COLONIA MUNATIA TRIUMPHALIS AND LEGIO NONA TRIUMPHALIS?
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The town of Augst, Switzerland, was founded as a Roman colony by Caesar's general Lucius Munatius Plancus. The text on his sepulchral monument at Gaeta provides decisive evidence of this: "colonias deduxit Lugudunum et Rauricam." ¹ In ancient sources, the colony is mentioned by Pliny in conjunction with Iulia Equestris: "Colonia Equestris et Rauriaca".² Ptolemy, the geographer, calls it "Ἄγογοςτα Ραυρικῶν".³ The same element "Augusta" occurs in the town's name as mentioned in the Itineraries.⁴

Munatius Plancus presumably left for Gallia Comata shortly after the Senate's session of 17 March 44 B.C. Before his assassination, Caesar had made him governor over this province. Raurica, therefore, must have been founded after that date.⁵ In April 43 B.C., Plancus led his army across the Rhône into Gallia Narbonensis, which therefore constitutes the ultimate date for deduction.⁶

The colony of Iulia Equestris (Nyon) was founded during Caesar's lifetime.⁷ It is generally assumed that the plans for the foundation of Raurica and Lugdunum (Lyon) were also initiated by Caesar.⁸

¹ CIL X 6087 (E. Howald and E. Meyer, Die römische Schweiz (Zürich, 1940), No. 334).
² Pliny n.h. IV 106.
³ Ptolemy geogr. II 9, 18.
⁴ Itin. Ant. 353; Tab. Peut.: Augusta Ruracum.
⁵ See RE XVI 545-6 s.v. L. Munatius Plancus (Hanslik); F. Staehelin, Die Schweiz in römischer Zeit (Basle, 1949), pp. 95-6; Walser, Der Briefwechsel des L. Munatius Plancus mit Cicero (Basle, 1957), p. 19; R. Laur-Belart (Führer durch Augusta Raurica, Basel, 1966, p. 10) suggests that the foundation of the colony took place on 21 June because the plan of the town was orientated towards the summer-solstice.
⁷ For the date of the foundation of Iulia Equestris cf. J. G. P. Best's article in this issue.
⁸ Cf. Staehelin p. 102, including bibliography under note 1; F. Vittinghoff,
Various interesting hypotheses have been put forward as to Caesar's intentions. K. Kraft has shown that Raurica and Equestris were possibly intended to cut off the Helvetii's passage to Gaul via routes to the north and south of the Jura mountains. Thus, a recurrence of the attempt to migrate of 58 B.C. would have been rendered impossible. This argument is based on the consideration that at this point in history, the Romans still regarded the Helvetii as an unpredictable factor among the subjugated tribes. Caesar must have reckoned with the possibility that they could cause unrest, which would have hampered all communication between Equestris and Raurica over Helvetic territory. It must, therefore, be assumed that connections between Raurica and Gallia Narbonensis followed the route west of the Jura, along the vital line of Lugdunum-Matisco-Cabillonum-Vesontio (Besançon). Raurica lay at the end of this route which passed through the Arar and Dubis river valleys. For the same reason, Raurica was situated to the north-west of the Jura, facing the Sequani region and not the territory of the Helvetii to the east. The land of the Sequani, unlike that of the Helvetii and the Raurici, had been subjugated as early as 58 B.C. Caesar's troops spent the winter of 58-57 there, which in itself is an indication of total subjugation of a tribe or people. The Helvetii, however, had been defeated in battle but Caesar did not seize their land.


1 Raurica as the northern terminus of a line connecting Rhône and Rhine, see Staezlin pp. 100-102 and note 1 with bibliography; W. Schleiermacher, *Jb. RGZM Mainz* 2, 1955, 245. Ibid. as a demarcation line Italy-Gaul see Vittinghoff p. 69.


3 Evidence for the fact that Munatius Plancus also concerned about the behaviour of tribes in this region is found in Cicero, *ad Fam.* 10, 4 (Walser IV): *interim maximam hic sollicitudinem curamque sustineo, ne inter aliena vita haec gentes nostra mala suam potens occasionem.*

4 On the strategic position of Lugdunum cf. Strabo IV 6, 11; see also RE XIII 1719 s.v. Lugdunum (Cramer). Matisco and Cabillonum served as bases for food supply to Caesar's army when it was stationed in winter camps further to the north in 52-51 B.C. Cf. Caesar, *Bellum Gallicum*, VII 90. Because of its strategic position, Vesontio was of great importance to the Romans; cf. Caesar *B.g.* I 38-9.


6 Cf. Caes. *B.g.* I 54.

7 In a forthcoming publication by Best and Isaac will be dealt with Caesar's treatment of the Helvetii.
In Caesar's account of the Gallic war, therefore, no mention is made of any winter camp on the territory of the Helvetii or that of the Raurici. The Romans situated their winter camps in areas which were under their full control. When founding the colonies of Equestris and Raurica, the Romans made use of a strategy they had applied before in their fight against the Insubres. This Gallic tribe, the largest south of the Alps, had been defeated near Clastidium in 222 B.C. Their territory was located north of the River Po and in the period under discussion it could not yet be incorporated and placed under Roman rule. The Insubres were therefore allowed a certain degree of independence, subject to clearly defined conditions; nevertheless, the large colonies of Placentia and Cremona were founded on the Insubres' territory only a few years later. The colonies received the ius latii. E. T. Salmon has expounded that in this period, full civil rights were only granted to small coloniae maritimae of minor importance whereas more important inland colonies were invariably latini iuris. The foundation of Parma and Mutina in 183 B.C. marked a change in this policy. From then on, large citizen colonies were also founded in inland areas. Tacitus gives an unambiguous description of Cremona's, and therefore also its counterpart Placentia's, function: "...propugnaculum adversus Gallos trans Padum agentes et si qua alia vis per Alpes rueret...".

At the time of their foundation, both Cremona and Placentia were "Propugnacula" in the sense that the hinterland had hardly been pacified and had not been urbanized by the Romans. Similarly, Equestris and Raurica were isolated colonies in the border region

---

1 Polybius II 34.
2 See p. 20, note 3 below. Mommsen (CIL V1 p. 413) has provided sufficient evidence to show that, at the time of its foundation, Cremona was situated on the Insubres' territory. See also RE IX 2 p. 1591 s.v. Insubres (Philipp).
5 Hist. III 34.
of a recently subjugated tribe. Just as Placentia and Cremona were intended as buffers against invasions by Transpadane Gauls, Eques-tris and Raurica were meant to halt the advance of the Helvetians. Moreover, of course, both pairs of colonies were intended to form bridge-heads for further expansion. It is a remarkable coincidence that this expansion and the consolidation of colonies were in both cases hampered: on the one hand by the second Punic War and the consequent attacks by Boii and Insubres who were greatly incensed at the deductions that had taken place, on the other hand by the Civil War and Caesar's death. After the second Punic War and after the Transpadane Gauls had been subjugated anew, the Romans paid special attention to Aemilia, the hinterland of Placentia and Cremona, before concentrating on further expansion north of the Po. In the same way, Octavian conquered the Alpine region after the Civil War and established colonies in Gallia Narbonensis and in the Salassi region before embarking upon the conquest of Germania.

Staehelin explains the later addition of the epithet "Augusta" in passages about Raurica in the sources quoted, as a promotion of the colony's rank as a result of the contemporary conquest of Raetia. Vittinghof argues that Raurica was, at its foundation, probably populated with veterans from Caesar's army, presumably of Gallic

1 A similar position was occupied by Aquileia, founded in 181 B.C. Aquileia also suffered considerably from attacks by neighbouring tribes and fulfilled defensive and offensive functions comparable to those of Equestris and Raurica. See Livy XXXIX 22, 45, 54, 55; XL 26; XLVIII i, 5 (cf. p. 20, note 3); Strabo V i, 8 p. 214; Pliny N.H. III 19, 131; Appianus Ill. 4, 18. Until Marius' action, Aquileia and Cremona were the only colonies north of the River Po (Mommsen, loc. cit.). For the history of the foundation of Aquileia, see also Mommsen, Römische Geschichte I 667; II, 164 and Salmon, op. cit. p. 55.

2 See p. 18 note 3.

3 See Appendix I.

4 In 187 B.C., the via Aemilia, linking up with the via Flaminia, was built between Placentia and Ariminium; in the same year, another road was completed connecting Arretium to Bononia (Livy XXXIX 2). Three colonies were founded alongside the Placentia-Ariminium road: Bononia in 189 B.C. (Livy XXXVII 57, 7 cf. 47, 2), Mutina and Parma in 183 (XXXIX 55). Forum Livi and possibly also Forum Popli date back to the same period. See Salmon, op. cit., pp. 47 ff. and Ewings, op. cit., pp. 56 ff.

descent. He relates the addition "Augusta" to a reinforcement of the colony by new settlers, coinciding with its refounding.¹

A more thorough examination of the primary sources may cast some light on the earliest history of the colony of Raurica. The text on Munatius Plancus' sepulchral monument includes the phrase "colonias Lugudunum et Rauricam". Pliny mentions "colonia Equestris et Rauriaca". These passages have served as the basis for the assumption that Munatius Plancus called his creation "Colonia Raurica".² Yet, neither the inscription on the tomb nor Pliny's writings include the full title of the three towns. On a coin struck to mark the foundation of Lugdunum, the town is referred to as "Colonia Copia Felix Munatia".³ Later on, it was known as "Colonia Copia Claudia Augusta Lugudunum".⁴ The more elaborate title of Colonia Equestris was "Colonia Iulia Equestris".⁵ Similarly, the phrase "Colonia Raurica" in both passages cannot signify anything but the town's popular name in the era when the texts in question were compiled. "Colonia Raurica" is not the complete official name given to the town when it was founded.

