

WORLD HISTORY

© Y. A. MEKHAMADIEV

mehamadiev@gmail.com

UDC 94(37).09

THE UNITS OF THE EMESENIAN ARCHERS AND THE LATE ROMAN ARMY IN IV A.D.: THE PROBLEMS OF ETHNIC STRUCTURE, MILITARY RANK AND TERRITORIAL DEPLOYMENT

SUMMARY. The present article deals with the history of the Emeseniian archers' units in the Late Roman Army. On the grounds of epigraphical, hagiographical and papyrological documents, the author reveals the process of territorial movements of these units and changes in their military ranks. The novelty of this article lies in the detailed analysis of two documents (an inscription from Moesia and the papyrus from Panopolis), which were not systematically considered in previous literature. The main idea is that there were two units of Emeseniian archers in the Late Roman Army of IV A.D., which belonged to the frontier garrisons and came from the time of Principate — equites sagittarii in Pannonia (former cohorts I milliaria Hemesenorum sagittaria) and Regii Emeseni Iudaei (the descendants of the Hemeseni unit from North Africa). The author proposes the idea that the names Regii and Iudaei in the title Regii Emeseni Iudaei reflects not the social (Regii means "royal") and ethnic (Iudaei) origin, but only territorial naming (place of deployment), i.e. they denote toponyms (the garrisoned forts of Regiae and Castra Iudaeorum).

KEY WORDS: the Emeseniian archers, Viminacium, cohorts, Coptos, Flavius, comitatus, Concordia, Jews, Panopolis.

1. The inscription from Viminacium and the first cohort of Emeseniian archers of Principate.

In 1986 within the second volume of *Inscriptions de la Mésie Supérieure*, edited by M. Mirković, the latin epitaph from Viminacium (now Kostolac in Serbia), first published by A. von Premerstein and N. Vulić in 1903, was reprinted:

IMS. Vol. II, p. 150, no. 144 (version, restored by M. Mirković)	AE. 1903. 302 (original text of inscription)
[Fl(avius)] Valer[ianus tri]bunus [sagittario]/rum Hem[esenorum] / fabrica[m] / ordina[]	F VALER BVNVS RVM HEM FABRICA ORDINA

In this context it should be noted, that in the reading of the name of the officer who obviously ordered to build the weapon workshop (*fabrica[m]*), M. Mirković correctly follows A. von Premerstein and N. Vulić's view, which sets in the beginning of first line of this monument the Roman patrimonial *praenomen* Flavius, and proposes the dating of the dedication by the late 3rd-early 4th century A.D. [1; 57, no. 90]. Despite this, it seems difficult to agree with the editors' view on the inscription's dating — *praenomen* Flavius was the ancestral name (*gentilicium*) of Constantine I's dynasty, so the tribune Valerianus (if we accept the view, proposed by A. von Premerstein and N. Vulić), could receive *gentilicium* Flavius only after 316, when the province *Moesia Superior*, where *Viminacium* was placed, passed under the power of Constantine.

A. Mocsy proposed, as it seems, a well-justified idea that the name Flavius served in the military context as a rank designation of close relationships between the Emperor and soldiers, their service as bodyguards of Constantine as *protectores*, which was passed from fathers to their sons [2; 259-260]. It should be noted that in recent works it is generally accepted to date the beginning of officers and soldiers' careers, mentioned in Late Roman epitaphs, by the reign of Constantine, if they bear the name *Flavius* [3; 18]*. It is interesting that after the transition of Western Illyricum (the Pannonian provinces, Dalmatia and Upper Moesia) to the half of Constantine I, his ancestral name became a *praenomen* (the first mandatory element in Roman naming conventions) and in the full sense pushed aside the former *praenomen* *Valerianus*, dominant during the reign of Diocletian.

Consequently, we should accept as a *terminus post quem* for building the monument from *Viminacium* 316 A.D., when Constantine defeated Licinius, his political and military rival, and according in the peace treaty received Western Illyricum, including Upper Moesia with *Viminacium* as a part. We have no doubt that the Emeselian archers' unit under the command of Flavius Valerianus (*[sagittario]/rum Hem[esenorum]*) was the direct descendent of the famous first thousands cohort of Emeselian archers (*cohors I milliaria Hemesenorum Sagittaria*), dislocated in the Roman camp *Intercisa* in Lower Pannonia during the Principate. It should be stressed that the name of the cohort itself — *Hemesenorum* (Emeselian) — represents the toponym and reflects its origin from the Syrian city *Emesa*, whose inhabitants served as a recruitment basis for building this unit.

