GUARDING THE DANUBE AND BEYOND (I)  
COHORS II MATTIACORUM

Abstract: Organization and operation of the Danubian limes had been a concern of the Roman imperial administration for several centuries. The strategic conception for this space was translated into practice directly with the support of the Roman army. One of the early arrived units in the Lower Danube area was cohors II Mattiacorum; detachments of the unit would flank the river, being stationed in the “bridgehead” fortifications of Dinogotia and Barboși. The history of this auxiliary unit may be broadly restored pegged solely by epigraphic records which we shall review below, together with historiographical discussions related to the completion and interpretation of their text. Although many of the opinions mentioned below remain mere hypotheses until new archaeological discoveries are made, I believe based on the documentary material that we know now, that the evolution of the cohors II Mattiacorum can be reconstructed with some accuracy. Obviously, any new epigraphic find may confirm or “colour” what we know now. The unit’s development spans more than a century from the last quarter of the 1st century AD to the end of the 2nd century AD, leaving more consistent traces at Dinogotia and Barboși, Sexaginta Prista and Sostra. We know the names of some soldiers and unit commanders and the fact that the unit was transformed somewhere in the middle of its existence into a milliaria unit.
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PREAMBLE

The organization and functioning of the Danubian limes was a matter of concern for the Roman imperial administration over several centuries. The concentration in the area on either sides of the river of certain elements, ultimately defensive, obviously served by a significant number of troops maintained in operation even after southern Moldavia became intra provinciam and Dacia was transformed into a Roman province, suggests, without the shadow of a doubt the importance that the Romans showed to the “riparian” segment by the Lower Danube. Such close supervision may not be by any means attributed to the “international nature” of navigation, as suggested (is it really possible to argue the presence by the Lower Danube of a “Barbarian fleet”, perhaps in rivalry with the Classis Flavia Moesica!?). Obviously, without entirely neglecting the defensive aspect (on the contrary,
the set-up of the Danube border shows that the Romans considered the possibility of a strategic retreat south of the river early on; we believe that the economic nature, flow of people and goods and the official or semi-official trading activities pulsating on both sides of the conventional demarcation lines⁸ should not be neglected. In this context, the very concept of limes⁹ as regarded by the ancients, that of a well-defined area, on either sides, of an outer and inner border with specific functions of preventing entry of certain ethnic elements and products and, respectively, exit of other from the delimited space, since both Romans and Barbarians were present both inside and outside the frontiers is worth mention. This entire strategic view of the space was put into practice with the direct support of the Roman army.

One of the troops early arriving in the area is cohors II Mattiacorum; detachments of the unit would flank the river also stationed in the “bridgehead” fortifications of Dinogetia and Barboși. The history of this auxiliary unit may be reconstructed in general, exclusively set out by the epigraphic records which shall be reviewed below, together with the completions and interpretations to which they have been subjected in the historiography on the issue.

**RECRUITMENT**

The Mattiaci were a tribe inhabiting an area between the rivers Lahn, Main and Rhine, famous for its hot springs (Aqua Mattiacae or Fontes Mattiaci), of interest for both written sources and imperial administration rather early, who would later found there Civitas Mattiacorum (the city of Wiesbaden in modern Germany)¹⁰. Although Tacitus counts the Mattiaci among the Germanic tribes (information adopted by the contemporary historiography), the archaeological finds at Wiesbaden do not seem to suggest the same; recorded there¹¹ are rather traces of worship of deities in the Gallic pantheon. The natives – whichever they were - were documented under Claudius (AD 41-54) at a time when they already were subjects of Rome, likely as foederati¹², used in the construction of fortifications, control of frontier areas and as labour in silver mines. They stand out during AD 69-70 when they sided with the Batavians besieging the Roman garrison of Mogontiacum;¹³ later, after Limes Germanicus had been established, they disappeared from known records; in fact, after the founding of that Civitas Mattiacorum during Trajan’s rule (AD 98-117), the town inhabitants would reference them as vicani Aquaenses not vicani Mattiaci¹⁶.