Of course, there is the possibility that "Raurica" formed part of the complete title after the foundation; this, indeed, is true for "Lugdunum" and "Equestris". In that case, the colony would bear the name of the local people. Yet, to my knowledge, the earliest instance of the name of non-Roman inhabitants being included in a colony's official title was that of "Colonia Iulia Augusta Taurinorum" in cisalpine Gaul.⁶ For the period of Augustus' reign, the same

¹ Vittinghoff p. 69. Kahrstedt (Kulturgeschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit (1944), p. 148) propounds the possibility that Raurica was originally oppidum latinum. The phrase 'deduxit colonias Lugudunum et Rauricam' on Plancus' sepulchral monument seems to contradict this suggestion because in the case of a Latin town deditio cannot have taken place. (cf. Vittinghoff (p. 44). See also Vell. I 15: 'Neque facile memoriae mandaverim quae (colonia), nisi militaris, post hoc tempus (i.e. 100 B.C.) deducta sit'. The same can therefore be said of Lugdunum where one or two of Plancus' four veteran legions (see below p. 19) were probably stationed.
² Inter alia Staehelin p. 95 and 115 and note 1; Walser p. 19 note 30.
³ For a discussion of this coin see M. Grant, From Imperium to Auctoritas (Cambridge, 1946), p. 206.
⁴ On this title, see RE XIII², pp. 1720-1.
⁵ The title of this colony is discussed by Best p. 8.
⁶ An enumeration of Roman citizen colonies will be found in the article entitled 'Coloniae' in RE IV pp. 520-60 (Kornemann) Iulia Augusta Tau-
may perhaps be said of "Colonia Iulia Augusta Apollinaris Reio-
rum".\textsuperscript{1} After Augustus' reign, capitals of nations (capita civitatum) which became colonies often acquired the names of the various civitates.\textsuperscript{2} In other words, before 27 B.C. it was not customary to include the name of a Gallic tribe in the title of a colony, unless Raurica was the first instance of this. Yet, it is not very likely that Munatius Plancus introduced a new category of colony names. As this category does not occur until after 27 B.C., under Augustus' reign, "Raurica" must be assumed to be an addition made by Augustus.\textsuperscript{3} Moreover, the inclusion in the colony's title of the name of a particular section of the population is a reason to believe that the group in question formed the core of the colony's citizens and occupied a dominant position. In the case of capitals of Gallic and Germanic peoples, such as Avenches (Colonia Helvetiorum),\textsuperscript{4} and of colonies whose names included legion numbers, e.g. Narbo Decumanorum, Arelate Septimanorum, and Forum Iulii (Octavano-
rum), we know for a fact that the group mentioned in the colony's name played a dominant role within the colony.\textsuperscript{5} In the years after Caesar's death, when Raurica was the remotest and most northern citizen colony of the Roman Empire, the recently defeated Raurici could not have formed the colony's core. During Caesar's reign and the second triumvirate, the procedure for the designation of names was reversed. Gallic tribes on whose territory Roman colonies had been founded were, after some time, no longer known by their Celtic names but were named after these colonies. Thus, the Salyi became the "people of Arelate".\textsuperscript{6}

From the above considerations one may conclude that the name

\textsuperscript{1} A discussion on material and conclusions about the legal status of this town will be found in Vittinghoff pp. 67 and 100, including note 7.

\textsuperscript{2} Cf. RE IV p. 543.

\textsuperscript{3} This assumption is strengthened by the fact, that Augustus also in other connections appears to have had a characteristic predilection for the use of tribal names. (This matter will be discussed by R. A. v. Royen in a forthcoming publication on Augusta Praetoria).

\textsuperscript{4} With the problems concerning this type of name will be dealt by the author in a separate study on Aventicum.

\textsuperscript{5} See Vittinghoff p. 66 note 4.

\textsuperscript{6} C. Jullian, \textit{Histoire de la Gaule} (Paris, 1908-26), pp. 33-4 and 324.
of the Raurici cannot have been included in the name of the colony in their territory before 27 B.C. The element "Raurica" cannot have been introduced into the colony's title until the term "Augusta" was likewise added. It is not known what Munatius Plancus called the colony in 44 B.C. The early name does not appear to survive in the later one because only the terms "Augusta" and "Raurica" are encountered.

Further attention should also be paid to the element "Augusta". It is especially noteworthy that there is no reference to a foundation before 27 B.C. Combinations such as "Iulia Augusta" frequently occur in the case of colonies founded by Caesar or on his behalf. Augustus expressly gave all his actions up to 27 B.C., when his position as a ruler had been consolidated, a stamp of authority by referring back to his adoption as Caesar's son. Yet, he continued to recognize Caesar's actions as such after 27 B.C. too. It is, therefore, very unusual that, in the case of a colony most probably founded under the Acta Caesaris in 44 B.C., the fact was ignored that it dated back to the years before the period in which Octavian bore the honorary title of "Augustus". All colonies founded between 44 and 27 B.C., afterwards acquired or retained names like "Iulia" or "Caesarea" which may also allude to Iulius Caesar, even though he may not have been the actual founder. Later on, the element "Augusta" occurred in combination with these names.¹

The conclusion drawn from the above considerations is that the name of the colony of Augusta Raurica as a whole dates back to the period of Augustus' reign. It does not contain any information about the previous name. In the case of colonies formed before 27 B.C., the foundation period can usually be inferred from the title. The element "Raurica" is not likely to have occurred before 27 B.C.

¹ This is true of all Roman citizen colonies discussed in RE IV pp. 520-60 and by Vittinghoff. As for Lyon, it is not known what the complete colony title was during Augustus' reign. Of course, the name of Munatia is not encountered in later periods (see p. 29 below). A series of bronze coins, probably dating back to 39-8 B.C., only bears the name of 'Copia' without any reference to the colony's founder (Grant p. 207); the same is true of a coin of a later date, possibly 7 A.D. (Grant p. 208). Later on, the name of 'Augusta' is exclusively found in combination with 'Claudia'. Laur-Belart stresses the fact, that we find the element "Augusta" in the name of Colonia Raurica for the first time in Ptolemy's geography. He therefore supposes, that it may be an addition by one of Augustus' successors (op. cit., p. 1).
If a colony like Raurica receives an entirely new name preserving nothing of its earlier existence, it means a new deduction of the colony.

We learn from Cicero that a new deduction of a colony already formed de jure, was only permitted if the colony was no longer intact. New settlers could always be admitted, provided it did not imply a refounding of the colony.\(^1\) In other words, a colony could only be newly established if the original one had fallen into decay. Applied to Raurica, this can only mean that the colony was refounded by Augustus, probably between 16 and 13 B.C., because it had been vacated in a earlier period.\(^2\) Raurica had been vacated just as Equestris.

Attention should once again be drawn to the striking similarity between the fate of Placentia and Cremona, on the one hand, and Equestris and Raurica on the other. After the new colonies of Placentia and Cremona had been attacked in 218 B.C.,\(^3\) they constantly suffered attacks by Punic and Gallic troops in the following years of war.\(^4\) As early as 206 B.C., ambassadors of the Cremonenses and Placentini complained “that their territory was being raided and laid waste by neighbouring Gauls, and that now they had sparsely peopled cities and land desolated and deserted”\(^5\). In 190 B.C., ambassadors from the people of Placentia and Cremona once again complained “of the shortage of colonists, some having been taken off by the fortunes of war, and some by disease, while others had left the colonies from reluctance to live with their Gallic neighbours”.\(^6\) The Senate then decided to take drastic measures to restore order in the colonies. Tenney Frank has, on good grounds, argued that in the case of the declining colony of Placentia these measures meant an entirely new foundation on a

---

1 Cicero, Philippica II 40, 102.
2 On the determination of the date of the refounding in 16-13 B.C. and its connection with the campaign against Raetia, see p. 32; see also Staehelin p. 115.
3 Polybius III 49, 3; Livy XXI 25.
4 Livy XXVII 39; XXXI 10; XXXIV 56.
6 XXXVII 46, translated by Evan T. Sage, Loeb Classical Library, Vol. XI.
territory which had recently been taken away from the Boii.\(^1\) If this assumption were correct, Placentia must have met the same fate as Raurica did afterwards, the only difference being that, after its refoundation, Placentia retained its old name.