A. Alföldy compared epigraphical data of Principate and the *Notitia Dignitatum* chapters (the list of Late Roman military and civilian officials) on Pannonian provinces, and in 1924 he proposed a hypothesis on the descendance of *equites sagittarii* units from auxiliary detachments of Pannonian *limes* in the first half of IIIA.D. Thus, the scholar cited the case of *Intercisa* and the *cohors I milliaria Hemesenorum Sagittaria* — according to the *Notitia*, the *equites sagittarii* unit was placed in this camp also in the

* — The civilian inscriptions and officials in the *comitiva Flavialis*' rank are also ascribed by R. Scharf to the reign of the Constantinian dynasty, i.e. 40-50th of 4 A.D.: [4; 151-152], [5; 71]. For more detailed treatment on change in Roman naming conventions and movements of *praenomen*, *nomen* and *cognomen* places in Late Roman Empire see.: [6; 164-182].

Late Roman period (ND. Occ. XXXIII. 38) [7, 88]. We can accept this view, as an inscription from Lower Pannonia RIU. V. 1144 = AE. 1971. 335, dated from 252 (the second consulate of Emperor Gaius Trebonianus Gallus), strictly places the garrison of the first thousands cohort of Emesenian archers in Intercisa: *Sanctissimo / ac super om/nes principes / clementissimo / Imp(eratori) Caes(ari) C(aio) Vibio / Treboniano / Gallo P(io) F(elici) Invic(to) Aug(usto) pontif(ici) / max(imo) trib(unicia) pot(estate) [III] / co(n)s(uli) II p(atri) p(atriciae) [pro]/co(n)s(uli) coh(ors) [I |(milliaria)] / Hemes(enorum) ma[ies]/tati eorum / devotissi[ma]*. Consequently, there can be no doubt that after 252 the former first thousands cohort of Emesenian archers saved its garrison in Intercisa until the end of the 3rd century A.D. — in this sense it should be noted that Viminacium's inscription is the latest evidence on the history of Pannonian Emesenian archers.

We believe that between 252 and the reign of Valentinian I (364-375), to whose time P. Kovacs, T. Nagy and S. Soproni ascribed the origin of the Pannonian chapters of *Notitia* [8; 193], [9; 64, 66], [10; 118], the Emesenian archers' unit, attested by the Viminacium inscription, was renamed in *equites sagittarii*. Nevertheless, we have epigraphical data allowing us to conclude a change of functions and ranks of Emesenian archers in earlier times — Tetrarchy (284-305) and Constantine I (306-337). In 1987 Th. Drew-Bear and M. Christol published a Latin epitaph from the city of Aulutrena in Phrygia, reprinted in AE. 1987. 943 and dated from the late 3rd-early 4th century A.D*, which mentioned the Emesenian archers' unit once again: *Iul(io) Mar[ei]/no mag(istro) Hem(e)s(enorum) Iu(lius) Monim(us) et Iulius Bassus / eq(uites) fratr(e!) nostro du/lcis(s)imo m(emoriam) p(osuerunt) / fecimus ti/t(u)lu(m)*.

As everybody knows, Phrygia was placed south of Bithynia, where the seat of the Diocletian residence (Nicomedia) was — in this sense we may assume that the dating proposed by Th. Drew-Bear and M. Christol, is proved by the Viminacium inscription cited above. R. Scharf proposed the idea that the Emesenian archers' unit from Aulutrena can not be identified with the *cohors milliaria Hemesenorum* of Principate as there are no marks of rank in the Aulutrena inscription [12; 345]. It leaves no doubt that the scholar does not consider the Viminacium inscription, which testifies to the deployment of the former first cohort of Emesenian archers in Upper Moesia during early IV A.D (at least since 316).

The comparison of these two inscriptions, it seems, reflects two consecutive stages of the Emesenian archers' history in the early 4th century: the Phrygian epitaph represents an earlier monument, attesting to the deployment in Asia Minor of the *cohors milliaria Hemesenorum*, transferred from Lower Pannonia. Obviously, placing the *sagittarii Hemeseni* unit in Phrygia was connected with the establishment of the Imperial *comitatus* (personal bodyguard of Emperors) during the Tetrarchy.

* — M. Christol and Th. Drew-Bear in their paper denoted the mention of magister' office in military context (commander of army unit), as a valid criteria for dating an inscription and this fact, according to the scholars' view, was characterized precisely for the border of III–IV A.D.: [11; 52].

These bodyguards were under direct command of each Tetrarch, and according to the conclusive arguments of D. van Berchem, represented themselves as the aggregate of small vexillations (cavalry units), separated from frontier legions [13; 107-110].