Otherwise, Catus Iul(ius) Sp(cius) ratus of n(atio) / Mattiacus, veteran of legion VI Victrix, sets up a votive inscription in the province of Britannia sometime during the 2nd century AD, at least after 131¹⁷. On the middle of the 3rd century AD (from 238 to 244) at Mogontiacum (in Germania Superior) appear Aur(elius) Candidus an cornicularius from Matt(ia)i(um) Gor(ianorum)urum. At Burdigala (in France) in the 4th century AD is recorded Flavinus – a soldier in numerus Mattiacorum, while at Nicopolis, in Cappadocia, an epitaph, dating to the same century, honours a primicerius in numerus Mattiacorum. In any case, the epigraphic material shows the existence of two units: numerus Mattiacorum seniorium and numerus Mattiacorum iuniorum at Concordia (in Dalmatia).

**ATTESTATIONS**

The auxiliary unit here, mentioned rather frequently on military diplomas and tile material by the Lower Danube, was thus raised from the (Germanic?) tribe of the Mattiaci, likely starting from the Flavian period, subsequent to the revolt of the Batavi of AD 69-70.¹⁴

The restoration of the inscription from Appiaria (Slivo Pole) is hypothetical, however it might firstly record the unit as early as 76.¹⁵ For certain though, it is mentioned for the first time in the constitution of February 7, 78 (reproduced on two military diplomas, that of Montana and another, whose find spot is unknown), without yet being able to distinguish whether it referenced cohors prima or secunda. From the same period or possibly early Trajan’s reign (?), a praef(ecto) co(hortis) / Mattiac(orum) is attested on an inscription discovered at Praeneste (in Italy), hence, whatever the recorded troop, with or without numerals, this was still a quingenaria cohort.

Cohors II Mattiacorum appears to be originally attested in the fragmentary diploma dated around AD 93 (957) and later possibly also the diploma of Oltina, from August 14, 99.¹⁶ It would remain in the province until mid 2nd century AD, being ever-present in the texts on military diplomas. Thus, it is documented by the diploma of May 13, 105, hypothetically that of November 24, 107.¹⁷

¹⁸ AÉ, 1889, 64 = CIL, XIII, 7250.
¹⁹ AÉ, 1910, 59; (II)c iac<ce> et Flu(vinus) de numero Mattiacorum seniorum qui vixi(um) / annus(um) qu(um) do(nante) et qui(nque) et dismisit(um) / crudelita(te)(m) uxori(!) et fili(i)s {I} (s) / qui vixs(i)t(!) / annus(!) qua(d)raginta et qui/nque et dismisit(!) grande(m) / crudelita(te)(m) uxori(!) et fili(i)s {I} (s) / qui vixs(i)t(!) / annus(!) qua(d)raginta et qui/nque et dismisit(!) grande(m) / crudelita(te)(m) uxori(!) et fili(i)s {I} (s) / qui vixs(i)t(!) / annus(!) qua(d)raginta et qui/nque et dismisit(!) grande(m) / crudelita(te)(m) uxori(!) et fili(i)s {I} (s).
²⁰ GREGOIRE 1999, 34-35.
²¹ CIL, V, 8737; 8739.
²² CIL, V, 8744; 8751.
²³ ALFOLDY 1968, 83. Also see MATEI-PESPECU 2015, 408, Table I. The units attested in Moesia in Flavian time.
²⁴ More recently see SCHMITZ 2008, 117-140.
²⁶ CIL, XVI, 22; RMD, IV, 208; AÉ, 1925, 67; ECK/PANGERL 2010, 237-243.
²⁷ For discussions in this respect see WAGNER 1998, 164-165.
²⁸ CIL, VI, 37274 = AÉ, 1906, 104.
²⁹ PETOLESCU 2014, 71-76.
³⁰ TOCLESCU 1887, 24-27, no. IX.15 (= CIL XVI, 44 = ILS, 2000). See also the reconstruction proposal at ECH/PANGERL 2014a, 215-218, no. 1, where instead of cohors II Mattiacorum is read cohors II Lucensium.
³¹ PETROVSZKY 2004, 7-64 (= AÉ, 2004, 1256).
³² ECH/PANGERL 2014a, 222-225, no. 4.
then in those of September 25, 11135, September 27, 1124, hypothetically in the ones of 113 (?36 and 119 (?36, then in those of October 19, 12037, June 1, 1258, August 20, 12739, April 2, 13440, February 28, 13841, April 7, 14542, AD 145-14643, 1464, October 11, 14645 and AD 14466.