Caesar's tenth veteran legion was most probably stationed at Iulia Equestris; afterwards, Plancus moved it elsewhere.\(^2\) It has been suggested, with good reason, that a veteran legion was also stationed in Raurica.\(^3\) It seems plausible that, like legio decima, this particular legion also formed part of the four veteran legions which, as appears from the correspondence between Munatius Plancus and Cicero, had gone with Plancus to Gallia Narbonensis before the end of November.\(^4\)

Under the law of the colony of Urso, founded in the same period, men exempted from military service could still be called up in case of civil war in Italy or Gaul; the same undoubtedly applied to retired veterans in other colonies. This is not an exceptional provision but a general rule, no doubt also valid for veterans in Raurica.\(^5\) The outbreak of civil war was apparently a valid reason for calling up all available men, even if the stability of the vacated provinces was thereby imperilled. In Gaul, a situation occurred in 44 B.C., comparable to that of 69 A.D.: almost all Roman garrisons pulled out, and wide-spread rebellion was the result. The difference is that the Gauls and Germans in 44 B.C., so soon after Caesar's

---

1 Placentia and the Battle of the Trebia, JRS IX (1919), pp. 202-7; this hypothesis has been attacked by R. Hanslik in RE XX\(^2\) s.v. Placentia, p. 1899.
2 See Best p. 5.
3 Staehelin p. 100; Vittinghoff p. 69.
4 For a detailed discussion of these events, see Best p. 6.
5 Cf. CIL I\(^2\) 594, Tab. I 3, 23 ff. (Lex Ursonensis). In Phil. V 19, 53, Cicero mentions the rewards given to legions that remained faithful to the Senate. According to Cicero's proposal, soldiers from these legions and their children would be exempted from military service 'extra tumultum gallicum italicumque'. Cf. also Phil. V 12, 31: 'tumultum decerni (...) dilectum haberi sublatis vacationibus in urbe et in Italia praeter Galliam tota'. An extensive analysis of the meaning of the word 'tumultus' is also found in Cicero, Phil. VIII 1, 1-4. For a conflict between the Senate and a number of colonies on the validity of their 'sacrosanctam vacatio' during the state of emergency in 207 B.C., see Livy XXVII 38. Sherwin-White is evidently right in pointing out the Italian origin of the clause in the Lex Ursonensis (op. cit., pp. 78-9). There is, however, no reason to assume, that the clause was, for the Ursonenses, merely an anachronism.
campaign, were not able to seize the opportunity to rebel, to which Plancus alluded in a letter to Cicero, as rapidly as in 69 A.D.1

The locally stationed veterans, then, were called away from Raurica before November 44 B.C. Not until Augustus’ major reorganization of the whole of Gaul was any attention paid to this colony.2

The abundance of information available on the history of the foundation of Placentia and Cremona may once more help us to gain a better understanding of the events and developments in Equestris and Raurica. After the decision to found these two colonies had been taken and a formal deduction had taken place in January 218 B.C., the actual colonization process made very slow progress. Yet, when it became clear round about June or July of the same year that war was imminent, this process was greatly accelerated.3 When the Gauls stormed the new colonies, the land was still

1 See p. 12, note 3 above.
2 Shortly after 17 March 44 B.C., Plancus left Rome for Gallia Comata with his veterans (see p. 11 above). When he expressed his concern about the local situation in November, he must have assembled his army already so that Raurica, too, had at that moment been vacated again.
3 i. Livy (per. XX) makes mention of the building of the via Flaminia and the circus Flaminius and immediately after that, finally, the foundation of the colonies. The road and the circus date back to 220 B.C. (534 according to Cassiodorus). Livy thus mentions the foundation of Cremona and Placentia in the same context as other events preceding the second Punic War, i.e. in the early months of 218 B.C. and not later that year, e.g. in the summer. The phrase “nuper (…) deductas” in XXI 25, 2 cannot be an indication for the moment of deduction. Aquileia is referred to as a “nova colonia”, ten years after its foundation (XLIII i, cf. below).

2. Asconius (in Pisonem p. 3) states that Placentia was founded in January 218 B.C. (Codd. according to the critical Oxford text, ed. Clark; similarly Orellius’ edition. Both editions include “Iun.” in their text on the basis of a conjecture by Madvig. Philipp (RE IX* s.v. Insubes p. 1591) starts from the assumption that “Iun.” is a conjecture of Kiessling and that “Iun.” is the original reading in the Oxford text. This is probably the result of a misunderstanding.

3. Polybius (III 49) makes mention of the following events: Hannibal marches through the Pyrenees, the Roman envoys from Carthage report to Rome, the authorities in Rome learn that Hannibal has crossed the Ebro and decide to send the consuls to Spain and Africa. “While occupied in enrolling the legions and making other preparations … ἔσπευσαν ἐπὶ τόλμος ἀγατεῖν τὰ κατὰ τὰς ἀποκλασές οἱ δὲ πρῶτον ἦσαν εἰς Γαλατίαν ἀποστέλλαν προκεχερισμένοι· τὰς μὲν οὖν πόλεις ἐνέργεις ἐτείχιζον, τοὺς δὲ οἰκτορεῖς ἐν ἁμέραις τρίακοντα παρῆγγελαν ἐπιτόπους γίνεσθαι …”. These events took place by the end of June or the beginning of July (cf. F. W. Walbank’s
being distributed and the colonists were, for lack of proper fortifications, completely unable to defend themselves.\(^1\) Such was the colonies’ position after the colonists had speeded up the formation of the new settlements for some time. The construction of Aquileia, which was not accelerated by the threat of war, was an even slower process. In 171 B.C., ten years after its foundation, this colony’s ambassadors complained “that their colony was new and weak and had been as yet insufficiently fortified against the surrounding hostile tribes of Histrians and Illyrians”. The ambassadors’ pleas were of no avail: “Fear for the consul and his army (campaigning in Macedonia) displaced for the present any consideration of fortifying Aquileia”.\(^2\) It was not until 169 B.C., after the plea had been repeated, that Aquileia was fortified.\(^3\) Similarly, the construction of Raurica cannot have advanced very far in November 44, about half a year after its foundation. It need, therefore, not cause surprise that the extensive excavations in the town have not brought any traces of the earliest period to light.\(^4\)

At this point, we ought to consider the question which veterans were stationed there. No concrete clues can be found in the archaeological material available, in the colony’s name, or in the works of contemporary writers. We do know for a fact that, even after their dismissal and delegation to a colony, Caesar’s legions were maintained and were, in exceptional circumstances, called up in their entirety.\(^5\) Plancus himself mentions this for the tenth and other

---

1 See Livy XXI 25.
2 XLIII 1, translated by Alfred C. Schlesinger, Loeb Classical Library.
3 XLIII 17.
5 Appianus, *Bellum Civile* II, 17, 120; 18, 133; 19, 141; also III 11, 81 where the same is noted as regards Lepidus’ and Asinius Pollio’s soldiers;
veteran legions. Especially in the case of a far-off border-colony with a strategic function like Raurica, one may well assume that a coherent group was sent there. The immediate conclusion, therefore, is that, just as in Iulia Equestris, a veteran legion, comprising virtually all surviving men, was stationed in Raurica. Yet, we must not rule out the possibility that the surviving men of more than one legion were involved. It is not likely, however, that the colony was so important that one legion was thought insufficient. In Antony's conflict with the Senate party, the prevailing mood in Plancus' army, which, as we have propounded before, probably also included the legion from Raurica, was definitely in favour of Antony. Apart from legio decima, there were apparently more veteran legions of Caesar's that belonged to Plancus' army. Just as Caesar's tenth legion was stationed in Equestris, one of Caesar's veteran legions must have been the local occupation force, mobilized anew afterwards, in Raurica, which was the pendant of Iulia Equestris.

It may be possible to infer even more specific data. Before his departure to Africa in 47 B.C., Caesar had promised to grant land to all his veterans after the civil war. After the Spanish campaign see also Tacitus, Annales XIV 27 where the events of a later period are compared with those of the first century B.C.; also comments by Furneaux, Tacitus Annals II, (Oxford, 1907), pp. 267-8 with the relevant passages Hyginus Grom. pp. 160, 176. Cf. Vittinghoff p. 25 with note 4.

1 Cic., ad Fam. 10, 11 (Walser XII); for other units from Caesar's army which after their dismissal were called up again in their entirety, see below Appendix II p. 39. The same thing happened once more in the struggle between Octavian and L. Antonius, viz. when two legions stationed in Ancona were incorporated into Octavian's army (cf. RE XI p. 299 s.v. Iulius (Augustus), Fitzler and Seeck). In this context, it is interesting to note that slingstones have been found near Perusia with inscriptions of Caesar's eleventh and twelfth legions (cf. CIL XI 6721, No. 25-30); quoted by RE XII p. 1690 and 1705 s.v. Legio (Ritterling).

2 Appianus (b.c. III 8, 46) mentions that a veteran legion was worth twice as much as a new one. Cf. also Cicero's efforts to moderate the tremendous respect for Caesar's old legions (Phil. XI 15, 38-9). Also significant is the passage in Hirtius, b.g. VIII 8 (see below p. 24, note 4). All this leads to the conclusion that Caesar's oldest legions must have been split up cautiously after their dismissal.