D. van Berchem justly stressed that the Tetrarchs' *comitatus* should not be identified with the full army, as its number was too small for such comparisons — in this context, the Aulutrena inscription may serve as a valid proof for *comitatus* including not only old vexillations, which before belonged to frontier legions, but also *alae* and cohorts transferred to Imperial residences of Tetrarchs. Accordingly, we can regard the Viminacium inscription, which is not considered by Th. Drew-Bear and R. Scharf, as the later monument, attesting the return of *sagittarii Hemeseni* to Lower Danube provinces. This return to Moesia was obviously connected with the consequences of civil wars in the Empire in 324 A.D. — in this year, Phrygia and part of Asia Minor passed under the power of Constantine I, who finally defeated his rival Licinius, who was the East Roman emperor. It is possible to assume that the Emeselian archers unit from Aulutrena was placed in Phrygia until Constantine became sole Emperor of all the Empire in 324 A.D.

Consequently, we may correct our first conclusion on *terminus post quem* for the dating of the Viminacium inscription from Upper Moesia — this monument was erected after 324, as since this year the ancestral name of Constantine *Flavius* might be extended to soldiers of the military unit which was the part of Licinian army. Obviously, in connection with the involvement of Emeselian archers (the former *cohors milliaria Hemesenorum*) in the conflict of 324 on the side of Licinius, Constantine as a victor transferred this unit from Phrygia in Upper Moesia and deprived it of its privileged rank — they were brought out of the Imperial bodyguard and ascribed to the frontier army as an ordinary detachment of *equites sagittarii**.

2. Regii Emeseni Iudaei, the papyrus from Panopolis (Dublian collection) and the Notitia Dignitatum: studies of treatment.

In 1877 in the second issue of volume V of *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* (inscriptions from the Venetia and Histria, Transpadana and Liguria provinces), Th. Mommsen published the Latin epitaph no. 8764 from Concordia (now Portogruaro

* — The latin epitaph from the city of Ulmetum (in Lower Moesia), dated 324, clearly proved that military units, included in Licinian *comitatus*, not only acted on his party against Constantine in 324, but also regarded a new ruler of Empire as a culprit of Civil Wars and a tyrant: D(is) M(anibus) / Val(erius) Victorinus / biarc(h)us qui militavi[t] / in sacro palatio ann(os) VII[3] / vix(it) ann(os) XL qui in *proe[li]o Romanorum Calc(h)ed[o]nia contra a(d) versarios* — IGLRom. 206 = AE. 1976. 631 (italics added — *Ye.M.*). M.P. Speidel, as it seems, justly noted that biarchus Valerius Victorinus, who served in *sacro palatio* (i.e. in the Licinian residence in Serdica), belonged to one of the *scholae palatinae*, which is identified by the scholar with the *schola scutariorum* («schild weaponed») of Licinius: [14; 85]. It is possible that in connection with the open hostility of the defeated Licinian palace guard Constantine scattered the Licinian army through different provinces and transferred the Emeselian archers in frontier army of Balkan and Danubian regions.

in Venice district), where another military unit, levied from the citizens of Emesa, was attested:

FLAVIA OPTATA MILI · DE
 NVM · REGI · EMES IVDEO
 RV SI QVI POST AVITV
 ME · ARC VOLV · AP · EN · FI
 RVI · AVR · LIB · VNA

Th. Mommsen offered the following reading of the inscription, based on the saved letters of monuments: *Flavia Optata(!) mili(tis!) de / num(ero) Regi(orum) Emes(enorum) Iude(o)/ru(m) si quis pos(t) obitu(m) / me(um) arc(am) volu(erit) ap(erire) [i]n(fe/ret) fisci [vir](ibus) aur(i) lib(ram) una(m)*. D. Hoffmann devoted a single chapter of his thesis and one paper to the military cemetery of Concordia, dating the erection of all gravestones, including the Flavia Optata epitaph, from autumn 394 — early 395, and connected 37 soldier sarcophagi from Concordia with the military campaign of Theodosius the Great in North Italy in September of 394. According to D. Hoffmann's view, the Concordian inscriptions reflected the involvement in this campaign of East and West Roman military units, which faced each other in battle near Frigidus river west of Aquileia. In this struggle, Theodosius won a decisive victory over the troops of the West Roman usurper Eugenius, who proclaimed himself Emperor in 392 [15; 25], [16; 91]*.

