

# Durham E-Theses

---

## *Studies in the later roman army*

J. R. Hepworth

### How to cite:

---

Hepworth, J. R. (1963) *Studies in the later roman army*. Doctoral thesis, Durham University.

### Use policy

---

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/8095/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

STUDIES IN THE LATER ROMAN ARMY

THESIS SUBMITTED IN CANDIDACY

FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

IN MAY 1963

BY

J.R. HEPWORTH

OF

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, DURHAM

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.  
No quotation from it should be published without  
his prior written consent and information derived  
from it should be acknowledged.

**VOLUME I**

- 1 -

## Preface

This thesis was undertaken with the help of a State Studentship grant from the Ministry of Education. As an undergraduate I had become interested in the study of the later Roman army, and I welcomed the opportunity to continue my investigations on a wider scale. The last full scale study of this subject was that of Grosse, published in 1920. Since then further evidence has come to light, and the time is now ripe for a fresh appraisal, based on an objective study of the sources. Within the limits of a Ph.D. project, one cannot hope to cover every aspect. Hence this thesis centres around the study of three groups of officers, namely the protectores, praepositi and tribuni, from the reign of Gallienus up to the close of the fourth century. This has the advantage that it will link up not only with recent studies on senators and equestrians in the emperor's service during the principate, but also with the projected prosopography of the later Roman empire at present in process of compilation. At this stage I wish to point out that during the time at my disposal I have not been able to consult all the collections of papyri, nor the majority of volumes in the Analecta Bollandiana series. Secondly, regarding the prosopography which occupies the second volume of the thesis, reasons of space have prevented me from citing every source in full, especially where literary sources are concerned.

During the course of my research I have received assistance from a number of people; but my especial thanks are due to Dr. Mann, for his patient examination of the text and helpful observations, to

Professor Dr. K. Stade of Munster University, for his kindness and valuable advice during my six months' residence in Germany, and finally to Professor Birley, to whom I am indebted above all others.

CONTENTS

VOLUME I

PREFACE . . . . . pp i - ii

CONTENTS . . . . . p iii

ABBREVIATIONS . . . . . pp iv - xi

CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION . . . . . pp 1 - 7

CHAPTER II THE PROTECTORES . . . . . pp 8 - 59

CHAPTER III THE PRAEPOSITI . . . . . pp 60 - 84

CHAPTER IV THE TRIBUNI . . . . . pp 85 - 115

INDEX OF PROTECTORES . . . . . pp 116 - 120

INDEX OF PRAEPOSITI . . . . . pp 121 - 124

INDEX OF TRIBUNI . . . . . pp 125 - 130

INDEX OF DOUBTFUL OR REJECTED PROTECTORES . . . . . p 131

INDEX OF DOUBTFUL OR REJECTED PRAEPOSITI . . . . . p 132

INDEX OF DOUBTFUL OR REJECTED TRIBUNI . . . . . p 133

VOLUME II

PROSOPOGRAPHY . . . . . pp 1 - 250

DOUBTFUL OR REJECTED PROTECTORES . . . . . pp 251 - 257

DOUBTFUL OR REJECTED PRAEPOSITI . . . . . pp 258 - 260

DOUBTFUL OR REJECTED TRIBUNI . . . . . pp 261 - 268

NOTES:-

    CHAPTER I . . . . . pp 269 - 271

    CHAPTER II . . . . . pp 272 - 286

    CHAPTER III . . . . . pp 287 - 292

    CHAPTER IV . . . . . pp 293 - 301

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . . pp 302 - 304

- IV -

Abbreviations

[With regard to the ancient sources, standard abbreviations are used, except in the case of Ammianus Marcellinus.]

Abh. d. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss.

Abhandlungen der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berlin.

AE

L'Année épigraphique, Paris,

AM

Ammianus Marcellinus, ed. J.C. Rolfe, Vols. I-III, Loeb, 2nd ed. 1950-52.

Anal. Boll.

Analecta Bollandiana, I, 1882, ff., Brussels.

Antig. Journ.

Antiquaries Journal.

Anz. d. phil.-hist. Klasse der

Anzeiger der philosophischen-historischen Klasse der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaft, Vienna.

Öst. Akad. d. Wiss.

Arch. Journ.

Archaeological Journal.

Babut

E. -Ch. Babut, 'Recherches sur la garde impériale et sur les officiers de l'armée romaine aux IV<sup>e</sup> et V<sup>e</sup> siècles', Rev. hist., CXIV, 1913, pp. 225-60; CXVI, 1914, pp. 225-93.

BGU

Aegyptische Urkunden aus den staatlichen Museen zu Berlin. Griechische Urkunden. Vols. I-IX, 1895-1937, Berlin.

BSR.

Papers of the British School at Rome.

CAH

Cambridge Ancient History.

Chron. Min.

Chronica Minora, ed. T. Mommsen,

Vols. I-III, Berlin, 1894.

CI

Corpus Iuris Civilis, Vol. II, Codex

Iustinianus, ed. Krueger, Berlin, 1906.

GIG

Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum, ed.

A. Boeckh & J. Franz, Berlin, 1825-77.

GIL

Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum, 1863 ff.,

Berlin. [Volumes in this series are cited by Roman numerals, and the prefix GIL is usually omitted].

Cohen<sup>2</sup>

H. Cohen, Description historique des

monnaies frappées sous l'empire romain,

2nd ed., Paris, 1880-92.

Corp. Pap. Herm.

Corpus Papyrorum Hermopolitanarum, ed.

C. Wessely, Leipzig, 1905.

Corp. Pap. Rain.

Corpus Papyrorum Raineri, ed. C. Wessely,

1895.

Corp. Script. Eccl. Lat.

Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum

Latinorum, Vienna.

CT

Theodosiani Libri XVI, ed. Mommsen-Meyer,

Vols. I-II, Berlin, 1905.

CW<sub>2</sub>

Cumberland and Westmorland Transactions,

new series, Kendal.

Dean

L.R. Dean, A study of the cognomina of

soldiers in the Roman legions, Princeton dissertation, 1916.

Degrassi A. Degrassi, I Fasti consolari dell' impero romano, Rome, 1952.

Deut. Lit. Deutsche Literaturzeitung.

Dobson B. Dobson, The Primpilares of the Roman Army, unpublished Durham University Ph.D. thesis, 1955.

EE Ephemeris Epigraphica, Vols. I-IX, Berlin, 1872-1913.

FHG Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum, ed. C. Müller.

Ges. Schr. Gesammelte Schriften von T. Mommsen.

Glasnik Glasnik Zemalskog Muzeja u Sarajevo, Sarajevo; old series until 1943.

Gothofred. J. Gothofredus, Codex Theodosianus, Lyons, 1655.

Grosse R. Grosse, Römische Militärgeschichte von Gallienus bis zum Beginn der byzantinischen Themenverfassung, Berlin, 1920.

Holder A. Holder, Altceltischer Sprachschatz, Leipzig, 1896.

IG Inscriptiones Graecae, Berlin (De Gruyter).

IGR Inscriptiones Graecae ad Res Romanas Pertinentes, ed. R. Cagnat, Paris, 1901-21.

ILA Inscriptions latines d'Afrique, ed. R. Cagnat, A. Merlin & L. Chatelain, Paris, 1923.

ILS

Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae, ed.

H. Dessau, Berlin, 1893-1916.

IRT

The Inscriptions of Roman Tripolitania,

ed. J.M. Reynolds & J.B. Ward-Perkins,  
Rome.

Jagenteufel

A. Jagenteufel, Die Statthalter der  
römischen Provinz Dalmatia von Augustus  
bis Diocletian, Vienna, 1958.

JEA

Journal of Egyptian Archaeology.

JRS

Journal of Roman Studies.

Le Bas & Waddington

Ph. Le Bas & W.H. Waddington, Voyage  
archéologique en Grèce et en Asie Mineure,  
Vol. III. Inscriptions grecques et  
latines, Paris, 1870.

Migne G.

Migne, Patrologia, series Graeca.

Migne L.

Migne, Patrologia, series Latina.

Mitt. Wilk.

L. Mitteis & U. Wilcken, Grundzüge und  
Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde, I-II,  
Leipzig-Berlin, 1912.

Mon. Germ. Hist.

Monumenta Germaniae Historica.

M. & S.

The Roman Imperial Coinage, ed. H. Mattingly  
& E.A. Sydenham, Vol. V pt. I, 1927, pt. II,  
1933, London.

ND

Notitia Dignitatum, ed. O. Seeck, Berlin,  
1876.

Nov. Inst.

Corpus Iuris Civilis, Vol. III, Novellae,  
ed. Schoell-Kroll, Berlin, 1904.

Nov. Theod.

Theodosiani Libri XVI, ed. Mommsen-Meyer,  
Vol. II, Berlin, 1905.

OGIS

Oriens Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae,  
ed. W. Dittenberger, I-II, Leipzig, 1903-5.

Ost. Jahresh.

Jahreshefte des Oesterrichischen  
archaologischen Instituts in Wien, Vienna.

Pallu de Lessert

A.C. Pallu de Lessert, Fastes des provinces  
africaines sous la domination romaine,  
I-II, Paris, 1896-1901.

P. Aberdeen

Catalogue of Greek & Latin Papyri &  
Ostraca in the Possession of the University  
of Aberdeen, ed. E.G. Turner, Aberdeen,

P. Abinn.

1939,  
The Abinnaeus Archive, ed. H. I. Bell, V. Martin, E. G.  
Turner & D. Van Berchem, Oxford, 1962.

P. Amh.

The Amherst Papyri, Vols. I-II, London,  
1900-01.