3 See above p. 19.

4 See Best p. 6.

had been completed, in 45 B.C., he started to carry out his promise. It is obvious that, in this respect, he gave priority to his oldest legions. The tenth legion was most probably sent to the colony of Iulia Equestris while Caesar was still alive.\(^1\) Legio septima and legio octava received colonies in Campania; Antony took them there.\(^2\) After Caesar’s assassination, many veterans, armed and assembled in their old army units, were still present in Rome. The authorities were very worried about a possible violent reaction among these troops after Caesar had been murdered.\(^3\) During the Senate’s session of 17 March, Munatius Plancus’ proposal not to punish Caesar’s murderers was accepted,\(^4\) the Senators further agreed that Caesar’s short-term plans should continue to determine official policy.\(^5\) On the emphatic request of colonial leaders, moreover, the Senate passed two separate decrees confirming the veterans’ right to the possession of their colonies; the decrees referred to veterans already delegated to colonies, as well as to those still to be sent out.\(^6\) In order to prevent riots, veterans who had already been allocated territory were sent to their destinations without delay.\(^7\)

Viewed in this perspective, the events leading up to the foundation of Raurica can be more readily understood. The four legions placed at Caesar’s disposal by the Senate in 58 B.C. were his oldest troops. They were known as the seventh, eighth, ninth, and tenth legions.\(^8\) The first legion sent out to a colony was the tenth. Next, the seventh and eighth were taken to Campania by Antony. Caesar had probably meant Raurica as a colony. The plans for its foundation must have been ready in 44 B.C. but no legion had as yet been sent there. Raurica was founded by Munatius Plancus at about the

---

\(^1\) See Best p. 8.
\(^2\) For the fate of the seventh and eighth legions after the battle of Munda, see Appendix II. Antony took at least a section of them to their colonies, as can be read in Cic. Phil. V 2, 3: ‘Veteranos, qui cum ab Antonio in colonias essent deducti (. . .)’.
\(^3\) Cf. App. b.c. II 18, 133; III 2, 17 and note 7 below.
\(^4\) Plutarch, Brutus 19, quoted in RE XVI p. 546.
\(^6\) Cf. App. b.c. II 18, 135.
\(^7\) Dio XLIV 51.
\(^8\) See Best p. 7; see also Botermann p. 197, note 4.
same time in which the seventh and eighth legions, perhaps their last components, received land in Campania. The fact that at the same time, between April and October 44 B.C., the ninth legion, as the fourth of Caesar's oldest legions, must also have been deduced to a colony suggests that there is a connection between the occupation of Raurica and the identity of the colony which legio nona was endowed with. In that case, Plancus must have led this legion to what was to become Raurica in a great hurry, for fear of the trouble it could cause in Rome.¹

Further details about Caesar's ninth legion may confirm whether it was really deduced to Raurica. In the winter of 59-58 B.C., it was stationed in Aquileia,² and in that year it already formed part of the veteran legions.³ Like the tenth legion, it continued to do active service from the start of the conquest of Gaul till the Spanish campaign, the end of the civil war.⁴ The ninth and tenth legions fought in many of the major battles as flank guards, the most responsible position in a battle formation.⁵ Caesar preferred to

¹ This is more plausible than the explanation that Plancus left in great haste because he felt no longer safe in Rome (cf. RE XVI p. 546: 'Er wird die günstige Gelegenheit, den heissen Boden Roms zu verlassen, bald ergriffen haben'). In Rome, Plancus had no reason to fear for his own safety. Just like the other followers of Caesar's, he was to receive the province Caesar had allotted to him. It was on his proposal that amnesty was granted to those who had assassinated Caesar and, consequently, the Senate party had no reason to bear him any malice either.
² Caesar, b.g. I 10.
³ B.g. I 24.
⁴ Hirtius b.g. VIII 8: 'Singularis enim virtutis veterrimas legiones VII, VIII, VIII habebat, summae spes delectueque iuventutis XI, quae octavo iam stipendio tamen in collatione reliquarum nonum candum vetustatis ac virtutis ceperat opinionem'. For the participation of the ninth legion in Caesar's campaigns in the civil war and in Africa, see below. For their presence in Spair, see bell. hisp. 34. The indication 'nonani' in this context cannot refer to one of Pompeius' legions, which, for example, the Loeb edition accepts as a matter of course (A. G. Way, Caesar: Alexandrian, Spanish and African Wars, (Loeb classical library) (London and Cambridge, Mass. 1964), pp. 374-5 and 423). The only parallel to the substantival term 'nonani' found in literature about Caesar's era is 'decumani' (b. hisp. 30 and 31; Suetonius, Divus Iulius LXX). This therefore constitutes an unusual way of designating Caesar's two favourite legions (see below). This kind of designation cannot possibly refer to a legion of Pompeius' occurring only once. Apart from that, it appears that these nonani fought on Caesar's side and even asked him for help.
⁵ Cf. Caes., b.g. II 23; b.c. III 89; (Pharsalus) 'Caesar superius institutum
command the tenth legion himself but he had special relations with the ninth as well.¹ The ninth and tenth together were his “own” legions.² During the civil war, moreover, the ninth legion was frequently commanded by Antony. On one particular occasion, Antony saved this unit from a very awkward situation.³ For these reasons, the ninth must have been one of the most ardent pro-Antony legions, which, indeed, corresponds closely to our conclusions about the prevailing mood among Plancus’ veterans.

The ninth and tenth legions had another aspect in common. While the tenth had rebelled in 47 B.C., before the departure to Africa, the ninth had been the instigator of a mutiny before. During the entire Gallic campaign, no rebellion occurred in Caesar’s army. Yet, right at the beginning of the civil war, in 49 B.C., mutiny broke out near Placentia, led by the nonani.⁴ They had chosen a moment of vital importance to Caesar: Pompeius had all his troops at his disposal and, consequently, Caesar’s legions were indispensable to him. The soldiers used their desire of dismissal as a pretext for mutiny but what they really wanted was complete freedom to loot and plunder.⁵ Caesar suppressed the mutiny in a characteristic way.⁶ When, in 47 B.C., the tenth legion in Campania decided to rebel at an equally inconvenient moment, other veterans also participated.⁷ In view of the fact that the ninth and tenth legions

servans decimam legionem in dextra cornu, nonam in sinistro collocaverat'.

B. afr. 81. The soldiers of the ninth legion apparently bore the brunt in the storming of Corduba too (see above p. 24 note 4, b. hisp. 34).

¹ See for example b.g. I 40; VII 47; App. b.c. II 11, 76: αὐτὸς δ’ ἐπὶ τοῦ δεξίου κέρας συνετάσσετο τῷ δεξάτῳ τέλει καθάπερ ἵν έθος αὐτῷ για legio X. For legio IX see, for example, b.c. III 46 and 67.

² Cf. Caes. b.c. I 87: ‘duas legiones suas’. The preceding text nowhere mentions two legions specially commanded by Caesar at that moment. The only legion mentioned by name is the ninth; it fought near Ilerda (b.c. I 45-6) under Caesar’s personal command. Yet, as the situation had changed completely, the formulation in c. 87 cannot refer to this. The only explanation seems to be that Caesar, irrespective of moment or situation, speaks of ‘his two own legions’, i.e. two legions having a stronger personal tie with him than the rest of the army. These can only have been the ninth and tenth legions.

³ Caes. b.c. III 45-6; 63-5; 89: ‘Caesar (...) legionem (...) nonam in sinistro collocaverat (...) Sinistro cornu Antonium (...) praeposuerat’.

⁴ Suet. Div. Iulius LXIX.

⁵ Dio XLI 26.

⁶ Ibid. ff.; App. b.c. II 7, 47.

⁷ App. b.c. II 13, 93-4.
arrived together in Africa after the rest of the army had already landed there, it may be assumed that soldiers from the ninth legion were among the rebels of 47 B.C. Caesar afterwards dealt with them together and for one and the same reason.¹ The firebrands among the soldiers and officers were sent away or systematically "used up" in the African campaign.² The latter disciplinary measure undoubtedly demanded a heavy toll from the ninth and tenth legions.

In the battle of Pharsalus, the ninth and eighth together had just sufficient men left to form almost a single legion.³ This fact, combined with the total defeat in the subsequent battles of the civil war and the additional "purge" in Africa, justify the assumption that, after the Spanish campaign, only some one thousand men at the most were left of the original ninth legion. Similarly, the tenth legion had been reduced considerably. From various examples it appears that this number was sufficient to populate a relatively small colony.⁴

If legio decima was in fact sent to Equestris, it is very likely that a legion as closely related to it as the ninth, was stationed in Raurica. Besides, the consideration that these two legions were the most mutinous elements among Caesar's veterans, may have played a role in the decision to send them both to rather remote regions where their temperament could be turned to more useful purposes among the local, recently subjugated peoples than in colonies in the very core of the Empire.⁵

In the case of the tenth legion, there is a logical connection between its mutinous tendencies and its deduction to a far-off colony; obviously, the same could be said of the ninth legion. This

¹ B. Afr. 53-4.
² Cf. Dio XLII 55: τοὺς γὰρ πάντα τε θρασείς καὶ ἱκανοὺς μέγα τι κακὸν δρᾶσιν ἐκ μὲν τῆς Ἰταλίας ἐξήγαγεν, ὅπως μηδὲν ἐκεί καταλειπθέντες νεκριμώσωσιν, ἐν δὲ δὴ τῇ Ἀφρικῇ καὶ μάλα ἡδέως, ἡλικοὺς κατ' ἡλικήν πρόφασιν ἀνάλοισε.
³ Caes. b.c. III 89.
⁴ Octavian's colonies in Gallia Narbonensis were also invariably populated by one veteran legion. In planning the colony account must have been taken of the fact that, in principle, the Raurici were also to be included in the colony (cf. Vittinghoff p. 69 note 1).
⁵ The possibility of rebellious legions being deduced to remote regions is borne out by a threat uttered by Caesar when he suppressed the revolt in Campania; on that occasion, he announced to the mutinous veterans that they would be sent to regions far away from each other as an extra precaution (Dio XLII 54). Cf. also note 2 above.
does not mean to say that the men regarded these measures as a punishment; it should be borne in mind that both legions received a colony in the area where they had served Caesar loyalty in the Gallic war.\textsuperscript{1} Besides, they must have occupied an elite position \textit{vis-à-vis} the Celtic population.