D. Hoffmann in his thesis, followed by Th. Mommsen, identified the unit of *Regii Emeseni Iudaei* from Flavia Optata's epitaph with the palace auxilia *Regii*, mentioned in chapter VI of the Eastern list of Notitia Dignitatum (49: *Regii*) — according to his view, the “eastern origin of soldiers” from *Regii Emeseni Iudaei*, levied among the Jewish community of Syrian Emesa, confirms this identification. D. Hoffmann explains the absence of the ethnonyms *Emeseni* and *Iudaei* in the title of *Regii auxilia* by the issue of the imperial constitution of the West Roman Emperor Honorius in 418 on exclusion of Jews from military service [16; 68]. But in this treatment the scholar contradicts his own conclusions on dating the Eastern list of ND, composed, as he believes, not later than Spring of 394, while a Honorian law, saved in CTh. XVI. 8. 24, was published in 418 and relates only to the West Roman provinces [16; 52-53]**.

It should be stressed that the epitaph mentioning the *Regii Emeseni Iudaei* unit caused intensive disputes among scholars in the 1990s, and the essence of these debatable points was the problem of *Regii Emeseni Iudaei*'s ethnic origin — how do

* — On the circumstances of military conflict between Eugenius and Theodosius I see more in detail: [17; 487-508], [18; 235-244].

** — The idea of D. Hoffmann regarded only the military aspect of research (a chronology of different troops' territorial movements), and is far from precise; in 1998 C. Zuckerman proved very convincingly from the account of papyrological data that the Eastern list of ND was composed not earlier than 401, but this treatment does not solve the problem of *Regii Emeseni Iudaei*'s connection with the law of 418. See.: [19; 143-144, 146].

the concepts of *Regii*, *Emeseni* and *Iudaei* correspond with each other? In 1992 D. Woods turned his attention to a passage of the treatise *On Saint Athanasius* by Lucius of Cagliari — a bishop of the same town in Sicily, who lived in the first half of the 4th century A.D. (died ca. 370). In this treatise, Lucius regards the events of Athanasius the Great's life, who was one of the eastern "church fathers", and in 356 mentioned the siege of the Alexandrian church by Jewish soldiers. Athanasius escaped to this church as a refuge from the persecutions made by the troops of the East Roman emperor Constantius II, a son of Constantine I (*sed Iudaeos destinasse militem ad Alexandriam, Iudaeorum militem obsedissee fores dei domus, Iudaeorum militum duces fuisse Syrianum- Lucifer Calarit. De S. Athan. II. 22, SCEL XIV, ed. G. Hartel, p. 188*).

D. Woods regards "the Jewish soldiers" of Lucius of Cagliari as the title of a special military unit of the Late Roman Army, levied among Jews — the scholar identifies Jews who besieged an Alexandrian church in 356, with *legio comitatenses Regii* from the Eastern list of ND, and believes that the Jews' unit was transferred to Gallia as a result of the partition of the army between two Emperors — Valentinian I (West Roman ruler, a senior brother) and his colleague Valent (Eastern half of Empire, a junior brother) [20; 404-405].

But, as it seems, R. Scharf justly defined that the mention of Jews in Lucius' treatise was designed as a polemic tool and represented no more than a rhetorical figure created by the author, who was, as it is well-known, fanatically devoted to the Orthodox Church and criticized Arianism [12; 347]. Obviously, Lucius did not mean Jews as a special military unit, and we have no sufficient proof to assume the identity of "Jewish soldiers" (*Iudaeorum militem*) besieging the church in Alexandria, or the *Regii Emeseni Iudaei* unit from Concordia.

C. Zuckerman ascribed the origin of *Regii Emeseni Iudaei* to the city militia of Emesa, levied in 250 by the representative of the local royal dynasty Sampsigeramus, and included in the regular Roman army in 270 as a palace *auxilia* [21; 19]*. M.P. Speidel, in polemic with C. Zuckerman's statement, denied the possibility of the existence of a Late Roman ethnic unit (*auxilia*) levied from Jews, and identified *Regii* from Concordia with the bodyguard of the Alamann king (chieftain) Croke, who played an important role in Constantine's ascendance in 306 [23; 165]. So inconsistent values of rank and origin of the *Regii Emeseni Iudaei* from Concordia, as we see it, are connected with the fact that scholars did not pay a proper attention to sources, which mentioned other Emesenan archer military units.

