'université de Nantes



ISBN 978-2-7535-1420-1

www.pur-editions.fr

22 €