P. Antinop.

The Antinopolis Papyri, Vol. I, ed.  
G.H. Roberts, London, 1950.

P. Byz. Caire

Papyrus grecs d'epoque byzantine, ed.  
J. Maspero, Vols. I-II, Cairo, 1910-12.

P. Caire Preis.

Griechische Urkunden des Aegyptischen  
Museums zu Kairo, ed. F. Preisigke,  
Strasbourg, 1911.

P. Flor.

Papiri Fiorentini, ed. G. Vitelli &  
D. Comparetti, Vols. I-III, Milan,  
1905-15.

P. Gen.

Papyrus latin de Geneve, ed. J. Nicole, Geneva, 1896-1906.

P. Grenf. & Hunt

New Classical Fragments & other Greek & Latin Papyri chiefly Ptolemaic, ed. B.P. Grenfell & A.S. Hunt, Oxford, 1897.

P. Gron.

Papyri Groninganae, ed. A.G. Roos, Amsterdam, 1933.

P. Ital.

Papyri d'Italia, Vol. I, 1955, Rome.

P. Lond.

Greek Papyri in the British Museum, Vol. II, ed. F.G. Kenyon, London, 1898.

P. Oxy.

The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, ed. B.P. Grenfell & A.S. Hunt & others, Vol. I, 1898 ff., London.

P. Princeton

Papyri in the Princeton University Collection, Vol. II, ed. E. Harris Kase, Princeton, 1936.

P. Thead.

Papyrus de Theadelphie, ed. P. Jouguet, Paris, 1911.

Pflaum

H.G. Pflaum, Les Carrieres procuratoriennes equestres sous le haut-empire romain, Vols. I-III, Paris, 1961.

PIR<sup>1</sup>

Prosopographia Imperii Romani, ed. H. Dessau, E. Klebs & F. von Rohden, Berlin, 1896-98.

PIR<sup>2</sup>

Prosopographia Imperii Romani, 2nd edition, ed. E. Groag, A. Stein & others (now A-H), Berlin, 1933 ff.

PSI

Publicazioni della Societa italiana per la ricerca dei papiri greci e latini in Egitto, Vols. I-X, Florence, 1912-32.

Rangord.

A. von Domaszewski, Die Rangordnung des römischen Heeres, Bonn, 1908.

RBRA

E. Birley, Roman Britain and the Roman Army, Kendal, 1953.

RE

Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft, Pauly-Wissowa (Kroll-Mittelhaus-Ziegler).

Regest.

O. Seeck, Regesten der Kaiser und Päpste für die Jahre 311 bis zum 476 n. Chr., 1919.

Rev. afr.

Revue africaine, Algiers.

Rev. de Philologie

Revue de philologie, d'histoire et de litterature anciennes, Paris.

Rev. hist.

Revue historique, Paris.

Ruinart

M. Ruinart, Acta primorum martyrum sincera et selecta, 1674.

Sammelbuch

Sammelbuch griechischen Urkunden aus Aegypten, ed. Fr. Preisigke, F. Bilabel & E. Kiessling, Strasbourg & Heidelberg, Berlin & Leipzig, 1913 ff.

Schmidt I<sup>2</sup> & II<sup>2</sup>

L. Schmidt, Geschichte der deutschen Stämme bis zum Ausgang der Völkerwanderung, Vol. I, 2nd ed. 1938; Vol. II, 2nd ed. 1934.

Schrifttafeln zur Alt. Lat.

Palaeogr.

Seeck, Briefe

Sitzungsb. d. Akad. d. Wiss.

in Wien

Unterg.

Wien. Stud.

Schrifttafeln zur Älteren Lateinischen

Palaeographie, ed. K. Wessely, Vienna,

1898.

O. Seeck, Die Briefe von Libanius,

Berlin, 1906.

Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der

Wissenschaften in Wien, Vienna &

Leipzig.

O. Seeck, Geschichte des Untergangs des

Antiken Welt, Stuttgart, Vols. I, 4th

ed. 1921; II and III, 2nd ed. 1921;

IV and V, 1922.

Wiener Studien, Zeitschrift für klassische

Philologie, Vienna.

## INTRODUCTION

This thesis is a study of the development of three groups of officers, namely the protectores, praepositi and tribuni, from the reign of Gallienus (253-68) up to that of Theodosius I (379-95). The present chapter, however, is intended as a brief sketch of the gradual evolution of the military organisation during this period. Such an introduction should help to place the later chapters in their proper perspective, while also indicating problems which require further investigation.

During the principate, almost the entire Roman army had been garrisoned along the perimeter of the empire to form a defensive cordon. Reinforcements needed to repulse an attack in one area were provided by vexillations drawn from troops stationed in other provinces. Once peace was restored, they returned to their parent formations. While this system had obvious advantages, it also contained serious defects. Recruitment became gradually restricted to the frontier provinces, where particularist tendencies began to take root. The provinces of the interior grew less accustomed to warfare, and there was no adequate reserve to cope with emergencies. The frontier army became increasingly sedentary during the third century. Under Septimius Severus (193-211) the unions formed by troops with local women were granted official recognition, and troops were permitted to live in

settlements attached to the camps<sup>1</sup>. A little later an edict of Severus Alexander (222-35) granted land captured from the enemy to troops garrisoned on the frontier provided that their sons enlisted in the army<sup>2</sup>. At this very time, however, the pressure of barbarian attack began to mount on all frontiers. The tribes on the Rhine united in two great confederations, the Franks and the Alamanni. On the Danube frontier the first effects of the Völkerverwanderung were felt with the attacks of the Goths and Heruli. In the east, the Persian empire under the new Sassanid dynasty once more became a serious threat. As a result, the frontier provinces became devastated by successive waves of invaders, who probed deep into the interior. Meanwhile, the discontented soldiery, angered by the neglected defence of their native provinces, or aroused by the hope of a donative, rose in a series of revolts. In consequence third century emperors rarely reigned more than one or two years.

Gallienus came to the throne when the crisis was at its worst, and immediately he initiated a series of far-reaching reforms. The most important of these was the formation of a mobile field army, able to move swiftly from one danger point to another. Coin evidence shows that it comprised a number of paired legionary vexillations, linked personally to him<sup>3</sup>. In addition, the cream of the cavalry was united under a single commander<sup>4</sup>. The results of Gallienus's work were reaped by his successors. Claudius II (268-70) defeated the Goths, and Aurelian (270-75) restored the unity of the empire by overthrowing Zenobia in the east and Tetricus in the west. Although there is very

little evidence for this period, it is hard to see how the field army can have been disbanded in view of the almost incessant warfare, much of which was between rival candidates for the throne<sup>5</sup>.

Diocletian's reign (284-305) saw the restoration of peace. This astute emperor evidently realised that a policy of decentralisation was the best means of restoring the empire's stability. As part of this policy, he drastically reduced the size of the field army, and stationed large sections of it within the frontier provinces. Such troops retained their mobility, and unlike the sedentary auxiliaries, listed in the minus laterculum, could always be re-drafted into the field army. The names of many of the units listed in the Notitia show that they were raised by Diocletian, and archaeology has furnished ample proof of his restoration and strengthening of the frontier defences. Constantine, following his defeat of Licinius in 324, seems to have retained a much larger field army, garrisoned in the towns of the interior. But even he did not neglect frontier defence, though perhaps he laid more emphasis on the establishment of bridgeheads, such as at Dafne on the Danube, and Divitia on the Rhine, enabling the field army to operate in barbarian territory.

What of the officer class during this period? The evidence suggests that senators were becoming increasingly unwilling to enter the emperor's service during the early third century, preferring to remain on their estates. In their eyes the rewards of a military career were far outweighed by its hazards. The decree of Gallianus which excluded senators from the army was probably a recognition of this

state of affairs<sup>6</sup>. At any rate, the last legatus legionis is attested in the period 256-6<sup>7</sup>. The legion is henceforward commanded by the equestrian praefectus agens vices legati<sup>8</sup>.

The recruitment of equestrian officers themselves was undergoing a parallel change. During the second century most seem to have entered the equestrian cursus as municipal worthies from the highly Romanised towns of the interior. During the third century, however, towns with a specifically military origin, situated in the frontier provinces, appear to supply a higher proportion of recruits. These officers were probably the sons of veterans or serving soldiers, and municipal office seems to have been held after service in the army, rather than before<sup>9</sup>. The following equestrian officers are attested from the mid-third century up to the reign of Probus (276-82):-

253-6	Statilius Amnianus	III 90
253-60	Aurelius Ianuarius (?)	III 10208
Ante 255	P. Aelius Primianus	VII 9045
257	M. Titius Castorius	VIII 21724
258	P. Aelius Antonianus	III 7450
"	Desidienus Aemilianus	VII 769
Ante 260	Q. Gargilius Martialis	VIII 9047; 20751
260-8	Marcus Gallicus	VII 820; 821
"	Probius Augendus	VII 822
262-6	Flavius Anmausius	VII 287
Ante 266	M. Aurelius Corellius Alexander	<u>Corp. Pap. Herm.</u> 59, 1. 119
267	Bellicius Saturninus	III 4811 - 11504
"	Septimius Alexander	<u>IGR</u> III 1044
268	Claudius Theon	<u>P. Flor.</u> 50, 1. 119
269	Iupullinius Amminus (?)	XIII 11975-6
270-4	Pomponius Designatus	VII 823
276-82	Aurelius Verinus	<u>JRS</u> , LI, 1961, p 194

It is significant that no more are known after this date. Laws issued by Diocletian, dating from 285 onwards, show that while it had been possible previously for sons of decurions to avoid serving on municipal councils, their obligation to undertake such service had always been

emphasised. Now the status of decurion became compulsorily hereditary<sup>10</sup>. Henceforward the sedentary auxiliary units stationed on the frontier were commanded by ex-field army centurions<sup>11</sup>. In fact practically all lines of promotion within the army were now channelled through the centurionate, a trend whose origins can be traced back to the early third century.