It is remarkable to learn that Caesar’s legions, on many occasions, acted in constant pairs. Apart from the recurrent juxtaposition of the ninth and tenth legions, a similar pattern is found back in the combined actions of the thirteenth and fourteenth,\textsuperscript{2} the seventh and eighth,\textsuperscript{3} and the eleventh and twelfth legions.\textsuperscript{4} In this context, it is interesting to note that these pairs were usually incorporated into Caesar’s army in the same year.\textsuperscript{5} The seventh and eighth legions both received colonies in Campania after Caesar’s death.\textsuperscript{6} Of Caesar’s four oldest legions, only the seventh and eighth are mentioned in connection with the events in Italy. From this we may infer that, at the time, the ninth and tenth legions were outside Italy. Since this has been confirmed in the case of the tenth and since the seventh and eighth legions had settled near each

\textsuperscript{1} Of all legions in Gallia Comata, the tenth was the only one to be involved in Caesar’s activities against the Helvetii near Genava in 58 B.C. (Caes. b.g. I 7-10). The ninth legion formed part of the forces which, in the same year, marched from Vesontio to meet Ariovistus’ troops on the battlefield and inflicted a decisive defeat on them (ibid. I 58 ff.). In the following winter, Caesar’s army, including the ninth legion, remained stationed in the region of the Sequani (Caes. b.g. I 54).

\textsuperscript{2} Cf. b. afr. 34 and 60.

\textsuperscript{3} Caes. b.g. VIII 8 see above note 72; B. afr. 62 if the reading of the MSS is followed there.

\textsuperscript{4} Caes. b.g. VIII 24: ‘\textit{M. Antonium quaestorem cum legione duodecima sibi conscriptui}’; in this context it should be borne in mind that legio XI, together with legio VII, VIII, and IX, as mentioned in b.g. VIII 8, still formed part of Caesar’s troops. See also b.g. I 24: ‘\textit{sed in summo ingu duas legiones, quas in Gallia citeriore proxime conscriptae}’. Cf. I 10. That it refers to legions eleven and twelve appears from b.g. VIII 8 (cf. p. 24 note 4).

\textsuperscript{5} Legions seven, eight, nine and ten formed part of Caesar’s forces from 58 B.C. onwards, and were at that time already veteran legions. See p. 24, note 3 above and Best p. 7. Legio XI and XII were raised in 58; cf. p. 24, note 4. Legio XIII and XIV were not incorporated into Caesar’s army in the same year. The thirteenth legion is mentioned in b.g. V 53 (54 B.C.); legio XIV was raised in 53 B.C. (see b.g. VI 1 and 32).

\textsuperscript{6} See Appendix II, p. 38 with note 2. The tenth legion’s absence from Italy in this period springs from the fact that it formed part of Plancus’ army.
other, it is very likely that two legions so evidently linked up with each other as the ninth and tenth, received colonies in the same region outside Italy.¹

There are no signs that Augustus' ninth legion traced back its origin to Caesar's ninth veteran legion, though other legions did indicate such origins by the use of emblems and epithets.² The former legio nona must have ceased to exist as an army unit. Two inscriptions from the second half of the first century B.C. are the last witnesses of this legion's military exploits. An inscription from Athens is dedicated to L. Aquillius (...) Gallus.³ Among his titles are "mil. leg. IX Macedonic". In this period of history, the indication "Gallus" is almost certain to mean that the veteran in question, and consequently his whole legion, took part in Caesar's Gallic war. If Mommsen's convincing argument that the legionary epithet "Macedonica" refers to the battle of Philippi ⁴ is true, the phrase quoted constitutes a confirmation of the legion's participation in the battle on Octavian's and Antony's side.

The second inscription was found near Visinada in Istria on a tombstone of a veteran "leg. IX Triumph".⁵ The location of the site where the inscription was found is significant. In 58 B.C., Caesar called up the three legions, placed at his disposal by the Senate, from the region around Aquileia where they had their winter quarters.⁶ The tomb inscription comes from Istria, i.e. the region

¹ My colleague Best has pointed out to me that Caesar's sense of humorous coincidence may have played a role in finding a location for the colonies of legions IX and X. As both legions had often fought on the flank of battle formations—the ninth on the left and the tenth on the right—, they were stationed in colonies 'on the corresponding flanks' of the Jura mountains in order to prevent a break-through of the Helvetii on either side of this "front".

² Cf. RE XII² s.v. legio (Ritterling): for legio V: p. 1564; for legio VI: p. 1587; for legio VII: p. 1614; for legio VIII: p. 1643; for legio X: p. 1671. About legio nona, however, we read on p. 1664: 'Die L. wird wohl auf die alle Caesarische dieser Nummer zurückgehen, wenn auch ein greifbarer Anhalt für diese Annahme bis jetzt nicht beigebracht werden kann.


⁴ Cf. Mommsen RGDA² p. 69 note 4, quoted in RE XII² ibid.

⁵ CIL V 397 (RE ibid.): L. Vinisius / L. F. Veter / Leg. VIII / Triumphh.; dated by Mommsen in early Augustan era.

⁶ See p. 24, note 3 above.
where the legion had originally been stationed. The epithet "Triumphalis" is not found with any other legion;\(^1\) this suggests that the honorary title was granted because of a victory in which especially legio nona had distinguished itself. When, in 44-43 B.C., Plancus was engaged in fights against Gallic, and possibly also Raetian tribes, the tenth legion was already in Iulia Equestris and consequently did not participate in the fighting. The ninth legion was not yet stationed in a colony, which leads us to assume that, being Plancus' oldest legion, it formed the hub of his army in the area of the Raurici. The permission for the triumphal march which Plancus led on 29 December 43, is among the major points of discussion in his correspondence with Cicero.\(^2\) It must have been closely related to the official recognition of the title of imperator which Plancus had earlier received from his troops.\(^3\) The significance these honours had for Plancus may have caused him to grant the title of "Triumphalis" to the ninth legion as a token of his gratitude. From these considerations, some indications may also be inferred about the name Plancus gave to what would later be known as Raurica. Just as Lepidus gave the name Lepida to the colony of Celsa founded by him, we find the name "Munatia" on a coin struck to commemorate the foundation of Lyon.\(^4\) In the same way, the colony that was later to become Raurica, may well have been called Munatia. It is, therefore, not at all improbable that legio nona triumphalis was located in Colonia Munatia Triumphalis, just as legio decima equestris was stationed in Colonia Iulia Equestris. As a parallel to the phrase "Colonia Triumphalis", we find "provincia triumphalis" in Cicero's work.\(^5\) The assumption that Munatius Plancus attached great importance to his military achievements is,

---

\(^1\) Domaszewski has propounded that the ninth legion may have received the epithet of 'Triumphalis' because of the triumphal march of the triumviri in 43 B.C. (Österr. Jahresh. II, Beibl. 83, quoted in RE XII\(^2\) p. 1664). In that case one wonders why only legio nona should have received this epithet and why Augustus' legions are never called 'Triumphali'.

\(^2\) Cic. ad Fam. X 1; 2; 7; 10; and 12 (Walser I; II; VIII; IX; X). For Plancus' triumphus see p. 33 note 3.

\(^3\) See the beginning of Plancus' letter ad Fam. X 8 (Walser VII); Cf. CIL VI 1316: cos. imp. iter.

\(^4\) Grant p. 206.

\(^5\) Cic. Pis. 19, 44. See also Plin. N.H. III 1, 10: 'Ipasturgi quod (cognominatur) Triumphale'.
for example, borne out by the fact that he had a painting of Victoria placed in the Capitol.¹ The god Hercules, with whom Plancus had special ties, was also closely associated with victory in battle and with triumph.² Another significant parallel, finally, to the epithet "Triumphalis" for a colony of veterans who had won their spurs in subjugating hostile tribes, is the case of the colony of "Tulia Victrix Triumphalis Tarraco" founded by Augustus.³

When most of the veterans who had been called up again were dismissed once more after the battle of Philippi,⁴ the ninth legion did not return to Raurica because this colony had been given up as a result of the political state of affairs in Gallia Comata.⁵ Nor was the ninth legion, unlike the seventh, eighth, and tenth, delegated to a colony in Gallia Narbonensis.⁶ This need not cause any surprise. The few hundred veterans who, after Philippi, were the last survivors of legio nona had, during Caesar's conflict with the Senate, fought regularly under Antony's command.⁷ It is, therefore, very well possible that they were among those veterans who, as we learn from Appianus, wanted to continue to serve as soldiers,⁸ and that they went with Antony to the eastern provinces of the Empire as his praetorians.