It was garrisoned at Sexaginta Prista, where emerge stamped bricks with its name: Coh(ors) II Matti(acorum)]47, but also two miliarii from 14448. From there it was transferred to Sostra (Lomet), being replaced by cohors Il Flavia Brittonum (likely from Durostorum), the latter attested by two milestones of 162-16449, then in AD 230 during the reconstruction of the baths50 and later in 273-27551.

Of particular importance to the unit’s history is the fragmentary diploma issued for a soldier in cohors II Mattiaccorum discovered at “Kalugserskoto”, a vicus nearby the castellum of Sostra (see supra). Although fragmentary, it could be dated with precision on October 11, 146 based on the name of the mentioned consuls and phrase “a(n)te (diem) VId(us) Oct(oberes)”. Undoubtedly, the record of numeral “III” is an error.

It is also attested at Sostra on an inscription52 set up on the base of an imperial statue erected during the fourth assumption of consular power by emperor Antoninus Pius, thus from 145 until the end of his reign, in 161, and subsequently, on a second statue base, this time dated with certainty to 20 July 19853. Therefore, the unit was likely present in the fort of Sostra in the interval between Antoninus Pius (138-161) and Septimius Severus (193-212) without interruption.

It is mentioned in Thrace on the diploma of March 10, 155, recording its prefect Antonius Annianus. It remains there for a few decades (?), being attested by diplomas issued between 155-165: March 10, 15534, April 23, 15735, AD 161-16236, AD 166-16937 and 167-16938.

It is present in Sostra, the garrison at Sexaginta Prista59; then, T. Flavius Lupus, originally from Medessa (writing error for Edessa?), mentioned in the diploma from Sostra60 (October 11, 146). As for the latter, we note he bears the nomina gentilica, a specific feature of the newly “Romanized” especially from the Danubian and African provinces of the empire61.

The epigraphic documents preserve the names of five commanders. In chronological order, these include the attestation from the Flavian or perhaps early Trajan period of L. Clodius Ingenmus - praefectus in the inscription from Praeneste62 (noteworthy, even in this case the unit’s numeral is missing from its title); then, T. Flavius Laco named in the diploma of Tarnovo (February 28, 138) and P. Aelius Alexander, a native of Ancyra in Galatia, mentioned in the diploma of Sostra (October 11, 146), likely prefects, insofar as the cohort became miliaria only after having left the garrison at Sexaginta Prista63; then, T. Aurelius Aquila - tribune of the cohort - attested by the inscription of Sostra (AD 198) and lastly, a certain Faustianinus, son to Marcus - former tribune of the cohort – recorded by the inscription from Carnuntum64 (August 23, 219) at a time when he was already decurion of the colonies of Savaria and Carnuntum.

For the stationing period in Thrace, the diploma of March 10, 15565 mentions an ex petide, Aelius Batonis f. Dassius, Pannonicus, recruited around AD 130 (hence he would have been in service for quite a while during the unit’s stationing in Moesia inferior) and the unit’s prefect of the time, a certain Antonius Annianus.