Growing specialisation is the keynote of the third century. During the principate many officers and N.C.Os. officially attached to the army had in fact been concerned with purely civil administration. The almost constant warfare of the third century, however, was bound to lead to a gradual differentiation between civil and military careers. Gallienus's creation of the field army obviously accelerated this process. The career of the praetorian prefect L. Petronius Taurus Volusianus is unique in that he never held a single procuratorship<sup>12</sup>. In this light the disappearance of the old senatorial and equestrian careers assumes a fresh significance. The conditions of the third century left no room for a cursus which combined civil and military posts. This was the age of 'Ballista' and 'Mamus ad Ferrem' (Aurelian), the professional soldier who had risen from the ranks via the centurionate<sup>13</sup>. If the assumption that a large number of supernumerary praetorian tribunes was created during the third century is correct, it was no doubt in part intended to facilitate the centurions' chances of promotion. The fact that the title of protector had become closely linked with the centuriones primi ordinis by the end of Gallienus's reign shows his anxiety to secure the loyalty of this all important class of officers.

Furthermore, if one considers specialisation from the viewpoint of the actual units, the disappearance of the legatus legionis after 260 becomes less surprising<sup>14</sup>. The legion during the principate was normally more of an administrative than a tactical formation, and this explains its fragmentation during the latter part of the third century, as the best fighting troops were incorporated into the field army. The units of Equites Promoti, Lanciarii, Mattiarii, Armigeri and Balistarii which figure in the field army lists of the Notitia are in fact legionary detachments. Meanwhile the parent legions remained on the frontier, and during Diocletian's reign equestrian praefecti continue to be attested at the old legionary headquarters<sup>15</sup>. But the Notitia clearly demonstrates that in most cases the individual cohorts were stationed at intervals along the lines, and one may speculate as to whether this development originated in Diocletian's reign, if not before<sup>16</sup>. Since senators cease to hold military posts after c. 260, it is hardly possible for those attested as governors of frontier provinces during this period to have exercised control over the troops stationed there<sup>17</sup>. It is significant that the dux limitis first comes into prominence under Diocletian<sup>18</sup>. His appearance is probably to be connected with the stationing by this emperor of the bulk of the field army within the frontier provinces.

Constantine's reforms are the logical outcome of the developments of the third century. The praetorian guard was disbanded in 312, and by 324 it seems likely that the praetorian prefects had lost their military powers<sup>19</sup>. This set the seal on the split between the

army and the civil administration<sup>20</sup>. The palatini who replaced the praetorian guard are first attested in 324<sup>21</sup>. It was probably Constantine who first recruited barbarians directly into the field army on a large scale<sup>22</sup>, though it is apparent that time and again during the third century they had been settled in the exhausted frontier provinces in order to furnish future recruits. A new order had arisen, but there is an essential continuity between the military organisations of the third and fourth centuries which it is a prime aim of this thesis to emphasise.

## THE PROTECTORES

### (1) Introduction.

For purposes of clarity, and by way of a brief introduction, it seems necessary to examine the nature of the term protector, before embarking on a study of that class of officers called the protectores. When first introduced by Gallienus, in the early years of his reign, it was essentially a title, designed as a mark of distinction for certain senior staff officers. The third century, however, was a 'period of crisis, experiment, and transition' (cf. CAH XII p 703). Political, social and economic revolution were inevitably accompanied by administrative changes. But it was not until the beginning of the fourth century that order was re-established as a result of the reforms of Diocletian and Constantine. The usage of the term, protector, is to be viewed against this background. The period was marked by an increasing emphasis on titles. A title, such as that of protector, was more flexible than that of the offices to which it might be linked. In an age of radical administrative change and increasing regimentation, it was easier for such a title to survive rather than the name of the post with which it had formerly been associated. Thus in the fourth century the terms, clarissimus, consularis, ducenarius, dux, and protector were all classed under the heading of dignitas. At the same time as the distinction between titles and ranks became blurred, the titles themselves often declined considerably in status. Part of the explanation may lie in the tremendous rate of depreciation in the value

of the coinage during this period<sup>1</sup>. The annona militaris, a form of supplementary payment in kind, probably introduced under Septimius Severus, eventually became all important. Thus such terms as centenarius, and ducenarius, which had hitherto reflected a certain salary scale, declined in status to such an extent that in the fourth century they appear as grades well below the rank of tribunus<sup>2</sup>. The decline in status of the term, protector, may not have been due to this factor alone, but it is to be emphasised that it is symptomatic of a general trend characteristic of the third century. The desire on the part of the lower ranks to gain the privileges enjoyed by their superiors also helps to explain why old titles depreciated and new ones were invented. At the beginning of Gallienus's reign, the title of protector was granted to praetorian tribunes. By its end, it was being conferred on centuriones primi ordinis.

It is obvious, therefore, that the protectores cannot at any time be considered in isolation. Instead, it is only by comparing and contrasting the ranks qualified to hold the title that one can arrive at a correct assessment of its value and importance at any given time. But in essence, the title of protector always had two basic implications. In the first place it implied that its holder was a military officer. In the fourth century, and even during the latter years of the third century, this stipulation was not always fulfilled. Owing to the privileges it conferred on its holder, it was coveted by civilians also, but the government always took care to emphasise its military character<sup>3</sup>. Secondly, it implied loyalty to the emperor, since it was the prime duty

of its holder to protect his person<sup>4</sup>.

(ii) The first appearance of the protectores.

Despite the scarcity of evidence available, the indications are that the title of protector was first introduced in the early years of Gallienus's reign. References to it occur in the biographies of Caracalla and Maximinus Thrax in the Augustan History, but these are not to be taken at their face value<sup>5</sup>. Numerous other examples of anachronistic terminology occur in the Augustan History. The importance of these references to the historian is that they demonstrate clearly what class of officer the fourth century compiler had in mind when referring to the protectores, i.e. the centurions serving on the emperor's staff.

On general grounds alone, a strong case can be established for crediting Gallienus with the foundation of the protectores. Including pretenders, the average reign of third century emperors is perhaps best assessed in terms of months rather than years. In the whole of the third century only Diocletian, significantly enough, had a longer period of rule. The very fact that Gallienus retained his throne for fifteen years is proof that he was endowed with a very large measure of ability and resource, qualities which enabled him to evolve a series of military reforms, while the very length of his reign afforded him the time to bring these to fruition. His period of rule coincided with the worst crisis that the Roman Empire ever weathered successfully. No area of frontier was immune from barbarian attack, and internal revolts occurred in almost every province. To meet the threat, Gallienus enlarged the

field army, united the cream of the cavalry under a single command, and finally excluded senators from officer posts. Hence there seems every reason for regarding the establishment of the protectores as an integral part of Gallienus's reform of the military machine.

More specifically, whereas with two exceptions, which will be explained later, there is no epigraphic evidence relative to the protectores prior to Gallienus's reign, at least three inscriptions mentioning them can be dated to his period of rule<sup>6</sup>. Again, the careers of L. Petronius Taurus Volusianus, Aurelius Sabinianus, and the anonymous praetorian tribune from Curictae are best explained if it is accepted that they held the title under Gallienus. All the protectores attested during his reign belonged to Gallienus's field army, and no officers of Valerian, Odenathus or Postumus are attested with the title. Finally, Gallienus himself is the only emperor who appears to hold the title of protector on inscriptions<sup>7</sup>.

(iii) The reasons for the introduction of the title.

If it is accepted that it was Gallienus who created the protectores of the later empire, the reasons for their introduction become more obvious. The rapid succession of emperors is a notorious feature of the third century. The army was fully conscious of its power to set up and depose rulers at will, and needed little encouragement to do so. The empire under Hadrian had been organised on a peace footing, the vast majority of the troops being stationed on the frontier to form a defensive cordon. If invasion occurred in any particular province, vexillations drawn from units stationed elsewhere were sent to repulse the attack.

Afterwards, these vexillations returned to their parent units. Recruitment was largely confined to the frontier provinces, and led to the growth of local loyalties among the various provincial armies. It was in the third century that these latent particularist tendencies blazed into prominence. Paradoxically, it was at this very time that the barbarian tribes began to band together to form confederations, such as the Franks and Alamanni on the lower and upper Rhine. At the same time, the fierce attacks of the Goths and Heruli on the Danube frontier indicated that the era of the Völkewanderung had arrived. On the eastern frontier, the replacement of the Arsacid by the new strong Sassanid dynasty in Persia heralded fresh wars in that region. The creation of a mobile, permanent field army was the obvious answer to the problem. But the ordinary soldier was most concerned with his province of origin, where his family and property were endangered. Hence he was only too ready to revolt, if the emperor did not lead an expedition in person to his home province when an invasion occurred. Another incentive was the donative which the successful usurper always distributed to the troops who had supported him.