In the second Panopolitan papyrus from the Dublin collection (Chester Beatty Library) the deployment of cavalry archers in the "camps of Potekoptos" within Upper Egypt (province of Thebaid) in 300 A.D. is mentioned. We may identify these archers with one of the numerous *Emesenan* archer units, widely attested by inscriptions

* — R. Scharf and O. Schmidt supported this view, stressed close relations and continuity between the armies of Principate and Dominate: [12; 356-357], [22; 109].

from Roman North Africa* (τοῖς ὑπὸ Οὐαλέριον πραιπόσιτον [ἰππεῦσι] σαγιτταριοῖς διακειμένοις ἐν κάστροις τῆς Ποτεκόπτου — P. Beatty. *Panop.* 2, 6. 162). Moreover, two Greek inscriptions from the same camp (Koptos = Potekoptos), dated 316 and 323, named in the staff of Koptos garrison Emesenean archers under the leadership of prepositus Victorine:

Milne, <i>Cairo Mus.</i> , p. 45, no. 9238b, 1-6 = SEG. 34. 1598, 1-6 (Italics added — <i>Ye.M.</i>), 323 A.D.	D 8882, 1-5 = ZPE. Bd. 62. 1986, S. 225 (Italics added — <i>Ye.M.</i>), 316 A.D.
μεγάλη τύχη τοῦ [θε]ο[ῦ] — — — και τ[ῶν] ἀγγέλων τῆς [ἰ]ερεί[ας] — — — ἀνε[]/νεώθη και ἐκοσμήθη [τὸ ἱερὸν ἐ]/π[ι] Οὐίκτηρινου π[ρ]αι[η]η[σοῖ]του) λεγ[ε]ώνων γ' /Γαλλικῆς και α' Ἰλλυρικ[ῆ]ς και Ἐμεσην[ῶν] σαγιτταρίων τῆ προ[νο]ία]	ὑπὲρ εὐχῆς τῶν ἀγγέλων Ἐμεσηνοὶ ἀνέθηκαν· νόοις τὸν ἀρχιερέα Διονῦσιν ἐν τῇ καλῇ ἡμέρᾳ μνήσθη/ Ἀραβία· Βάσος ἔγραψεν μεγάλη τύχη τῶν ἀγγέλων· ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας τῆς οὐξιλλατίωνος λεγ[ε]ώνων) γ' Γαλλικῆς και α' Ἰλλυ/ρικῆς τῶν ὑπὸ Οὐίκτηρίων/ πραιπόσιτον·

The cited inscriptions and papyrus, as we believe, testify that Emesenean archers, composed in the Early Principate and placed in Numidia in the early 3rd century A.D., were transferred to Upper Egypt ca. 300, where Koptos was elected as a garrison site for the deployment of this unit. It should be stressed that the Emesenean cavalry continued to stay in Thebaid also in 316-323, when the Empire was divided into Constantinian and Licinian parts and Egypt with its Emesenean troops belonged to the half of Licinius.

We may assume that the Emesenean cavalry from Coptos cannot be identified with the thousands cohort of Emesenean archers of Principate placed in Lower Pannonia. Our only source left an account on the transfer of military forces from Danubian regions in Egypt — the famous P.Oxy I 43r., dating from 295, indicates that the Egyptian stay of vexillations, derived from some of the Balkan frontier legions (legio VII Claudia, legio IV Flavia, legio XI Claudia), lasted only a small time. As for this matter, E. Ritterling, who paid a special attention to this papyrus for the first time, connected it with the Diocletian military expedition, sent to Egypt to suppress a revolt against the Roman power in Coptos and Alexandria during 294-295 A.D. According to the scholar's view, the structure of these expeditionary corps was reflected by the evidence of P.Oxy I 43r [24; 1359-1361]**.

* — For instance, the inscription from Numidia, dated 211-217 (the reign of Caracalla), mentions an Emesenean archers unit with the complementary name *iuniores* ("juniors"), what also presupposes existence of the «senior» (seniores) half of this unit during the same period: [Deo Soli] / [pro salute et vict]or[ia et reditu] / [Imp(eratoris) Ca]es(aris) M(arci) Aureli Severi A[ntonini] / [Aug(usti) et I]uliae Aug(ustae) matris A[ug(usti) et] / [castr(orum) M(arcus)] Ulpius Optatu[s] (centurio) leg(ionis) III Aug(ustae) prae[posit]us *n(umeri) Hemesenoru[m]* d(e)d(icavit) sub] / [cura I]uniorum Phosimi et [3] — AE. 1926. 145 = AE. 1992. 1850 (italics added — *Ye. M.*)

** — R.T. Updegraff also connects arrival of Danubian expedition corps in Egypt with the rebellions, raised by local tribes of Blemmii, and insurrections of Aksumites in Upper Egypt, undertaken in the same time (294-295): [25; 72].