The situation in the recently subjugated regions in the western part of the Empire was considerably influenced by the civil war. As to Gallia Comata, the period from Caesar's death until 16 B.C. was characterized by recurrent battle⁹ and by the lack of any

¹ Plin. N.H. XXXV 36, 1,08. Pliny writes expressly: '(tabula) quam Plancus imperator posuerat'.
² See RE VIII s.v. Hercules pp. 567-9 and 589-90 (Haug.) See also Orelli 1042: Hercules Triumphator. For Plancus' connections with Hercules and the Hercules cult in Raurica, see Staehelin pp. 96-100. The aforementioned foundation coin of Lyon is explicitly reminiscent of Plancus' military victories in Gaul as it depicts Hercules defeating a bull.
³ RE IV A² s.v. Tarraco (Schulten) p. 2399.
⁵ See Appendix I.
⁶ For the colonization of Gallia Narbonensis, see Best p. 9.
⁷ See p. 25 with note 3 above.
⁸ See note 4, Appianus.
⁹ For a survey of the history of Gallia Comata in the period between 43-16 B.C., see Appendix I.
distinct administrative and political organization, as is, for instance, evident from numismatic data. The situation changed completely in 16 B.C., when large hordes of Sugambres, Usipetes, and Tencteri crossed the Rhine and invaded Gallia Comata; in the battle that followed Lollius, the provincial governor, was defeated. Consequently, Augustus left Rome, together with Tiberius, in order to implement a large-scale organization of Roman rule over Spain and Gaul. After the Germanic raids, chaos prevailed in Gallia Comata. Besides, Licinius, the procurator, was guilty of financial mismanagement; this Gaul had been made a prisoner of war by the Romans and was afterwards released. He was not punished because he decided to surrender part of his unlawfully acquired possessions to Augustus. Dio has pointed out that Augustus focused his activities on colonization...

In the same year, Publius Silius began the conquest of Raetia which was continued in 15 B.C. It is significant that in the years between 16 B.C. and 6 B.C., at least one member of the imperial family was at any time present in Gaul and Germania. Official policy vis-à-vis Gaul and Germania in this period seems entirely different from that of the previous era. During this period, the conquest of Raetia, Noricum, and Germania was begun by stages. In the same period, apparently for the first time since 44 B.C., measures were taken for the systematic organization of Roman rule over Gaul, e.g. large-scale colonization.

The colonization programme most probably included the refounding of Raurica. In 15 B.C., Drusus drove the Raetians out of Italy from Tridentum. Dio informs us that, at that time, the Raetians were still active in Gaul. Augustus then sent out Tiberius as well who invaded Raetia at the same time as Drusus. In Dio's

1 Cf. Grant, op. cit., p. 118.
2 Dio LIV 19 and 20; Velleius Paterculus II 97.
3 Dio ibid. caput 27.
4 Ibid. caput 23.
5 Ibid. 20. For the political background and the meaning of Silius' campaign, see the excellent article by D. van Berchem, La conquête de la Rhétie, Museum Helveticum, Vol. 25 Fasc. i (1968), pp. 1 ff.
6 Dio LIV 22-3; Strabo VII 1, 5 and p. 32 below.
7 See Julian IV p. 69.
8 Dio LIV 22: 'Ραουλιος οδοιμντες μεταξύ τοῦ τε Νορίκου και τῆς Γαλατίας, πρὸς ταῖς Ἁλπεσι ταῖς πρὸς τῇ Ἰταλίαι ταῖς Τριδεντῖναις, τῆς τε Γαλατίας,
account, there is a distinct differentiation between the areas where each of them operated; Tiberius was active in Gaul (i.e. Gallia Comata) whereas Drusus operated in Italy (including cisalpine Gaul). In marching against Raetia, Tiberius followed the route described above, going from Lugdunum, via Vesontio, along the Arar and the Dubis. Raurica served as a base for attacks; traces of the presence of Tiberius' army have been found here. The Raurici must also have suffered from these Raetian attacks, as perhaps may be inferred from the destruction of the Raurici village near the gas works at Basle. It must, therefore, be considered plausible that the Raurici, directly involved as they were, gave all possible support in the battle against Raetia.

Bearing this in mind, it was to be expected that Augustus would honour the Raurici by refounding a colony on their territory which, as an additional token of honour, was called after the Raurici themselves. Augustus must have had one more reason to refound Raurica: the colony's location made it an important meeting-point

1 For the Lugdunum-Raurica route, see p. 12 and note 4. For a discussion of problems concerning Tiberius' route, see RE IX A p. 5 ff. s.v. Vindelici (Heuberger); see also van Berchem op. cit.; K. Christ, Zur römischen Okkupation der Zentralalpen, Historia 6 (1957), p. 417 ff. Staehelin pp. 107 ff. Howald-Meyer's assumption that Tiberius must have attacked Raetia from the south is in contradiction with Dio's reading, as well as with Velleius': 'e diversis partibus (...) adgressi' (II 95 cf. Caes. b.g. I 1) which suggests that the attack was launched from different directions (Howald-Meyer p. 365; repeated by E. Meyer in Neuere Forschungsergebnisse, p. 78). This hypothesis starts from the assumption that the text of the Trophaeum Augusti, quoted by Pliny III 136 ff., sums up Alpine tribes in a particular order indicating military campaigns. For a convincing refutation of this theory, cf. a publication in preparation by R. A. van Royen.

2 Cf. E. Meyer in Neuere Forschungsergebnisse, p. 78.

3 Ibid. in Museum Helveticum 19, (1962), p. 146.

4 In this context, it is interesting to note that Dio remarks that, under Augustus' colonization programme of the period, it was the state which designated names to colonies, and not the settlers or inhabitants themselves, as was the case in his own time. Dio mentions the example of the city of the Paphii to which Augustus personally gave the honorary name of 'Augusta' (Dio LIV 23).
of four major routes. First of all, the road starting at Lugdunum; secondly, the road leading along the Donau to castra Regina (Regensburg), which served as a base for attack on the bank of the Donau during the Germanic campaign; thirdly, the road to Mogontiacum and Vetera (Mainz and Xanten), both on the Rhine, from where raids into Germania were launched.\(^1\) Thus Raurica was the point where the route from the Gallic capital, Augustus' then residence, branched off into two roads leading to the regions from where attacks were launched. Besides, these roads via Raurica formed the shortest two-way connection over Roman territory between both fronts. It is interesting to note that, like the road from Lugdunum to Raurica, these two other routes leading out of Raurica also went through river valleys. The last, though not the least important route started from Augusta Praetoria and continued through the major St. Bernhard pass and the Swiss plain to Raurica, thus forming the most direct link between Italy and the Rhine region.\(^2\)

The inscription on Munatius Plancus' tomb must have consciously been made to refer to existing circumstances. Plancus had founded Lugdunum which from 16-13 B.C. served as Augustus' temporary residence. Moreover, Tiberius had commenced his march against the Raetians at Lugdunum. Plancus had also founded Raurica which had been refounded and served as a base for attack against the Raetians. The phrase on the tomb reads "triumphavit ex Raetis" and not "ex Gallia", as is written in the Fasti Triumphalium,\(^3\) because it was Raetia on which attention was focussed after Tiberius' expedition.\(^4\)


\(^2\) Cf. Staehelin p. 115 and the forthcoming article by R. A. van Royen on Augusta Praetoria.

\(^3\) CIL I\(^1\) I, p. 50 quoted by Staehelin p. 101 note 2. See also RE XVI I p. 548. An indirect confirmation of the assumption that Plancus did triumph over Gaul is found in the fact that, during Lepidus' and Plancus' triumphal march the soldiers kept on repeating the phrase: 'De germanis, non de Gallis duo triumphant consules' (Vell. II 67, 4).

\(^4\) It is of course not at all impossible that the Raetians launched attacks outside their own territory in 44 B.C., just as they did in 15 B.C., and that, on that occasion, Plancus fought against them; yet, for our purposes it is not necessary to find out whether the inscription represents historical truth but to record that a shift in emphasis took place as compared to the time in which Plancus celebrated his triumph.
There may have been a third reason for the refounding of Raurica. It would never have been so easy for the Raetians to invade Gaul if the veteran colony founded by Munatius Plancus had not ceased to exist after legio nona triumphalis had departed.
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Appendix I

Gallia Comata between 43-16 B.C.

When Antony had obtained Plancus' and Lepidus' support and went to Italy, he took the best and largest sections of their armies along; only six of the seventeen legions were left behind as an occupation force for the whole of transalpine Gaul and the Spanish provinces together, under the command of Varius Cotyla, one of Antony's intimates and boon companions.¹ The triumviri allocated Gallia Comata to Antony,² and after the battle of Philippi, he acquired Gallia Narbonensis too.³ Antony never visited his Gallic provinces and consequently lost all contact with his generals there.

In 41 B.C., during the battle between Octavian and L. Antony at Perusia, all available forces stationed in transalpine Gaul were located in the region of the Alpine passes.⁴ Gradually, these troops were almost wholly taken to Italy.⁵ One of the results of this phase of the civil war was that Octavian took over transalpine Gaul from Antony's generals Ventidius and Calenus, at the same time acquiring their powerful armies.⁶ In 40 B.C., the transfer of Gaul from Antony to Octavian was officially ratified.⁷ The state of affairs described here shows that between 44-40 B.C., the triumviri did not pay any attention to remote regions like colonia Raurica, and it is very likely that no troops were stationed there.