This situation was exploited to its fullest extent by the cadre of higher officers, who were motivated by ambition and jealousy. In the vast majority of cases, the emperors of the third century were assassinated as a result of conspiracies among their own officers<sup>8</sup>. Ability as a general, or popularity with the troops at large was no safeguard in the last resort, as the deaths of Gallienus and Aurelian demonstrate. An emperor who could succeed in maintaining the loyalty

of the higher officers would go far towards re-introducing stability and order in the affairs of the empire. In effect, the evil was not effectually curbed until the advent of Diocletian, and the growth of a theocratic monarchy based on Hellenistic concepts. The institution of the protectores by Gallienus helps to explain why he survived longer than most emperors, while his basic idea was preserved and developed by his successors. In this period, the very concept of loyalty to the empire as a whole was weakening. In 250 T. Julius Priscus, governor of Thrace, deserted to the Goths, and surrendered the city of Philippopolis to them<sup>9</sup>. Following the death of Odenathus, many of the eastern provinces threatened to secede from the empire altogether, under the leadership of Palmyra. It is significant that Gallienus repeatedly minted coins with the legend 'Romae Aeternae'; Postumus, however, also struck coins with this title<sup>10</sup>. He also maintained his own praetorian guard and consuls, and in every way tried to depict himself as the legitimate ruler<sup>11</sup>. In fact Rome was now beginning to lose much of its earlier importance, and strategic centres of communication, such as Trier, Milan, Aquileia, Poetovio, Nicomedia and Antioch were becoming increasingly more important.

Gallienus in effect was only ruler of the area of the empire controlled by his field army, i.e., chiefly Italy, Illyricum and Africa. The field army was all important to guard against both barbarian attacks and the threat of usurpers, such as Ingenus or Macrianus. Hence Gallienus made every attempt to bind it more closely to his person. From 254 onwards, coins occur with the legend, 'Fides Militum', depicting two ensigns, representing the normal pair of legionary

vexillations from the same province<sup>12</sup>. The novelty of Gallienus's policy consisted in holding these legionary vexillations together as a permanent striking force, linked to him in a very personal fashion<sup>13</sup>. In practice, therefore, Gallienus's throne and life depended on the fidelity of his field army, and in particular of its officers. He also, however, attempted to gain a religious sanction<sup>c</sup> for his claims as a legitimate ruler, by personally identifying himself with various gods, e.g. Demeter, Mars and Hercules<sup>14</sup>. This claim of the emperors developed steadily after Gallienus's reign, and culminated under Diocletian with the introduction of the ceremony of adoratio at the imperial court. In this respect it is significant that the full title for the protectores in the latter part of the third century, and in the fourth, was protector divini lateris<sup>15</sup>. In the fourth century a person obtained the status of protector merely by participating in the ceremony of adoratio<sup>16</sup>.

(iv) Previously existing models.

With regard to previously existing models which may have influenced the establishment of the protectores, three factors should be taken into consideration. In the first place, it is not strictly accurate to state that the protectores made their first appearance in the reign of Gallienus. Two soldiers are attested with the title at an earlier stage in the third century<sup>17</sup>. Both, however, served in a very low capacity, and their status is not to be compared with that of the senior officers who held the title of protector under Gallienus. The example of Aurelius Severus indicates that the praetorian prefects

had a bodyguard composed of certain soldiers in the Equites Singulares. Herodes was perhaps serving in a turma of Equites Singulares, acting as an escort for the governor of Thrace. Whether these earlier protectores had anything in common with the tectores is uncertain<sup>18</sup>.

On the other hand, the protectores as established by Gallienus, need not have been modelled on a specifically Roman institution. It has been suggested that initially at any rate the somatophylakes of the Hellenistic kings perhaps served as a pattern for their establishment<sup>19</sup>. Gallienus's leaning towards Greek culture is well known. In the field of philosophy this is demonstrated by the popularity of neo-Platonism at his court, and in that of religion by the attention devoted to the cult of Demeter of Eleusis. In portraits he is often depicted in the Greek manner. Salonina, his wife, was a Greek from Bithynia, originally called Chrysogone<sup>20</sup>. Alternatively, the institution may have had a Persian precedent. The ceremony of adoratio was probably an adaptation from the court procedure of the Sassanid kings<sup>21</sup>. The description of the privileges accorded to Antoninus, when he deserted to the Persians in the mid-fourth century, has parallels with those to which he would previously have been entitled as protector.

But at the same time, even under Gallienus, one cannot discount Germanic influence. This became increasingly important with the growth of time, as more Germans were recruited into the army; but even in origin the protectores in some respects resemble the Germanic Gefolgsweesen. This was a guard, composed chiefly of young noblemen, but also including veteran warriors. They were attached to persons of birth or outstanding personality. In war, they formed his bodyguard,

and were pledged to follow him to the death<sup>22</sup>. In return, their lord undertook to provide them with arms, and support them. In the light of Gallienus's reform of the cavalry, and its subsequent increase in importance, it is interesting to note that the members of the Germanic Gefolgswesen were all mounted. Their number was not above 200 as a rule, owing to the great cost of maintenance. Gallienus was continually fighting on the Rhine frontier against the Franks and Alamanni in the period 253-60, and he would be certain to notice the fanatical loyalty of these warriors to their chieftain. When Chonodomarius, a prince of the Alamanni, was captured by the Caesar Julian at the Battle of Strasbourg in 357, his 200 followers surrendered voluntarily, thinking it to be a disgrace to survive their leader<sup>23</sup>. Similarly, when Vannius, a prince of the Suebi, was driven out by the Hermundur in 50 and took refuge in the empire, his bodyguard accompanied him into exile<sup>24</sup>. Previous emperors had utilised this loyalty of the Germans in order to form a faithful bodyguard. A series of inscriptions from Rome, dating to the early principate, mentions a number of custodes corporis<sup>25</sup>. Under Caracalla, the idea of a German bodyguard was revived, with the creation of the Equites Extraordinarii, who retained their national dress and arms<sup>26</sup>. Under Macrinus, Caracalla's successor, they were disbanded, but a German bodyguard was again formed by Pupienus, and garrisoned outside Rome<sup>27</sup>. But as Macrinus disbanded the bodyguard of Caracalla, so Gordian III dismissed that of Pupienus and Balbinus.

Although there is no evidence to suggest that Gallienus possessed a bodyguard composed of Germans, there is no doubt that Germans of noble birth were prominent at his court. In the first place he

concluded with Attalus, a prince of the Marcomanni, an agreement whereby he took Pipa, the latter's daughter, as his mistress. In return he granted him a part of Pannonia Superior in which to settle<sup>28</sup>. The revolt of Ingenuus in 260 followed closely by that of Regalianus, may have decided Gallienus to grant land to the leader of a warlike tribe, who would be closely attached to him by personal rather than abstract and juridical ties. Any future governor of Pannonia would be less likely to stir up his troops to revolt, as long as these Marcomanni constituted a potential threat to their families and property. The tribunus gentis Marcomannorum, attested in the Notitia Dignitatum, may date back in origin to this period<sup>29</sup>. Naulobatus, a prince of the Heruli, who took part in a raid on the empire in 267 was promoted to consular rank, following his surrender<sup>30</sup>. He may be identical with the Andonoballus, also a prince of the Heruli, who fought in the army of Claudius II<sup>31</sup>. Similarly, Pompeianus Francus, who fought at the Battle of Emesa in 272, probably entered the imperial service under Gallienus, since Aurelian did not gain control of the Rhine frontier until after his defeat of Zenobia<sup>32</sup>. The settlement of barbarians on a large scale in the frontier provinces was begun under Marcus Aurelius<sup>33</sup>. During the third century, the tempo of barbarian settlement was steadily increased, and gradually these new immigrants became more important as a source of recruits for the army. Previously attached to their local chieftains by ties of personal loyalty, they could not grasp the idea of allegiance to a supreme emperor, whom they had never actually seen. Hence they were ready to support an ambitious governor in his bid for the throne.

Gallienus certainly made an attempt to come into closer contact with his troops, and the evidence suggests that he obtained a firm place in their affections. His title of Protector Imperii Romani was no mere boast. Even the Augustan History, a source notoriously prejudiced against him, commenting on his defeat of Postumus, accords him grudging praise<sup>34</sup>. The fact that he was wounded while on reconnaissance around the walls of the city into which Postumus had fled shows that he was normally in the forefront of the fighting<sup>35</sup>. His challenge to Postumus, to meet him in single combat on horseback to decide who was the rightful emperor is reminiscent of the chivalrous ideals of the mediaeval world<sup>36</sup>. Had Gallienus not been popular with the troops, it is certain that he could never have survived for 15 years. As it was, his murder was the work of his generals, in collaboration with the Senate. The soldiers had to be informed that Gallienus had designated Claudius as his successor before dying, and were only placated by the promise of an extra large donative of 20 aurei for each individual<sup>37</sup>.

(v) The development of the protectores under Gallienus.

It was probably in order to secure the loyalty of these selfsame senior officers that Gallienus originally introduced the title of protector. However, in his reign, it was still in the experimental stage of its development, and was to decline considerably in status. The reasons for this depreciation are unknown. Perhaps Gallienus thought it necessary to widen the basis of loyalty among his officers by admitting more of them to the title. Alternatively, the junior officers may have clamoured for the privileges enjoyed by their

superiora. Petronius Taurus Volusianus is the earliest attested protector, holding the title while occupying the post of tribunus cohortis I praetoriae, in the period 253-6. The fact that he did not hold the title in his previous position, also a praetorian tribunate, indicates that he was among the very first of the protectores. Conversely, the fact that he did not hold the title as praefectus vigilum, his next post, shows that the praetorian tribunate was the highest rank that ever merited the title. His rapid and exclusively military career, commencing with the centurionate, emphasises the fact that this was a period of crisis; it also provides a precedent for the future. After 260, no senators are attested as holding military posts. In the initial stage of its development, when held by senior equestrian staff officers, the title of protector might be compared with that of comes, previously held by trusted senior officials of senatorial rank. The praetorian guard would obviously form a prominent part of Gallienus's field army operating on the Rhine frontier in the period 253-60 and is often commemorated on coins<sup>38</sup>. The officers of the praetorian guard would of necessity be in close contact with the emperor, and the other two praetorian tribunes attested in this period both hold the title of protector. When praetorian tribunes ceased to hold the title is uncertain. However, it must have been prior to 269 since primi ordines could qualify for it by this date.