Incomplete information is provided by a funerary monument discovered at Bisanthe (today near Tekirdağ in Turkey), set up for Aurelius Diopanes by his comrade Aurelius Martialius - miles cohortis Mattiaccorum and dated to the 3rd century AD (more likely the second half, based on palaeographic details)66. In any case, the band was equitata,

**THE UNIT’S SOLDIERS**

During the unit’s stationing Moesia inferior, few mentions were preserved about the soldiers who joined cohors Il Mattiaccorum. For a certain Capito, possibly associated with the unit on an extremely fragmentary epigraph discovered at Sexaginta Prista67 no additional data are available, not even chronological. We “know” Clagissa, son to Clagissa, of Thracian origin, former pedestrian recorded by the diploma of Tarnovo68 (AD 138), L. Spurennius Rufus - buccinator cohortis owing to the inscription of Obedine in the territory of Nicopolis ad Istrum69 (unfortunately, without dating elements; the lack of the numeral in the unit’s title may suggest an early dating to the Flavian period ??) and T. Flavius Lupus, originally from Medessa (writing error for Edessa?), mentioned in the diploma from Sostra70 (October 11, 146).

The epigraphic documents preserve the names of five commanders. In chronological order, these include the attestation from the Flavian or perhaps early Trajan period of L. Clodius Ingenmus - praefectus in the inscription from Praeneste (noteworthy, even in this case the unit’s numeral is missing from its title); then, T. Flavius Laco named in the diploma of Tarnovo (February 28, 138) and P. Aelius Alexander, a native of Ancyra in Galatia, mentioned in the diploma of Sostra (October 11, 146), likely prefects, insofar as the cohort became miliaria only after having left the garrison at Sexaginta Prista; then, T. Aurelius Aquila - tribune of the cohort - attested by the inscription of Sostra (AD 198) and lastly, a certain Faustianinus, son to Marcus - former tribune of the cohort – recorded by the inscription from Carnuntum (August 23, 219) at a time when he was already decurion of the colonies of Savaria and Carnuntum.

For the stationing period in Thrace, the diploma of March 10, 155 mentions an ex petide, Aelius Batonis f. Dassius, Pannonicus, recruited around AD 130 (hence he would have been in service for quite a while during the unit’s stationing in Moesia inferior) and the unit’s prefect of the time, a certain Antonius Annianus.

Incomplete information is provided by a funerary monument discovered at Bisanthe (today near Tekirdağ in Turkey), set up for Aurelius Diopanes by his comrade Aurelius Martialius - miles cohortis Mattiaccorum and dated to the 3rd century AD (more likely the second half, based on palaeographic details). In any case, the band was equitata,
the two soldiers being part of the same turma.

**HISTORY**

Apparently, the unit was raised beginning with the Flavian period, subsequent to the revolt of the Batavi (AD 69-70), from a demographic area comprised between rivers Lahn, Main and Rhine. As shown, its record by the inscription from Appiaria is hypothetical, however it could be a first attestation as early as AD 76⁷⁰. It is mentioned with certainty on the diploma of February 7, 78, without yet being able to know if it was cohors prima or secunda⁷¹. Most likely from the same period (or possibly early Trajan’s reign?), a praef(ecto) coh(ortis) / Mattiacorum is recorded on an inscription discovered at Praeneste (in Italy)⁷², so, whatever it was, either prima or secunda, it was quingeneria.

The lack of the numeral in the title of the auxiliary unit (due either to the lapicide’s error or the fragmentary preservation of the epigraphic document) gave rise to passionate debates, which, we believe, will not provide additional information until a new decisive find. Spaul⁷³, for instance, was convinced this was one and the same unit and treated it as such. Of course, there is neither evidence in this respect, as recently underlined by Whately⁷⁴, however, we dare say, nor to the contrary, since the available written sources are not quite convincing. In any case, Wagner⁷⁵ and Kraft’s⁷⁶ suggestions on the evolution of cohors II Mattiacorum from that cohors Mattiacorum of which L. Spareninus Rufus - bucinator and L. Clodius Ingenus - praefectus formed part early in its history, seems plausible and justifies the presence of the second, distinctive numeral. However, if these are different units, considering that once with the last decade of the 1st century AD only cohors II Mattiacorum is recorded, what happened to that cohors (?) Mattiacorum? The single explanation for its disappearance might be related to its association with the disasters suffered by Oppius Sabinus or Cornelius Fuscus in AD 85-86 before the Dacians and their allies. In this context, the destruction of the original cohort justifies the establishment of the second.