As it seems, W. Enßlin justly noted that the papyrus reports the regrouping of Diocletian expeditionary troops *before their return* to Danubian provinces, suffered from sudden incursions of Sarmatians and Quadi in 295 [26; 29-30]. Consequently, Emesenan archers from Lower Pannonia, placed in Intercisa under the Principate, could not be transferred to Egypt in 295 as part of the expeditionary corps of Diocletian — all the units of this army, except vexillations of legio V Macedonica from Dacia, were withdrawn to their home provinces after the revolt was put down, while Emesenan archers continued to stay in Coptos in 316-323.

The unit, as we believe, descended from Emesenan archers, attested by the Numidian epitaph of Caracalla's reign, cited above: *Deo Soli* / [*pro salute et vict] or[ia et reditu]* / [*Imp(eratoris) Ca]es(aris) M(arci) Aureli Severi A[ntonini]* / [*Aug(usti) et I]uliae Aug(ustae) matris A[ug(usti) et]* / [*castr(orum) M(arcus)] Ulp[ius Optatu]s |(centurio) leg(ionis) III Aug(ustae) prae]/[posit]us n(umeri) Hemesenoru[m d(e)d(icavit) sub]* / [*cura I]uniorum Phosimi et [3]* — AE. 1926. 145 = AE. 1992. 1850. R. Scharf identified the mentioned West Roman legio comitatenses Regii with one of the frontier garrisons of North Africa, which, according to his view, was placed in the city of Regiae in Mauretania Caesariensis, but by the beginning of the 4th century A.D., was moved into the local field army and received a name after its former site of deployment [12; 352].

But the scholar does not consider that in the city of Regiae just those Emesenan archers might be placed who were moved to Numidia during Caracalla's reign and in their title retained the complementary name Regii, represented as a toponym — for instance, the citizens of Regiae were named Regienses ([...] *termini pos(iti) i[n]ter Regienses* [...] — CIL VIII 21663 = D 5963). Moreover, we have another good and interesting example of the use of the name Regii = Regienses not as a function (in the sense of "royal"), but as a topographical indication: in the epitaph from Hippo Regius, from the end of the 4th century A.D. or the first third of the 5th, the military frontier unit *numerus Hipponensium Regiorum* is mentioned, which, obviously, was destroyed during the Vandal invasion of Africa in 429: (*Buraido millex(!) / de num(ero) Hipp(onensium) Reg(iorum) / vixit in pace / ann(os) XL milita(v)it XVIII (q)uie(v) i(t) / s(u)b d(ie) III N(onas) Iul(ias) indi(c)/t(i)on(e) nona* — CIL VIII 5229 = CIL VIII 17401 = ILCV 549).

We may note that the *Hemeseni* unit, also placed in the city of Regiae, was moved to Thebaid and billeted in Coptos during the early 4th century A.D. (presumably, in 298-300, when Diocletian reorganized the military forces of Egypt after the suppression of the Egyptian governor Domitius Domitianus' revolt*). This military unit retained an additional name Regii, connected with the place of its initial deployment, and now

* — We support the view of J.D. Thomas, who ascribed the usurpation and mutiny of Domitius Domitianus to 297/8 from the account of vast papyrological data, especially — P. Mich. III, 216-220, contrary to a commonly assumed concept on dating these events from 296/7: [27; 253-279]. Arguments against this treatment, offered by F. Kolb (mainly, references to rhetoric passages by Latin panegyrists and legends of coins), seem to us inconclusive: [28; 105-125].

the official nomenclature of Upper Egypt's Emesenan archers included two titles (toponym and ethnonym): *Regii Hemeseni*. Despite this, *Hemeseni* from Coptos continued to be a frontier military unit, as during the Tetrarchy field armies still had not been created.

We believe that there is a direct connection between *Regii Emeseni Iudaei* from Concordia and Emesenan archers from Coptos — it is likely that *Regii Hemeseni* were moved from Thebaid in Lower Egypt in 356 as a part of troops which besieged the church in Alexandria under the command of dux Syrianus. It is essential that one of the military camps of Lower Egypt was indicated in the relevant chapter of the Eastern list of ND as *castra Iudaeorum* (XXVIII. 42) — as it seems, this was the camp where *Regii Hemeseni* was placed primarily, and thus in its name this unit included a new additional toponym (but not an ethnonym and especially not a designation of confession): *Iudaei*.

Indirect evidence from a passage of the anonymous work *Historia Acephala* — a short biography of Athanasius the Great, which has survived only in Latin translation — may confirm the involvement of *Regii Emeseni* from Coptos in the siege of the Alexandrian church. In chapter V of this work we can find statements on dux Syrianus arriving in Alexandria together with legions gathered from all Egypt and Libya (obviously, by “Libya” it means neighbouring Cyrenaica, whose troops really were under the command of Egyptian dux since the Tetrarchy*): *Itaque dux Syrianus... ac praemittentes omnes per Aegyptum ac Libyam militum legiones* — *Historia Acephala*, 5 (PG. XXVII. Col.1444 B).