With regard to praepositi, only one is attested with this title, namely Vitalianus. Since the inscription was found at Sirmium, and vexillations of German and British legions are explicitly mentioned, the most plausible date would seem to be in 260 when Gallienus was

obliged to withdraw troops from the Rhine frontier to quell the revolt of Ingenuus in Pannonia, and soon afterwards, that of Regalianus, governor of Moesia. Vitalianus was evidently commanding either a pair of legionary vexillations or a detachment of auxiliaries. Two other praepositi, both dated to the sole reign of Gallienus, are also attested. These are L. Flavius Aper, commanding vexillations of V Macedonica and XIII Gemina at Poetovio, and C. Rufius Synforianus, commanding vexillations at Lychnidus<sup>40</sup>. Both are unquestionably field army commanders, and yet neither holds the title of protector. The explanation can only be that it had already depreciated in the period 260-8. Certainly, the Gratianopolis inscription of 269 shows that praepositi no longer held this title<sup>41</sup>. Perhaps, therefore, these inscriptions are to be dated towards the end of Gallienus's reign, when he was campaigning against the Goths on the Danube frontier.

M. Aurelius Victor is the only praeses recorded as holding the title of protector. As governor of Mauretania Caesariensis he set up an inscription commemorating the return of peace to the province in January 263. There is no evidence to show that Gallienus ever visited Africa in person. It is known, however, that serious revolt raged there from his accession down to 262<sup>42</sup>. The emergency reached such serious proportions that the special command of dux per Africam, Numidiam, Mauretaniamque was created for Cornelius Octavianus about 260<sup>43</sup>. All the available forces in Africa were united under him, and thanks to this measure the revolt had been suppressed by the end of 262. Aurelius Victor probably holds the title of protector because, like Octavianus, he was a trusted field army officer, sent specially to Africa to cope

with the grave situation there. Clearly, however, by 267 the title had depreciated, and was no longer being held by praesides, even on frontiers where the field army was campaigning. Thus Clementius Silvinus, acting as praeses of Pannonia Inferior at this date, does not hold this title.

Valerius Marcellinus, however, prefect of II Adiutrix, also mentioned in the same inscription, does hold the title. He is the only legionary prefect specifically dated to Gallienus's reign, attested with it. The explanation seems to be that the title of protector had declined in status still more by this date, and was now being granted to those praefecti whose legions were temporarily co-opted into the field army. It is known that Gallienus was conducting a campaign against the Goths on the Danube at the very end of his reign. He won a decisive victory at Naissus early in 268, but was unable to follow it up, owing to the revolt of Aureolus. This obliged him to withdraw to Milan, together with the bulk of his forces. Vexillations of the two legions of Lower Pannonia were prominent in Gallienus's field army<sup>44</sup>. It seems likely that the whole of II Adiutrix, a highly regarded unit, was temporarily incorporated into the field army, which was campaigning in the vicinity, and placed under a trusted field army officer. No praefectus legionis is attested with the title after Gallienus's reign. Either before, or shortly after his death, this class of officer had ceased to hold it. Aurelius Firminus, commander of II Adiutrix in 290 is specifically attested as ex protectore<sup>45</sup>. There is only one other legionary prefect attested with the title of protector, namely Aelius Aelianus, prefect of II Adiutrix at Aquincum. It seems

safe therefore to date this inscription also to the latter part of Gallienus's reign.

One can conclude that in the period 260-8 there was a gradual depreciation in the status of the protectores. This could reflect an attempt by Gallienus to secure a wider basis of loyalty among the officer class. This interpretation gathers weight when viewed against the background of usurpations in Gaul, Illyricum and Egypt which followed soon after the news of Valerian's capture in 260. It is ironical that the conspirators who plotted Gallienus's murder were all high ranking generals, e.g. Heraclianus, praetorian prefect, and the cavalry commanders, Claudius, Aurelianus and Cecropius.

(vi) Primipilares and centurions with the title.

The evidence suggests that after 268 the title of protector was confined to <sup>primi pili</sup> primipilares and a certain category of centurions. With regard to the former, only one is attested with the title, i.e. the anonymous officer of the Aïoun Sbiba inscription. At some stage in the third century, this rank ceased to be a military command. Instead, the primipilares became quasi-civil officials, whose chief concern was the collection and distribution of the annona<sup>46</sup>. Two primipilares, dated to the reign of Diocletian, were clearly concerned with purely civil administration. Firstly, M. Arrius Frugidus, primipilaris censor, is recorded as having supervised the installation of a boundary stone between two villages in Syria in the period 292-305<sup>47</sup>. Secondly, the name of Origenes, primipilaris, is recorded on a list of tax receipts in money from Oxyrhynchus in Egypt, dated to 290<sup>48</sup>. An examination of the legal sources seems to confirm this; it seems that the <sup>status</sup> ~~office~~ of

primus pilus  
primpilaris had become compulsorily hereditary by 286<sup>49</sup>. The career of Traianus Mucianus suggests that the title of protector had ceased to be associated with the rank of primus pilus before this post lost its military character. At all events, on becoming a specifically civil grade, its holders would tend to qualify no longer for this title, which was always an essentially military distinction.

It is possible that certain centurions were permitted to hold the title of protector during Gallienus's last year of rule. Certainly the ducenarii protectores recorded on an inscription from Gratianopolis in Gallia Narbonensis, dated to 269, can only be field army centurions<sup>50</sup>. This shows that praepositi in command of field army vexillations had ceased to hold the title of protector. An inscription dated to June 30th 268 demonstrates that by this date the same is true of legionary prefects also<sup>51</sup>. Hence only centurions are left for consideration. Altogether, nine are attested with the title in the latter half of the third century.

Florius Baudio  
T. Flavius Constans  
Acesonius Kalandinus  
Ulpius Maximinus  
Traianus Mucianus  
M. Aurelius Processanus  
Superinius Romanus  
Anon VI 32945  
Anon AE 1954 135

It is evident that quite soon after they became qualified to hold the post, the title of protector became synonymous with the rank of centurion, or at any rate a certain category of centurions. Hence, as early as 269 it is evident that only the title was recorded on inscriptions. From then onwards, the practice became increasingly more customary.

Claudius Dionysius	270-5
M. Aurelius Valerius	280
Theodorus	288-9
Aurelius Firminus	290

However, not all centurions were qualified to hold the title of protector, and in order to understand why this is so, it is necessary to examine the centurionate during the third and fourth centuries in some detail.

(vii) The centurionate during the third and fourth centuries.

Mommsen was led to state that there was no sure evidence for the continued existence of the centurionate during the fourth century<sup>52</sup>. It was the belief of both Seeck and Crosse that the military centurionate ceased to exist after the beginning of the fourth century<sup>53</sup>. Their argument runs briefly as follows. Firstly, a fourth century unit's official strength was probably only 500 men, and this was too small to permit the continued existence of centurions. Secondly, they point out that barbarian recruits would not be likely to endure the rigorous standards of discipline which had characterised the principate, and for whose maintenance the centurions had been chiefly responsible. Finally, they state that in the fourth century there were insufficient candidates with the standard of education requisite for the post.

A closer examination of these arguments, however, shows that their validity is questionable. During the principate, numeri, recruited from barbarians, had been officered by centurions, and the declining standards of discipline need not necessarily imply the abolition of the post<sup>54</sup>. The whole structure of the Roman army under the republic and during the principate had been based on the subdivision of units

into centuries, each commanded by a centurion. That fundamental organisation is unlikely to have been altered at the beginning of the fourth century, even though many important reforms were then carried out.

However, throughout the fourth century, references to the post of centurion continue to occur, although sparse.

A. Inscriptions and papyri

(a) Dated centurions

294-305	Anon	<u>AE 1946 227</u>	<u>centurio ex officio praesidis</u>
296-305	Flavius Martinus	<u>AE 1931 82</u>	<u>cent(urio) p(rae)p(ositus)</u>
312	Anon	<u>P. Flor. I 36</u>	<u>princeps</u>
318	Ammonius	<u>P. Oxy. XII 1424</u>	<u>centurio princeps</u>
325	Flavius Sarapion	<u>P. Oxy. X 1261</u>	<u>centurio officii v.p. catholici</u>
340	Anon	<u>BGU I 21, col. 3</u>	<u>centurio catholici</u>
<del>345</del>	<del>Telegius</del>	<del><u>P. Lond. 235</u></del>	<del><u>(centurio)</u></del>
350	Bassus	<u>AE 1911 243</u>	<u>veteranus ex ordinario</u>
386	Flavius Adeodatus	<u>XIV 231</u>	<u>cent. coh. VII (Vigilum)</u>
"	Crispinus (?)	" "	" " <u>II</u> "

(b) Undated centurions

Apergisius	<u>P. Antinop. I 34</u>	<u>centurio</u>
Aurelianus	<u>VI 32974</u>	<u>cent(urio)</u>
Flavius Eventius	<u>AE 1915 99</u>	<u>cent(urio)</u>
Aurelius Ikarus	<u>VI 2995</u>	<u>cent(urio) coh(ortis) VII</u>
		<u>Vig(illum)</u>
Luppianus	<u>AE 1953 8</u>	<u>ord(inarius)</u>
Paulus	<u>AE 1928 159</u>	<u>ex campidoctoribus ordinarius</u>
Stidin	<u>AE 1926 139</u>	<u>centurio</u>
Theodorus	<u>P. Antinop. I 34</u>	<u>centurio princeps</u>
Valentinus	<u>VIII 23181 - ILS 9206</u>	<u>centurio legionis II Flaviae</u>
		<u>Virtutis</u>

B. Codex Theodosianus

I 16 7 (331): - - - Nullas litigatoribus adiutores eorundem officii principum consussiones adhibeant; centurionum, aliorumque officialium parva magnaue poscentium, intolerandi impetus oblidantur, eorumque, qui iurgantibus acta restituunt, inexpleta aviditas temperetur.