The first time it appears on the “history’s stage” - and, we believe, one of the plausible reasons why it was (re) established under the new title of cohors II Mattiacorum is the expedition against the Sarmatians undertaken by emperor Domitian in AD 92⁷⁷; thus, the diploma of AD 93-95 seems to record precisely the units drawn together from the two Moesias for the Pannonian campaign⁷⁸.

After the division of the province, it would remain in Moesia inferior until mid 2nd century AD, ever-present on military diplomas, which record it there during AD 93 (957) - 147. Available data for the first period of the unit’s operation are relatively numerous, but not always eloquent for the reconstruction of its history. According to Strobel⁷⁹, the unit was involved in the two Dacian wars, manoeuvring in the north-eastern part of Dobrudja and past the Danube in the Siret valley area (in any case, it left no recognizable traces⁸⁰) and, in this scenario, after Dacia devicta est, it remains in garrison at Dinogetia⁸¹ and Barboși⁸², flanking the Danube’s crossing area. In both locations, it is also involved in building activities, leaving epigraphic evidence, unfortunately impossible to restrict chronologically (all widely dated over the course of the 2nd century AD). Attempts to place there cohors II Mattiacorum only from, or after mid 2nd century AD⁸³ are, first of all, in contradiction with its attestations at Sexaginta Prista (Ruse) and Sostra (Lomet) - and, in general, without arguments due exclusively to the automatic adoption of the information thus “accustomed” in the historiography of the matter, hence, the suggestion of its presence at Barboși-Dinogetia in the first part of the 2nd century AD, or at least for the time being, in any case prior to 144/145 should be used.

At Barboși, several rectangular “tiles” were discovered, bearing the coh(ors) II Mattiacorum stamp, applied in the negative. It is by far the most recorded unit there - perhaps also further evidence of a longer term stationing in southern Moldavia, however, we believe rather, the consequence of its involvement in many building activities. Pârvan’s excavations⁸⁴ resulted in the find of a specimen, those of Ștefan⁸⁵ with the identification of seven tegulae (out of three only COH survived), of Gostar⁸⁶ with “an appreciable number” and those of Sanie’s (et al.) with 35 examples⁸⁷, respectively 16 (selectively published out of the 60 available to him)⁸⁸. There is no further information regarding the context of their find, except they emerged among the “finds from the oldest Roman level”⁸⁹, yet this detail is important in order to establish the cohort’s early presence in the south of the Danube, as Pârvan theorized more than a century ago⁹⁰. Amendments to and detailing of the chronology of