The cited passage clearly shows that in his military campaign, Syrianus relied only on local frontier armies of Egypt, which included also Emesenan archers from Coptos. We have not sufficient data to establish the reasons of *Regii Hemeseni* (*Emeseni*) *Iudaei*'s transfer from Egypt to Constantinople, from where Theodosius I marched with his troops to North Italy in 394, but there is little doubt that by its origin, the *Regii Emeseni Iudaei* from Concordia was none other than the Emesenan archers earlier placed in Coptos. In this sense it is noteworthy that neither the former *cohors I milliaria Hemesenorum* from Pannonia, nor *Regii Hemeseni* (*Iudaei*) from Coptos belonged to the Late Roman field army, but remained in frontier military forces, taking part in large campaigns and fields of the 4th century A.D.

* — See.: AE. 1934. 7 — *Pacis aeternae propagatorem / et publicae securitatis con/servatorem d(ominum) n(ostrum) Gal(erium) Valerium / Maximianum P(ium) F(elicem) Invictum Aug(ustum) / Aurel(ius) Max[im]inus v(ir) [p(erfectissimus)] dux / Aeg(ypti) et Theb(aidos) [u]trarum[ue] Libb(yarum) / devotus n(umini) m(aiestati)que eorum*; AE. 1934. 8 — *Iuventutis auctorem et pacis / aeternae conservatorem / d(ominum) n(ostrum) Fl(avium) Val(erium) Constantinum nob(ilissimum) / Caesarem Aur(elius) Maximinu[s] / v(ir) p(erfectissimus) dux Aeg(ypti) et Theb(aidos) utrarum[q(ue)] / Libb(yarum) devotus n(umini) m(aiestati)q(ue) eorum* (italics are our, Ye.M.).

REFERENCES

1. Premerstein, A. von., Vulić, N. Antike Denkmäler in Serbien und Macedonien // Jahreshefte des Oesterreichischen Archaeologischen Institutes in Wien. 1903. Bd. 6. Beiblatt. S. 1–60.
2. Mócsy, A. Der Name Flavius als Rangbezeichnung in der Spätantike // Akte des IV. Internationalen kongresses für Griechische und Lateinische Epigraphik (Wien, 17 bis 22. September 1962). Graz: H. Böhlau, 1964. S. 257–264.
3. Scharf, R. Der Dux Mogontiacensis und die Notitia Dignitatum. Berlin–N.Y: Walter de Gruyter, 2005. 352 s.
4. Scharf, R. Zur Comitiva Flavialis // ZPE. 1996. Bd. 114. S. 151–152.
5. Scharf, R. Comites und comitiva primi ordinis. Mainz–Stuttgart: Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, 1994. 72 s.
6. Cameron, A. Polyonymy in the Late Roman Aristocracy: The case of Petronius Probus // JRS. 1985. Vol. 75. P. 164–182.
7. Alföldi, A. Der Untergang der Römerherrschaft in Pannonien. Bd. I. Berlin–Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 1924. 91 s.
8. Nagy, T. Die Militärbezirke der Valeria nach der Notitia Dignitatum // Acta Antiqua Academiae scientiarum Hungaricae. 1959. Vol. 7. Fasc. 1-3. S. 183–194.
9. Soproni, S. Beiträge zur Frage der Liste von Valeria der Notitia Dignitatum // Acta Archaeologica Academiae scientiarum Hungaricae. 1974. Vol. 26. Fasc. 1-2. S. 59–70.
10. Kovacs, P. The Late Roman Army in Pannonia // Acta Antiqua Academiae scientiarum Hungaricae. 2004. Vol. 44. Fasc. 1. P. 115–122.
11. Christol, M., Drew-Bear, Th. Un castellum Romain près d'Apamée de Phrygie. Wien: Verlag der Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1987. 59 p.
12. Scharf, R. Regii Emeseni Iudaei: Bemerkungen zu einer spätantiken Truppe // Latomus. 1997. Vol. 56. Fasc. 2. S. 343–359.
13. Berchem, Denis van. L'armée de Dioclétien et la réforme constantinienne. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale et P. Geuthner, 1952. 130 p.
14. Speidel, M.P. A Horse Guardsmen in the War between Licinius and Constantine // Chiron. 1995. Bd. 25. P. 83–87.
15. Hoffmann, D. Die spätromischen Soldatengrabschriften von Concordia // MH. 1963. Bd. 20. S. 23–57.
16. Hoffmann, D. Das spätromische Bewegungsheer und die Notitia Dignitatum. Bd. I. Düsseldorf: Rheinland-Verlag, 1969. 531 s.
17. Szidat, J. Die Usurpation des Eugenius // Historia. 1979. Bd. 28. Hft. 4. S. 487–508.
18. Croke, B. Arbogast and the Death of Valentinian II // Historia. 1976. Bd. 25. Hft. 2. P. 235–244.
19. Zuckerman, C. Comtes et ducs en Égypte autour de l'an 400 et la date de la Notitia Dignitatum Orientis // Antiquité Tardive. 1998. Vol. 6. P. 137–147.
20. Woods, D. A Note Concerning the Regii Emeseni Iudaei // Latomus. 1992. Vol. 51. Fasc. 2. P. 404–407.
21. Zuckerman, C. Les «Barbares» romains: au sujet de l'origine des auxilia tétrarchique // L'armée romaine et les barbares du IIIe au VIIe siècle / Ed. M. Kazanski. Rouen: Association française d'archéologie mérovingienne, 1993. P. 17–20.
22. Schmitt, O. Stärke, Struktur und Genese des comitatensischen Infanterienumerus // BJ. 2001/2004. Bd. 201. S. 93–111.