XII I 156 (397): Omnes ordines, collegia, centuriones, ac si qui cuiusque muneribus, vel officiis ubicumque sunt corporati, ita generaliter inligentur, ut testimoniales impetratas sciant sibi nihil honoris, privilegii excusationisve confere.

XII 15 I (399): Hac auctoritate sancimus, ut quicumque centurionum corpus deseruit, nullis dignitatum privilegiis excusatus, debitum munus subire cogatur.

C. Ammianus Marcellinus

- XVI 6 2 Dorus -- quem nitentium rerum centurionem sub Magnentio --
- XVIII 6 21 Anon -- cum centurione quodam fidissimo --
- XX 4 18 Marcus -- Petulantium tunc hastatus --
- c.f. XIX 6 3 -- primisque ordinibus minitantes --

It is true that the vast majority of these references concern centurions who were serving as apparitores on the staffs of civil governors. During the principate, a large number of centurions, though officially attached to a legion, had in fact been concerned with purely civil administration. After the final separation of the civil and military organisations under Diocletian and Constantine, these centurions ceased to be regarded as military officers. Nevertheless, the fact that the post of centurion survived in the civil administration implies that it continued to exist in the army. Even discounting the evidence of Ammianus, who is prone on occasion to use imprecise and anachronistic terminology, the examples of Bassus, ~~Maecius~~, Paulus, Stidius and Valentinus prove that the view of Seeck and Grosse is untenable.

Both rely heavily on the testimony of the Epitome rei militaris. But Vegetius merely states that the centurions who had commanded individual centuries at an earlier period, were now termed

centenarii. In no way can his words be construed to mean that the post of centurion had ceased to exist<sup>55</sup>. Centenarii are often attested in the fourth century, chiefly in connection with field army units, both cavalry and infantry, palatini and comitatenses.

V 8740 = ILS 2798	Flavius Andia	<u>Brachiat</u>
V 8745	Flavius Diocles	<u>Ebores</u>
V 1680	Macrobius Eugnuchus	<u>numerus palatinus</u>
XIII 1848	Claudius Ingenuus	<u>Equites Catafractarii Seniores</u>
V 8758	Flavius Roveos	<u>Equites Comites Seniores</u>
		<u>Sagittarii</u>
III 14406a	Aurelius Saza	<u>Equites Catafractarii Pictavenses</u>
<u>AE</u> 1891 106	Flavius Severianus	<u>Equites Catafractarii</u>
V 374	Flavius Ursicinus	<u>Stabuli</u>
<u>AE</u> 1912 44	Flavius Valerianus	<u>Sagittarii</u>
<u>Wien. Stud.</u> XXIV p 131	- - -	<u>Leones Clibanarii</u>

Other officers are attested with this title in connection with the frontier army<sup>56</sup>, arms factories<sup>57</sup>, and the officia of civil and military officials<sup>58</sup>.

It is difficult to establish precisely when the term, centenarius, first became applied to centurions. However, numerous references attest the existence of small limes posts, each termed a centenarium.

#### A. Dated Inscriptions

244-6	Tripolitana	Gasr Duib	<u>AE</u> 1950 128 = <u>IRT</u> 880
293	Mauretania Sitifensis	Aqua Frigida	VIII 20215
303	Numidia	Ain-Naima	<u>AE</u> 1942-3 81
c. 303	Tripolitana	Tibubuci	VIII 22763
315-6	Mauretania Sitifensis	Bir Haddada	VIII 8713
328	Mauretania Caesariensis	Kabilia Maior	VIII 9010

#### B. Other References

Tripolitana	Sidi Ali ben Zaid	<u>AE</u> 1950 209 = <u>IRT</u> 877
"	Bir Scemech	<u>AE</u> 1951 10 = <u>IRT</u> 889
Germania Secunda	Tungrecanum	<u>AE</u> 1901 78
Valeria	Centenarius Burgus	<u>ND</u> Oc XXXIII 62

cf. Peutinger Table: e.g. Ad Centenarium, on the road from Lambaesis to Zarai, and between Tigisi and Gadiaufala.

It seems likely that this name derives from the title of the commander, who was presumably a centurion in command of a static, territorial force<sup>59</sup>. If this is so, the Gasr Duib inscription shows that already by the reign of Philip certain centurions had the right to the title, centenarius.

It is difficult, however, to discover the reason for this. Briefly, there are three possible explanations. In the first place, it may have some connection with the fact that certain centurions during the principate are attested with the title trecenarius<sup>60</sup>. Dr. Mann has suggested to me that this title perhaps designates those who had held a praetorian centurionate. But it does not seem to have any relevance in the present context because it is never attested in the later empire. Secondly, after discussing the centurionates of the first cohort, Vegetius goes on to state that all the remaining centurions of the other nine cohorts, each in command of 100 men, were now called centenarii<sup>61</sup>. It seems highly probable that during the principate all centurions in a legion, apart from those in the first cohort, were equal in rank, though not in status<sup>62</sup>. The first cohort, however, was of double strength, and its five centurions differed in rank<sup>63</sup>. According to Vegetius, the hastatus prior commanded 200 men in the second line, and in the late empire was called ducenarius<sup>64</sup>. Thus there is the implication that centurions with the title of centenarius held it in virtue of their commanding 100 men, and those with that of ducenarius in as much as they commanded 200. However, it does not seem possible to regard each of the ducenarii protectores recorded on the inscription of 269 from Gratianopolis as holding the post of hastatus prior<sup>65</sup>. Traianus Mucianus is not recorded with this post in any of his five centurionates,

each held with the title of protector<sup>66</sup>.

The third explanation, which seems the most probable in the circumstances, is that these titles, as applied to centurions in the later empire, were derived from the grades of the same name which equestrian officials had held during the principate. In the first two centuries A.D. the post of primus pilus, the chief centurion in a legion, had carried with it a salary of almost 60,000 sesterces, and had conferred equestrian status on its holder<sup>67</sup>. At the same time, members of the equestrian order had sometimes preferred a permanent career in the centurionate to the less secure employment offered by the normal equestrian cursus.<sup>68</sup> Apparently, even during the principate centurions could be promoted to equestrian status as the reward for outstanding service<sup>69</sup>. Others may have gained it as centuriones deputati, serving on the emperor's staff<sup>70</sup>.

In view of the rapid depreciation of the coinage as the third century progressed, it is evident that the bulk of any official's salary must have been largely comprised of annona by the end of the period. In this respect, the terms centenarius and ducenarius, in so far as they reflected the salary of the official concerned, must have become largely meaningless. The statement of Herodian<sup>71</sup> that under Septimius Severus all principales were granted the gold ring should not be construed to mean that they were all granted equestrian status<sup>72</sup>. Nevertheless, it is not entirely without significance. An inscription of 234 records that a decurio alae was promoted to the equestrian order without continuing in his military career<sup>73</sup>. An inscription of 256-8 mentions a vir egregius ex kanaliculario<sup>74</sup>. In the latter part of the

third century, two centurions are specifically attested as viri egregii<sup>75</sup>. Again, just as no senatorial officers are attested as holding commands in the army after c. 260, from the mid-third century officers of equestrian origin, recruited from town councils, cease to be attested also. Corellius Alexander is the last attested eques a militiis in 266<sup>76</sup>. By the end of the third century, officers commanding auxiliary units seem to have been ex-centurions, e.g. Flavius Martinus, 295-305 and Flavius Abinnaeus, 342-51<sup>77</sup>. It seems likely that such centurions would hold equestrian status, as in the case of the previous commanders, and receive the same rates of pay.

During the first and second centuries, it had become customary for a primipilaris to go on to hold the three Rome tribunates and the post of primus pilus bis before being appointed ducenarian prefect in command of a legion. The latest attested primus pilus bis is T. Licinius Hierocles, who set up an inscription as praeses of Mauretania Caesariensis in 227<sup>78</sup>. The anonymous officer of VI 1645, whose career from the praetorian tribunate onwards was under the Philips, did not hold the post<sup>79</sup>. Nor did Petronius Taurus Volusianus, praetorian tribune in the early years of Gallienus's reign. Traianus Mucianus was promoted direct from the post of primus pilus to that of prefect commanding IV Flavia. L. 15 of his inscription shows that the legionary prefecture was still a ducenarian appointment. The post of epistrategus in Egypt had been a sexagenarian appointment during the principate. In 267, however, Aelius Faustus is attested as vir egregius ducenarius epistrategus<sup>80</sup>. The same could also apply in the case of the primipilares. At some stage prior to 286 the ~~office of~~ primipilares became a hereditary <sup>officials</sup> ~~post~~ in the civil administration<sup>81</sup>. From then

onwards, therefore, legionary prefects, such as Aurelius Firminus, Aurelius Maximianus and Clodius Honoratus were presumably promoted direct to this post, after being centurions in the first cohort<sup>82</sup>.