---

⁷¹ CIL, XVI, 22; Aê, 1925, 67; ECK/PANGERL 2010, 237-243.
⁷² CIL, VI, 37274 = Aê, 1906, 0104.
⁷³ SPAUL 2000, 243-244.
⁷⁵ WAGNER 1938, 164-165.
⁷⁶ KRAFT 1951, 180.
⁷⁷ STROBEL, 99-104. For the results of this campaign the emperor received an ovatio (Martial, VIII, 8, 5).
⁷⁸ PETOLESCU 2014, 71-76. (In the restoration suggested by the Romanian epigraphist, cohort II Mattiacorum appears as militia. If this is correct, then it is the first record of the unit’s strength, which lowers the dating of the inscription from Praeneste attesting a praef(ecto) coh(ortis) / Mattiacorum and for which the diploma from 93 (957) becomes a terminus ante quem.)
⁷⁹ STROBEL 1984, 139.
⁸⁰ MATEI-PESPECU/TENTEAA 2006, 75-120.
⁸¹ ISM, V, 260, 267.
⁸² ISM, V, 306 = CIL, III, 07620 = CIL, III, 00785, 2; Aê, 1975, 739; Aê, 1974, 562b.
⁸³ RADOVTI 1959, 149; GOSTAR 1967, 110, 112; ZAHARIADE/GUDEA 1997, 80-81, no. 48(14); KARAVAS 2001, 121 and table 3; GUDEA 2005, 455-457, no. III.48 (the presence of the cohort post 167).
⁸⁴ PÂRVAN 1913, 114.
⁸⁵ ȘTEFAN 1938, 345, fig. 4/17 (= Aê, 1939, 84 = CIL, III, 7620 = CIL, III, 785, 2).
⁸⁶ GOSTAR 1962, 508.
⁸⁷ SANIE/DRAGOMIR/SANIE 1975, 190, fig. 1/3 (= Aê, 1975, 739; Aê, 1974, 562b).
⁸⁸ SANIE 1996, 143-144, fig. 9/2, 4-8; 11.
⁸⁹ SANIE 1981, 80. See also GOSTAR 1968, 108-109; SANIE 1996, 144: “at Barboși, the stamps with the smallest letters were found in the oldest level.”
⁹⁰ PÂRVAN 1913, 115; similar views also at CANTACUZINO 1928, 65; VULPE 1938, 126, 159-162, 246; the same early dating of the presence of the military unit at Barboși also at WAGNER 1938, 165, who is convinced that at the latest in 113 the cohort was stationed in southern Moldavia. For the same chronology see also the original epigraphic interpretations at TUDOR 1953, 476-477, who appreciates that veterans Marcus Antonius and T. Flavius... recruited during consulats Longus and Messallinus (year 147) and thus released in 172-173 (= CIL, III, 7515 = ISM, V, 295), belong to legio V...
the Roman complexes at Barboși are also indicative of the unit’s early presence there. Discussions concerning the size of the fortification that might have accommodated a cohors quingenaria are useless in this context; no such information exists about the fort on the Tirighina hill and we do not believe they would ever be recovered; in addition, surprises about military installations in the area continue to emerge, with recent research eloquently suggesting the presence of forts within the territory enclosed by the earthen rampart between the places at Traian and Tulučești (Galați county), so that the camping area increases significantly.

Stamps of the same type, applied retrograde (negatively) on rectangular bricks also appeared in Dinogetia, nearby and therefore associated in the historiography of the issue with a tile firing kiln, dated with coins during the Tetrarchy, yet these would only mark the date of its disuse, after having been operational during the 2nd – 3rd centuries AD, as evidenced by “the 5-6 clay coating layers covering its walls”. A stamped fragmentary brick appeared in the area in 1949, another in 1956 (in fact, the chance, successive find of these tegulae led to the survey which identified the kiln) and later another evidence, we believe, of a present still unidentified military facility and not the “firing” of the stamped tiles in respective kiln, as seems to be suggested at first sight. The lack of certain dating elements of the remains left by cohors II Mattiacorum was synonymous with the adoption of hypotheses of its presence on the left bank, at Barboși (see supra), the authors of the archaeological research choosing the early arrival of the auxiliary unit at Dinogetia, from the beginning of the 2nd century AD.

Lastly, for the issue at hand, worthy of note is a pottery fragment, unfortunately lost today, on which a soldier had written his wish: “Demitte me / mil(item) coh(ortis) II [Mattiacorum?]”.99

Therefore, cohors II Mattiacorum seems to have arrived in the area (perhaps transferred even from Sexaginta Prista or Appiaria?) within the context of emperor Trajan’s expeditions, and stationed at Dinogetia. After the province organization, it would remain in Dacia at Barboși where it would substantially contribute in stone construction of the fortification on Tirighina hill (the stone carried across the Danube from Dobrudja is indirect evidence of the early presence in the area of the auxiliaries from classis Flavia Moesica). Although quartered at Barboși, it would send detachments to the forts and towers supporting the linear fortification between Traian and Tulučești. Though finds to this effect are missing for the time being, it is not excluded that in the future its presence would be documented even in the fortification of Aliobrix (Cartal), strategically similar and where, except for it, all the other military units stationed at Barboși were also recorded, evidence of the unitary vision of the imperial administration in this area.