23. Speidel, M.P. Raising New Units for the Late Roman Army: «Auxilia Palatina» // DOP. 1996. Vol. 50. P. 163–170.

24. Ritterling, E. Legio // Paulus Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft / Ed. G. Wissowa, W. Kroll. Bd. XII. Stuttgart: J.B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1925. Col. 1359–1361.

25. Updegraff, R.T. The Blemmyes I: The Rise of the Blemmyes and the Roman Withdrawal from Nubia under Diocletian // ANRW. II. Bd. 10. Hbd. 1. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1988. P. 44–106.

26. Enßlin, W. Zur Ostpolitik der Kaisers Diokletian // Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1942. Hft. 1. S. 1–83.

27. Thomas, J.D. The Date of the Revolt of the L. Domitius Domitianus // ZPE. 1976. Bd. 22. P. 253–279.

28. Kolb, F. Zu chronologischen Problemen der Ersten Tetrarchie // Eos. 1988. Vol. 76. Fasc. 1. S. 105–125.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

- AE — L'Année épigraphique. Paris, 1889-
- ANRW — Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt. Berlin, 1972-
- BJ — Bonner Jahrbücher. Bonn, 1842-
- CIL — Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum. Vol. I-XVI. Berlin, 1863-1959.
- CSEL — Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum. Vindobonae, 1864-
- CTh — Theodosiani libri XVI cum constitutionibus Sirmondianis et leges novella ad Theodosianum pertinentes. / Ed. Th. Mommsen et P. Meyer. Vol. I. Berolini, 1905.
- D — Dessau H. Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae. Vol. I-IV. Berolini, 1892-1916.
- DOP — Dumbarton Oaks Papers. Dumbarton Oaks, 1941-
- IGLRom — Popescu E. Inscriptiile grecești și latine din sec. IV-XIII descoperite în România. Bucharest, 1976.
- ILCV — Diehl E. Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres. Bd. I-IV. Berlin, 1925-1967.
- IMS — Inscriptions de la Mésie Supérieure. / Ed. M. Miković. Vol. 2: Viminacium et Margum. Belgrade, 1986.
- JRS — The Journal of Roman Studies. London, 1911-
- MH — Museum Helveticum. Basel, 1943-
- Milne. Cairo Mus. — Milne J. G. Greek Inscriptions. Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire. Oxford, 1905.
- ND — Notitia dignitatum : accedunt Notitia urbis Constantinopolitanae et Laterculi provinciarum / Ed. O. Seeck. Berolini, 1876.
- PG — Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graeca. / Ed. J.-P. Migne. Paris, 1857-1866.
- P.Mich — Michigan Papyri. / Ed. C.C. Edgar, A.E.R. Boak, C. Bonner, J.G. Winter etc. Vol. I-XIX. Ann Arbor, 1931-1999.
- P.Oxy — The Oxyrhynchus Papyri. / Ed. B.P. Grenfell and A.S. Hunt etc. Vol. I-LXXV. London, 1898-2010.
- RIU — Die römischen Inschriften Ungarns. / Ed. L. Barkóczi, A. Mócsy, B. Lőrincz, J. Fitz, S. Soproni. Bd. 1-5. Amsterdam–Budapest, 1971-1991.
- SEG — Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum. Leiden, 1923-
- ZPE — Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik. Bonn, 1967-