During the principate, centurions in the first cohort were probably paid twice as much as those in the remaining nine<sup>83</sup>. This conforms with Wegeleben's views on the system of promotion within the centurionate<sup>84</sup>. Thus if the centurions of the <sup>other</sup> nine cohorts were upgraded to the status of centenarii, one would expect those in the first cohort to hold ducenarian rank. In this respect, a fourth century inscription from Aquileia may have a special significance<sup>85</sup>. As with centenarii, officers with the ducena dignitas are attested in field army units in the fourth century.

Flavius Batemodus	<u>Heruli Seniores</u>	<u>AE</u> 1890 148
Flavius Cascinivus	<u>Armaturae</u>	<u>AE</u> 1891 104
Flavius Fasta	<u>Equites Batavi Seniores</u>	<u>AE</u> 1890 147
Valerius Iovinus	<u>Equites Promoti</u>	<u>AE</u> 1903 291
Romanus	<u>Vexillatio <del>Batavi Seniores</del></u>	<u>P. Gen.</u> II 79 = <u>P. Abinn.</u> 42
Flavius Savinus	<u>Batavi Seniores</u>	V 8759 = <u>IIS</u> 2797
Anon	<u>Equites III Dalmatae (?)</u>	V 8777

Unlike the centenarii, however, no ducenarii are attested as officers in the frontier units.

In the latter part of the third century, six protectores ducenarii are attested, who were presumably centurions of the first cohort.

- Aurelius Baia
- Florius Baudio
- Ulpus Maximinus (?)
- Sennius Paternus
- Aurelius Processanus
- Aurelius Romanus

cf. also XII 2228 = IIS 569

In the fourth century, protectores continued to hold the status of ducenarius<sup>86</sup>. Generally speaking, however, only one of these titles

is stated. Just as there is no known instance of a centenarius holding the title of protector, conversely there is no record of a ducenarius serving in the frontier forces.

This explains some difficulties with regard to the title of protector in the latter part of the third century. It is interesting to note that the anonymous officer of the Aion Sbibia inscription did not hold the title with his first centurionate in III Augusta. In his next post, however, namely centurion in IV Flavia he has the status of protector. The simple explanation that he was now serving in a field army vexillation does not suffice, since, as has been noted, centenarii also served in field army units. The answer must surely be that he now held the post of centurio primi ordinis, as one would expect before his next post as primus pilus. Again, Titus Flavius Constans, centurio protector, is recorded as having set up an inscription to his brother, Titus Flavius Superus, centurion of XXX Ulpia, who did not hold the title of protector. The most likely explanation is that the former was a centurion of the first cohort, whereas his brother was an ordinary centurion. Florius Baudio was promoted from being centurio ordinarius, i.e. centurion in any of the cohorts II to X, to be protector ducenarius. During the latter half of the third century, there are a number of dated inscriptions which mention centurions who did not hold the title of protector.

260-8	Aurelius Marcus	<u>IV Flavia</u>	Singidunum	III 8148
276-82	Septimius Chaeras	<u>III Italica</u>	Castra Regina	AE 1955 99
274-5	Honoratus		Adraha	AE 1922 130; <u>Syria</u> XXXIX, 1952 pp.317-8
274-5	Marcus		Adraha	AE 1922 130; <u>Syria</u> XXXIX, 1952 pp.317-8
284-305	Aurelius Maximus	<u>II Adiutrix</u>	Dalmatia	III 10060
289-93	Iulius Aurelius	<u>III Augusta</u>	Lambaesis	VIII 2660

The find spots of these inscriptions indicate that these centurions were in fact serving in the frontier army. Hence they would have the status of centenarii, and not qualify for the title of protector. As in the fourth century, centurions of centenarian status also served in field army vexillations, and these also did not qualify for the title. Thus Marcellus is attested simply as centurio ordinarius in a field army vexillation of II Traiana in 298<sup>87</sup>. On the other hand it is clear that each centurionate held by Traianus Mucianus with the title of protector constituted a fresh promotion. These five centurionates, followed by the post of <sup>primus pilus</sup> primipilaris probably correspond to the five grades within the first cohort of a legion. Generally speaking, the protectores ducenarii attested during the latter part of the third century appear to have been field army officers. This is because the title of protector was always viewed as being an essentially military distinction. However, in the latter part of the third century, as in fourth century, civil officials seem sometimes to have held it<sup>88</sup>. In conclusion, it may be stated that the titles of protector and ducenarius were always closely linked throughout their history. In order to view the rapid decline of the former during Gallienus's reign in its proper perspective, one has to take into account the parallel decline in that of ducenarius during the first half of the third century, which, though slower, was equally remarkable<sup>89</sup>.

(viii) Protectores attached to field army units.

For purposes of study, it seems most convenient from now onwards to divide the protectores into two main categories,

firstly those attached to field army units, and secondly those serving on the staff of the emperor or one of his generals. With regard to the former category, during the latter part of the third century the field army appears to have been composed of a number of vexillations, each being normally drawn from a pair of legions garrisoned in the same province. Apart from the fact that they were commanded by praepositi, and probably each numbered about 1,000 men, little is known concerning their internal organisation. It seems that where a centurionate in a legion is mentioned, the protector concerned was serving in a vexillation from that unit which had been drafted into the field army. Thus the anonymous officer of the Aicou Sbiha inscription, Florius Baudio, Ulpius Maximinus and Traianus Mucianus each held the title in virtue of their centurionates in vexillations from IV Flavia, II Italica, II Parthica and XIII Gemina respectively. In the closing decades of the third century, however, it became standard practise to omit the name of the unit and the post of centurion. The result is that in most cases it is impossible to differentiate between protectores serving in vexillations, and those belonging to the emperor's staff.

After the ~~post of~~ primipilaris had become a hereditary <sup>officials</sup> ~~office~~ in the civil administration, the princeps seems to have become the chief centurion. The inscription of Traianus Mucianus shows that this post was held with the title of protector. In the fourth century this officer was also called Brimicerius or domesticus<sup>90</sup>. He ranked second to the tribunus in command of a field army unit<sup>91</sup>. Normally, the post appears by itself without further qualification.

A)

Primicerii

Adabrandus	<u>Schola II Scutariorum</u>	VI 37276
Macrobius	<u>Primi Theodosiani</u>	XI 1693
Mauricius	<u>Thebaei</u>	<u>Passio Acaunensium Martyrum</u>
Menas	<u>Mattiaci Seniores</u>	ILS 9481 a
Paterenes	--	<u>Sammelbuch IV 7425</u>
Sergius	<u>Schola Gentilium</u>	<u>Anal. Boll. XIV, 1895, p 376</u>
Vitalianus	<u>Felices Theodosiaci</u>	VI 32970
Zimarcus	--	<u>AE 1951 92</u>
Anon	<u>Vexillatio Eq. Catafract.</u>	<u>P. Gen. II 79 = P Abinn. 42</u>
cf. also <u>P. Ital.</u>	<u>I (1955) 16, l. 31; 22, l. 4; 23, l. 7</u>	

B)

Domestici

Flavius Alatancus		V 8738
Iohannes Aulus	<u>Lanciarri</u>	<u>AE 1903 73</u>
Flavius Carpilio	<u>Batavi Seniores</u>	V 8743

Two officers with this rank, however, one certainly, and the other probably belonging to the earlier part of the fourth century, are shown to hold ducenarian status<sup>92</sup>. Furthermore, the example of Viatorinus makes it seem likely that primicerii still held the title of protector in the fourth century.

The next in rank after the primicerius in a fourth century field army unit was the senator<sup>93</sup>

Senatores

Flavius Agemundus	<u>Auxiliarii Constantiaci</u>	359 <u>BGU I 316</u>
Amabilis	<u>Numerus Bis Electorum</u>	- VIII 17414
Candidus	<u>Thebaei</u>	- <u>Passio Acaunensium Martyrum</u>
Evingus (?)	<u>Equites Bracchiati (?)</u>	- V 8760 -, <u>ILS 2804</u>
Flavius Maximinus	<u>Scutarii</u>	- III 14188
Flavius Sindia	<u>Heruli Seniores</u>	- <u>AE 1890 144 -, ILS 2796</u>
Stephanus	<u>Schola Armaturarum</u>	- <u>ILS 8883</u>
Strategius	<u>ex palatine milite</u>	365 <u>AM XXVI 6 5</u>
Anon	<u>Schola I Scutariorum</u>	- VI 32948

The view that this officer obtained this title because he held the clarissimate seems at first sight the most plausible<sup>94</sup>. However, a senator is recorded as early as 359 and the earliest dux attested as vir clarissimus is ten years later<sup>95</sup>. An officer with the post of

secundacarius is attested together with the primicerius, Sergius, in the Schola Gentilium, 303<sup>96</sup>. This officer seems to rank next to the primicerius, and perhaps acquired the title of senator at a later period. If the fourth century primicerius is to be equated with the former princeps of the first cohort during the principate, one would logically expect the secundacarius or senator to be the former hastatus prior<sup>97</sup>. Presumably, like the primicerius and ducenarius, this officer would qualify for the title of protector.

The ducenarii serving in fourth century field army units have already been listed. They probably correspond to the two posteriores of the first cohort during the principate. They rank below the senator, but above the centenarius. Ducenarius was apparently the lowest rank which qualified for the title of protector. Seven protectores are recorded as belonging to field army units, and no doubt they fall into this category<sup>98</sup>. In order to avoid confusion, officers serving in field army units would probably prefer normally to state their rank, rather than the title of protector.

(ix) Protectores serving as staff officers.