Between 39-37 B.C., there was so much unrest in Gaul, that

¹ Dio XLVI 54; Plut. Antonius 18.
² App. b.c. IV 1, 2; Dio XLVI 55.
³ Dio XLVIII 1.
⁴ Dio XLVIII 10; App. b.c. V 3, 20.
⁵ App. b.c. V 4, 31 and 33.
⁶ Ibid. 6, 50 and 51; Dio XLIII 20.
⁷ App. b.c. V 7, 65; Dio XLVIII 28; Plut. Ant. 30.
Octavian was forced to intervene personally.\(^1\) His general Agrippa assisted him in his military expeditions and fought the Aquitanians\(^2\) as well as the Germans who had seized the opportunity to cross the Rhine and invade Gaul.\(^3\) Octavian, however, had to terminate his campaign abruptly when the battle against Sextus Pompeius went so badly that he had to focus all his attention on it.\(^4\) This proves once again that engagement in a civil war was given priority over the maintainence of stability in the provinces, as was mentioned above in connection with the events of 44-43 B.C. and 69 A.D.\(^5\) Sextus Pompeius was not finally defeated until 35 B.C.\(^6\) Up till then, Octavian could not have paid much attention to Gaul. Any Roman action that was taken in Gaul between 39-35 B.C. was intended to suppress rebellions there, which always started far away from Raurica. There was, therefore, no reason at all to send veterans to the region of Raurica again. Veterans were, however, sent to Gallia Narbonensis.\(^7\)

In 35-34 B.C., Octavian had to give up his plans to put his affairs in order in Africa; in the same period, he interrupted an expedition to England because of unrest caused by rebelling Salassi, Taurisci (in the south of Noricum) and Liburni and Iapyges (north-west Illyria). The suppression of these revolts resulted in the systematic subjugation of the Dalmatian coast, from Aquileia to Salona.\(^8\) Octavian, then, still concentrated on campaigns in regions far away from Raurica, and any plans of reorganization that he may have had were meant for entirely different regions.

---

\(^1\) App. b.c. V 8, 75; cf. p. 1 and p. 12, note 3 above. The course of events has shown that Caesar's precautionary measures and Plancus' concern about their suppression were fully justified.

\(^2\) App. b.c. V 10, 92.

\(^3\) Dio XLVIII 49.

\(^4\) Ibid. For the conflict with Sextus Pompeius, see App. b.c. V cap. 9 and 10.

\(^5\) See pp. 19 and 20 above.

\(^6\) Dio XLIX 18.

\(^7\) Ibid. 34; it is significant that Augustus, in his Res Gestae, gives an enumeration of the regions where he established colonies; the list includes Gallia Narbonensis but does not mention Gallia Comata (Mon. Anc. Tab. V 35).

Of course the subsequent period was dominated by the conflict between Antony and Octavian, culminating in the battle of Actium, and immediately afterwards, by Octavian's journey to Egypt where, after Cleopatra's death, he made this country into a Roman province in 30 B.C. In the summer of 29 B.C., Octavian returned to Italy where he celebrated a triumph in the month of August.¹

In the years following, Nonius Gallus fought the Treveri who had entered into an alliance with the Germans from across the Rhine; it was the second time that the Germans had invaded Gaul, since Caesar's death.² C. Carrinas suppressed a revolt among the Morini and other Gallic tribes.³ He celebrated a triumph on 12 June 28 B.C.⁴ After Agrippa, Valerius Messalla Corvinus became the second general to fight the Aquitani.⁵ His triumph took place on 25 September 27 B.C.⁶ In the same period, the Suebi were also driven back across the Rhine.⁷

In 27 B.C., the whole of Gaul was added to the imperial provinces. For the second time, Octavian, in the meantime proclaimed Augustus, had to abandon his plan for an expedition to Britain; according to Dio, this was because of the chaos he found in Gaul caused by the fact that the conquest was immediately followed by the Civil Wars. Augustus then held a census and implemented administrative organization.⁸ Nothing is known about the exact nature of this organization. As Augustus spent only a relatively short time in Gaul, especially in Gallia Narbonensis, it is not likely that he took very comprehensive measures in Gallia Comata. In the same year, Octavian travelled on to Spain. In 26 B.C., Augustus had to refrain from going to Britain for the third time because the Salassi south of the Alps and the Cantabri and Astures in the northwest of Spain demanded all his attention. In 25 B.C., the Salassi

¹ CIL I² pp. 76, 180, 248; Macrobr. Sat. I, 12, 35; quoted by RE X¹ p. 339, s.v. Iulius Augustus.
² Dio LI 10.
³ Ibid. 21.
⁴ CIL I² p. 76, quoted by RE VIII A 1 p. 150, s.v. M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus (Hanslik).
⁶ CIL I² p. 50 and 70. See also the article in RE loc. cit.
⁷ Dio LI 21.
⁸ Dio LIII 22; Livy per. CXXXIV.
were subjugated and practically exterminated by Terentius Varro. In the same year, Augustus led the war in Spain. After the Salassi had been killed off, he founded the colony of Augusta Praetoria (Aosta) on their territory, and in Spain he founded Augusta Emerita (Merida).¹

It was not until 22 B.C. that Augustus transferred the administration of Gallia Narbonensis to the Senate because, according to Dio, a Roman military presence was no longer required there.² This seems to show that the colonies founded there by Augustus around 35 B.C. had the situation well in hand and that the activity of 27 had been fruitful. In 19 B.C. Gallia Comata was under Agrippa's rule because the local inhabitants were at variance with each other as well as with the Germans. In the same year, Agrippa left again in order to restore law and order among the Cantabri in Spain.³ The overall picture for this period shows that Gallia Comata would be faced with Roman action only when the population staged a large scale rebellion. This happened regularly and often coincided with German raids across the Rhine. Roman troops were repeatedly forced to leave in a hurry by civil war or more serious troubles elsewhere. There is no evidence of any systematic organization in Gallia Comata, in contrast to Gallia Narbonensis, which was pacified completely after intensive colonisation in 22 B.C., and in contrast to the region of the Salassi, south of the Alps. It must be assumed that the region of the Raurici fell outside the Roman scope of action.⁴

¹ Ibid. 25.
² Dio LIV 4. See also Van Royen's forthcoming publication on Augusta Praetoria.
³ Ibid. 11.
Appendix II

Legio septima and legio octava after the battle of Munda

After the battle of Munda had put an end to the civil war, these legions, which together with legio nona and legio decima formed Caesar's oldest veteran forces, received colonies in Campania. During the civil war, Campania had actively sided with the Senate party and its inhabitants had repeatedly shown their militant outlook. It was therefore necessary for Caesar to maintain experienced and faithful troops in this area. With the same military record as the ninth and tenth legions but without the reputation of being mutinous, the seventh and eighth legions, consisting of loyal veterans, were best suited to be sent to this region.

Caesar had expressly promised his veterans that, in granting them land, he would avoid such awkward situations as expropriation without compensation, and the crowding together of old and new settlers. He presumably kept this promise in the case of the seventh and eighth legions who, as seniors, were allocated colonies without delay. At the moment of his death, however, Caesar had not yet completed the implementation of his colonization programme. In view of the necessity of evacuating the dangerous masses of veterans from Rome, Antony apparently did not manage to find a universally satisfactory solution. This assumption is borne out by Cicero's constant invectives against Antony's colonization policy in April and May 44 B.C., and by the Senate's attempts to declare Antony's measures null and void after they had initially been ratified. A

1. See p. 23 and p. 24, note 4 above.
2. Cf. RE XII p. 1614 for legio VII, and p. 1643 for legio VIII concerning epigraphical and historical sources. An elaborate discussion, based on the material available, of the fate of these legions after Caesar's death up to the rise of the second triumvirate will be found in Botermann's work, especially on pp. 36-45, 74-7, 79-80, 182-4, 196-7.
3. See Caes. b.c. I 14; III 20-22; Dio XLII 24-5; Cic. Phil. XII 3, 7 for some striking passages.
4. App. b.c. II 13, 94; Dio XLII 54.
5. See p. 23 above.
6. Cf. Cic. Phil. II 39, 100 ff.; 17, 43; 25, 62; V 3, 6; 4, 10; also very striking is V 19, 53: '(... \textit{de agro campano separatim cognoscere})'; see further VIII 8, 25-6; X 10, 22; XI 5, 12; XIII 2, 3; XIII 15, 31. As appears from Cicero's correspondence (cf. ad Fam. XI 20-1), he was prepared to admit
plausible explanation for this may be that Senators and other large landowners with their clients suffered substantial losses as a result of land expropriation for the benefit of Caesar's veterans. The settling of veterans in Campania had always been a delicate matter. One of the richest and most fertile regions in the Roman empire, Campania had never been affected by large-scale land distribution programmes and it comprised many vast estates.\(^1\) Numerous tenants rented small plots of land there, providing an important source of income for some very wealthy Senators.\(^2\) The Senate had on an earlier occasion opposed land allocation in Campania because it considered the veteran's commanders as a menace;\(^3\) in this particular case they viewed Antony with suspicion, whose hold on central Italy had been strengthened as a result of the programme. The nullification of Antony's deductions was to serve a dual purpose: first of all, undesirable land allocations could be repealed, and land of Antony's supporters allotted to troops supporting the Senate; secondly, the dangerous presence of so many of Antony's followers in Campania could be terminated.