It is impossible to say when it was transferred to the garrison at Sexaginta Prista (placing the unit there from the time of the Flavians relied on the dedication set up for Domitianus nearby, at Appiaria, in which the unit’s name was restored only presumably), where stamped bricks with its name also appear, but also two milestones from 144. The last record of the unit in this garrison dates from AD 145, nonetheless, as shown, the last diploma of Moesia inferior places it within the province until AD 146.

From there it was displaced to Thracia, being replaced at Sexaginta Prista by cohors II Flavia Brittonum. Likely from this period, subsequent or concurrent with the transfer, as Birley suggested, it became milliaria (however, for this matter the restoration of milliaria on the diploma of AD 93 should be also considered); regardless, the Sostra inscription, of 198, records its tribune, alike that of Carnuntum (in Pannonia superior) already in August 23, 219, which also documents a trib(unus) coh(ortis) of the unit which is then (milliariae) eq uitatae).

Most likely, the unit’s presence in the fort of Sostra (Lomet) was uninterrupted during the time span between Antoninus Pius (138-161) and Septimius Severus (193-211), its episodic mention on the diplomas for Thrace being, according to Rossignol’s argument, the result of a temporary re-tracing of the border between the two provinces. In any case, the unit’s pertaining to the army of Thrace was also linked to a possible exchange of troops with cohors I Cistadzensium, unit whose evolution has many gaps as well. After the province’s division, it would be stationed in Moesia superior, where it is recorded by the diplomas of

---

99 PETCULESCU 1982, 251.
90 See GOSTAR 1967, 110-111 with an ingenious attempt to explain the presence of only a section of the cohort that would have been ‘detached’ to Barboși, where it would have been placed under the command of a centurion of legio V Macedonica, with the suggestion of the analogy from Varia: – – – – Falco (– – –) / vex(illatio) – – II [/ – –] / sub cura [/ – –] / leg(ionis) V Ma(cenedonicae) – – – –, according NICORESCU, 1937, 218 (= AE, 1934, 112). ŢIENŢEA/RATIU 2015, 189-270.
94 ŞTEFAN 1949, 132-133.
95 ŞTEFAN 1957, 339. See also ŞTEFAN 1958, 324.
96 BARNEA 1974, 111, fig. 516.
97 ŞTEFAN 1949, 133; ŞTEFAN 1958, 324 (= ISM, V, 267).
Studies

September 16, 94 and May 8, 100. After the Dacian wars it was deployed during the Parthian campaign and nothing would be known about its fate until 138 when it was recorded again among the troops of the Thracian army. Later it is transferred to Moesia inferior where it is documented by the diploma of around AD 155. It would remain there until mid 3rd century AD, under the reigns of Maximinus Thracius (with epithet Maximiana) and Gordian III (with epithet Gordiana), accommodated in the Sostra fort.

Returning to the unit of interest here, we also note that, according to Dubois, it would have been one of the elite units of the Roman army, together with the Lanciarii representing the “last stronghold” of the emperor’s protection; thus, being involved in the disaster near Adrianople (AD 378), resulting including with the disappearance of Valens (363-378).

There is no information on the disappearance or evolution of the unit in the 3rd century AD, which makes impossible any connection between the cohort here and those Mattiaci seniores, respectively iuniores from the 4th century, which seem rather to be new units.

**CONCLUSIONS**

Although much of what could be summarized here as conclusions remains until new, more eloquent finds, mere working hypotheses, we believe that the evolution of the auxiliary unit cohors II Mattiacorum may be restored with somewhat precision on the basis of the currently available documentary material. Obviously, any new epigraphic find might confirm or nuance what we know for now. The unit’s evolution spans over more than one century, from the last quarter of the 1st century AD to the end of the 2nd century, leaving more consistent remains in Barboși and Dinogetia, Sexaginta Prista and Sostra. The names of certain soldiers and also some of the unit’s commanders are known, the unit being, somewhere midway its existence (?), transformed into a miliaria.
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