In October 44 B.C., Octavian spent large amounts of money to buy Caesar's veterans stationed in Campania, including the seventh and eighth legions, over to his side.\(^4\) According to Appianus, most of them changed their minds again when it turned out that they would have to march against Antony. A number of them, however, did stay with Octavian, who went on to Etruria to try and recruit veterans there as well. Besides, many of those who could not make up their minds in the end decided to join Octavian after all.\(^5\) In

Antony's veterans into Campania when Antony's military situation improved afterwards. For Antony's deductions in Campania, see Botermann pp. 19 ff., and for the Senate's attempts to repeal them, see pp. 64 ff. and 140 ff. (ibid.).


\(^3\) See for example Cic. de lege agraria II 73.

\(^4\) Nicolaus of Damascus: Βλατς Καίσαρος, 31; 131 ff.; Dio XLV 12; Appianus B.C. III 6, 40; Cic. ad Att. XVI, 8; Velleius Paterculus II 61; Livy per. 117. Cf. Botermann pp. 36 ff.

\(^5\) Appianus B.C. III 6, 41. The fact that Octavian's veteran army was a mixture from various old legions is also apparent from Velleius wording:
contemporary sources, frequent mention is made of Octavian’s veteran army. Yet, the exact identity of the legions making up his army is nowhere specified. It may therefore be assumed that it comprised a mixture of various army units from Campania and Etruria. In view of the tremendous reputation which Caesar’s veteran legions enjoyed, it is highly improbable that Caesar would not have mentioned the troops by name if they could, if only in part, be identified as legio VII and VIII; indeed, mention is invariably made, for example, of Antony’s defected legio martia and legio IV, as well as his loyal V Alaudae. Similarly, Cicero records, in March 43, that legio VII and VIII remained neutral in distinct contrast to Octavian’s veterans who sided with the Senate. Yet, Cicero later relates how, in the battle of Forum Gallorum, legio VII put up a brave fight and it appears that legio VIII also fought against Antony’s troops in the battle of Mutina.

It appears, therefore, that Caesar’s seventh and eighth legions initially sided with Octavian but, as Cicero recorded in March 43, afterwards withdrew into a neutral position. Shortly before the battle of Forum Gallorum, legio VII must have decided once more to side against Antony while legio VIII did the same in the battle of Mutina.

In June 43, Asinius Pollio wrote a in letter sent to Cicero from Spain that he had learnt that the seventh, eighth, and ninth legions had joined Antony’s follower Ventidius. This letter, in which 'primumque a Calatia, mox in Casilio veteranos excivit paternos; quorum exemplum secuti alii brevi in formam iusti cotere exercitus'; (Velleius loc. cit.). There is no reason to believe that this army was any further identified with legio VII and VIII.

1 See p. 38, note 4 above; also: Cic. ad Fam. X 28; Philippica III 2, 3 ff.; V 16, 43-4.

2 See also Cic. ad Att. XVI 8; ad Fam. X 30; XI 7; X 28; XII 25, Philippica I 8, 20; III 3, 6-7, 15, 39; IV 2, 5-6; V 2, 3-4; 8, 23; 19, 52-3; XII 2, 3; 9, 19-20; XIV 27. For the tremendous respect Caesar’s oldest veteran legions enjoyed, see for example: Hirtius b.g. VIII 8 (legio VII, VIII and IX, cf. p. 24, note 4); b. afr. 16 (legio X); see also p. 22 note 2.

3 Phil. XI 14, 37.

4 The fact that legio septima fought for the Senate near Mutina appears from Cic. Phil. XIV 10, 27. For legio octava, see CIL X 4786 quoted in RE XIIa pp. 1614, 1643. For a different interpretation of the attitude of legio VII and VIII in this period, see Botermann pp. 74-80.

5 Cic. and Fam. X 33. ‘(...) Ventidium quoque se cum legione VII, VIII, VIII coniunxisse (...)’.
Pollio just reported what he had heard from Lepidus in Gaul, contains a number of obvious mistakes. Pollio is at fault when he states that legio Martia had been destroyed in the battle of Forum Gallorum and that all of Antony's and Hirtius' men had been killed there; he goes on to claim that the fourth legion, under the Empire still active under the epithet of Macedonica, had afterwards been wiped out as well. Pollio deeply laments the supposed death of Octavian. Brutus is said to dispose of only seventeen cohortes and two incomplete recruit legions raised by Antony. Various hypotheses have been put forward as to the identity of legions VII, VIII, and IX, about which Pollio had heard that they had joined Ventidius. In the available sources, Ventidius' three legions are frequently mentioned but they are not mentioned by name in any other extant text. Ferrero and Botermann are probably right in

1 Ibid.: 'Nunc haec scribuntur ex Gallia Lepidi et mutiantur'.
2 Ibid.: '(...) Martiam legionem interisse (...'). It appears from B.C. IV 15, 115-6 that legio Martia continued to exist until the battle of Philippi. Cf. Botermann pp. 193-4. For legio Martia in the battle of Mutina, see also: App. B.C. III 9, 69 and ad Fam. X 30.
3 Ad Fam. X 33: '(...) Hirtino audem proelio et quartam legionem et omnis pareaque Antoni caesas, item Hirti (...'). Cf. App. B.C. III 19, 70 and ad Fam. X 30; Botermann ibid. From ad Fam. XI 14 it is clear that legio Martia and legio IV were still important in May 43.
4 Ad Fam. X 33: '(... ) quartam vero (... ) a quinta legione concisam esse'; cf. RE XII p. 1549; Botermann ibid.
5 Ad Fam. loc. cit.: '(... ) dixi etiam Octavianum ceidisse (...').
6 Ibid.: 'Brutum enim cohortis XVII et duas non frequentis tironum legionis, quas conscripsert Antonius, habere audio'. In Mutina Brutus had the command over at least two veteran legions and one recruit legion (App. B.C. III 8, 49), and probably a fourth one too (Botermann p. 201). Soon after the siege was ended in April 43 B.C., he received three more recruit legions which had been raised by Pansa (ad Fam. XI 10; Botermann pp. 111-2 and 201). On 28 July he had already a total of ten legions (ad Fam. X 24). Pollio's description is not valid for any moment during this period.
7 Botermann's suggestion (p. 194) that Pollio means that Brutus took over seventeen cohortes and two incomplete recruit legions from Antony and incorporated them into his own forces does not conform to Pollio's phrase 'Brutum (... ) habere audio'.
8 Three newly numbered legions supplemented to Antony's legions at Mutina (A. von Domaszewski, Die Heere im Bürgerkrieg (Heidelberg, 1894), p. 182), to the Macedonian legions (O. E. Schmidt, P. Bagiennus, Philologus LI, 1892, p. 186 note 3); both hypotheses have been rejected on good grounds by Botermann pp. 196-7.
9 Among others App. B.C. III 9, 66; 11, 80; 84; ad Fam. X 34; XI 10. See RE VIII A1 s.v. P. Ventidius Bassus (Gundel) p. 799.
assuming that Pollio meant Caesar’s veteran legions with these numbers. The absence of any further specification of these numbers leads us to believe that all Pollio referred to was the legions universally known by these numbers. Yet, if we accept that Caesar’s legions VII and VIII, in the period following Caesar’s death, behaved in the manner described above, it is hardly possible that legions VII and VIII at the same time joined Ventidius and thereby sided with Antony. It is very likely that Pollio or his informant once again provided wrong information.

It must be considered impossible that the ninth legion, led out of Picenum by Ventidius, was the same as Caesar’s veteran legion. If it had really been stationed in Picenum, right in the middle of Italy, it would have played a role much earlier, viz. during the recruitment of veteran legions after Caesar’s death. Yet, this was not the case. Whereas the seventh and eight legions are frequently mentioned in connection with the events in Italy, legio nona is only found in Pollio’s letter which has shown to be an unreliable source of information in other respects as well.

In 36 B.C., the seventh and eighth legions mutinied for the same reasons and under similar pretexts as previously the ninth and tenth. Applying the same tactics as Caesar in the case of the ninth and tenth legions, Octavian dismissed them right away. Still following Caesar’s example, he took some of his troops back into service the

1 G. Ferrero, Grösser und Niedergang Roms III (Stuttgart, 1909), pp. 175 ff.; Botermann (p. 197) does consider Pollio a reliable source and accepts that both Antony and Octavian had men from Caesar’s seventh and eighth legions under them. Botermann claims that both parties involved used these vestiges (each side cannot have had more than a couple of hundred men per legion, see p. 26 above) to form new legions with identical numbers. Pollio’s ‘hearsay’ seems to form an inadequate basis for such a complex assumption.

2 Botermann p. 197 considers the possibility that Antony’s legio IX was Caesar’s legion.

3 Dio XLIX 13 and 14. The fact that the legions seven and eight were among the instigators of mutinies in those years can be inferred from Dio’s remark that those who had supported Octavian in his battle against Antony near Mutina, were the first to be dismissed, followed by all soldiers who had served for more than ten years. As has been argued above, the seventh and eighth legions must have been added by Octavian in the battle of Mutina. Thus, they were the oldest units in Octavian’s army, and this is why he dismissed them before the others in 36. Octavian then gave them land in Campania from where he had led them in 44.
year after. When they mutinied again in 35 B.C., they were dismissed for good and, like the veterans of legio decima, were finally sent to a colony named after their legion in Gallia Narbonensis.¹

¹ Dio XLIX 34: ‘... διλέγους ἐξ αὐτῶν τοὺς πρεσβυτάτους ἐς Γαλατίαν κληρουχήσοντας ἐπεμψε...’