With regard to the second category, centurions are known to have served on the emperor's staff during the principate<sup>99</sup>. If the anachronistic references to protectores in the Augustan History have been correctly interpreted, centurions also served on the staffs of Caracalla and the elder Gordian<sup>100</sup>. During the third century, emperors were constantly required to lead their armies in person, either against barbarian invaders, or rival candidates for the throne. In such a situation they would obviously have required a large number of staff

officers on whose intelligence and loyalty they could rely. In this light it is significant that the castra peregrina should have played an important role in the first part of the third century. Essentially it seems to have been a transit camp for principales and centurions staying at Rome<sup>101</sup>. Officers who rose to high positions during this period had frequently held some post connected with it at some stage during their careers<sup>102</sup>.

The castra peregrina was headed by the princeps peregrinorum, having as his deputy a subprinceps. The centurions who resided there all had the status of primi ordines<sup>103</sup>. They were, in order of precedence, the centuriones deputati, supernumerarii and frumentarii. The frumentarii were officially concerned with commissary duties, but in fact often acted as spies and secret police. In the early third century their reputation was already notorious<sup>104</sup>. They were disbanded by Diocletian, only to be replaced, however, by the agentes in rebus, a schola under the magister officiorum<sup>105</sup>. The centuriones supernumerarii were apparently carried on the books of a legion, but in excess of the full quota, and in fact serving under other officers, or in other units<sup>106</sup>. In the fourth century the term vacans evidently corresponds to that of supernumerarius<sup>107</sup>. Only two inscriptions mention them. The first shows that they were quartered at the castra peregrina when residing at Rome<sup>108</sup>. The second, from Aquileia, is clearly third century in date, and shows such an officer acting as magister equitum<sup>109</sup>. He had previously served as discens equitum, i.e. a cadet in the legionary cavalry<sup>110</sup>. It is probable that Gallienus increased the number of legionary cavalry, and drafted them into the field army as part of his programme of military reform<sup>111</sup>.

This inscription may well date to the period after this reform. Whether the post of magister equitum has any connection with the fourth century command of the same name is uncertain.

Altogether, eight centuriones deputati are attested, all of whom belong to the third century.

Q. Carinius Amabilis	VI 36776 = <u>ILS</u> 9080
Aurelius Mucianus	III 7326
L. Pullius Peregrinus	VI 3558 = <u>ILS</u> 2669
Aurelius Flavones Rufinus	<u>IGR</u> III 28 = <u>ILS</u> 8871
Aurelius Silivius	VI 3557
Aurelius Titus	VI 32415 = <u>ILS</u> 4932
Ulpius Verus	" " " " "
L. Petronius Taurus Volusianus	XI 1836 = <u>ILS</u> 1332

Mommsen put forward the theory that they were centurions serving on the emperor's staff<sup>112</sup>. The evidence, though scanty, seems to point in this direction. The inscriptions set up by officers serving in this capacity have all been found at Rome, with one exception<sup>113</sup>. In three instances, the previous post of a centurio deputatus is known. Amabilis and Rufinus were both previously centuriones frumentarii, while Volusianus had served on the V decuria at Rome. The latter's rapid career culminated in the praetorian prefecture. Clearly, the post of centurio deputatus was only granted to trusted and able officers. The centuriones deputati are also mentioned in an interesting inscription dated to 256-8<sup>114</sup>. This throws considerable light on the organisation of the castra peregrina. It is probable that the two tribuni referred to were praetorians, and were in charge of the castra peregrina at this time<sup>115</sup>. It seems significant that the last dated epigraphic reference to the centuriones deputati should occur at this period. The first dated reference to centurions holding the title of protector occurs shortly afterwards.

With regard to the protectores serving as staff officers in the fourth century, it is evident that each emperor had two scholae of protectores domestici, one of cavalry, and one of infantry, serving at his court<sup>116</sup>. The term, schola, is an ambiguous one in the fourth century. It is used to describe the units which constituted the emperor's household guard, namely the scholae palatinae, which came under the control of the magister officiorum<sup>117</sup>. On the other hand, it could also be applied to various bodies of officials, such as the agentes in rebus, the secret police, and the notarii, the clerks of the imperial chancellery<sup>118</sup>. Frequently, ordo, or consortium is used as an alternative term in connection with the protectores domestici<sup>119</sup>. The Notitia shows that the two scholae of domestici were each commanded by a tribunus, who held the title of comes<sup>120</sup>. This office was a key post in the fourth century<sup>121</sup>. Its holders were almost certain to be promoted at a later stage to the rank of magister militum<sup>122</sup>. Each schola had a primicerius as its most senior member. During the fourth century, four of these are known by name<sup>123</sup>. There is no evidence to indicate the precise number of protectores domestici within each schola. However, a fifth century law states that there were 48 ducenarii in the schola of agentes in rebus<sup>124</sup>. It has already been shown that all protectores had ducenarian status. It seems likely therefore that, by analogy with the agentes in rebus, there were about 50 in each schola of protectores domestici, thus making a total of 100 in all. Of these, 50 (presumably 25 from each schola) were selected to serve in praesenti, i.e. at the emperor's court.<sup>125</sup> These 50

protectores domestici serving in praesenti are presumably to be identified with the deputati mentioned in the Notitia Dignitatum as serving under each comes domesticorum<sup>126</sup>. The term, deputatus, as employed in the legal sources during this period, seems to imply service at the imperial court<sup>127</sup>. The remaining protectores domestici seem to have served on the staffs of the various regional magistri militum.

At first sight, it seems difficult to point to any institution in the preceding century which corresponds to that of the protectores domestici. Clearly, however, the emperors of the latter part of the third century possessed a large field army, and would have required a considerable number of staff officers. The term, deputati, as applied to the protectores domestici serving in praesenti, seems to provide a clue, since it is also used to characterise those centurions of the third century who served on the emperor's staff, and were quartered in the castra peregrina. The importance of the castra peregrina during the first part of the third century has already been shown. What evidence exists concerning the centuriones deputati during this period suggests that they were normally destined for rapid promotion, and high positions. Thus Petronius Taurus Volusianus rose to the praetorian prefecture, while Aurelius Flavones Rufinus's last attested post is that of urban tribune.

During the latter part of the third century, there is little evidence concerning the castra peregrina. But since access to the higher military grades was confined to the centurionate after Gallienus's reforms, it is evident that it will have gained rather

than lost in importance. An ex principe peregrinorum is attested as praeses of Numidia under Carinus<sup>128</sup>. Diocletian is described as holding the post of comes domesticorum immediately prior to his elevation as emperor<sup>129</sup>. This, however, is clearly an anachronism, since the protectores domestici are not attested elsewhere until 346<sup>130</sup>. It is known that the cavalry of Gallienus's field army was unified under a single command<sup>131</sup>. It is possible therefore that the staff officers at the castra peregrina were divided into two sections, infantry and cavalry. This would explain why there are two tribunes attested in command under Gallienus<sup>132</sup>. It is possible that Diocletian was one of these. If so, Zonaras's wording suggests that he was in charge of the cavalry section.

Perhaps, therefore, the posts of comes domesticorum equitum and the comes domesticorum peditum evolved from the two praetorian tribunates in control of the castra peregrina in the latter part of the third century. Similarly, the two primicerii at the head of the two scholae domesticorum in the fourth century could approximate to the principes and subprincipes of the castra peregrina during the principate. Finally, the protectores domestici serving in praesenti during the fourth century seem to correspond to the centuriones deputati of the preceding century, while the protectores domestici who served on the staffs of field army generals appear to have analogies with the centuriones supernumerarii.

It is unlikely that the protectores domestici originated from the praetorians, since the latter seem to decrease in importance under Diocletian, perhaps as a natural result of his policy of

decentralisation. He is recorded as having reduced their numbers<sup>133</sup>. Again, contemporary inscriptions relative to the careers of individual soldiers indicate that service in the praetorian guard represented an honourable retirement after an active career<sup>134</sup>. The scholae of Scutarii and Gentiles, which eventually replaced the praetorians as the imperial bodyguard are already attested in his reign<sup>135</sup>. The eventual disbandment of the praetorian guard after the Battle of the Milvian Bridge in 312 was only the logical outcome of Diocletian's policy.

Evidence concerning those protectores who served as staff officers in the latter part of the third century and during the early fourth century is sparse. The first dated reference to them as protectores domestici does not occur until 346<sup>136</sup>. Hence it is difficult to prove that any protector attested during this period was in fact serving as a staff officer. It seems probable, however, that Traianus Mucianus served in this capacity, while attached to the Vigiles and Urban Cohorts. These are not attested on coins as belonging to the field army, and the omission of the number of the cohort to which he was attached in these two centurionates seems significant. Again the inscription does not state the legion to which he was attached while serving as princeps and principularis<sup>primus pilus</sup>. Daia's rapid career, and the influence wielded by his uncle, Galerius, make it probable that he also served as protector on the emperor's staff, while the same may be true of Servantus and Terentius, since no unit commander is attested in their case, in contrast to the other sections of the papyrus in which they are listed. Valerius Thiumpo also probably falls into

this category. This is implied by the term, protexit, in his inscription, and the fact that he served as protector for five years, one year less than Flavius Memorius's term as protector domesticus. The inscription of Licinianus, who served in the schola protectorum, also seems to belong to the early part of the fourth century. Finally, the inscription of Valerius Vincentius, actuarius protectorum, from Nicomedia, where Diocletian often had his residence, implies that there was an organised body of protectores serving at the imperial court at this time. During the fourth century, 22 officers are specifically attested with the rank of protector domesticus.

Flavius Aurelius	Ammianus Marcellinus
Marcus Bitianus	Marcellus
Eareter	Masaucio
Flavius Gabso	Flavius Memorius
Gratianus	Teutomeres
Hariulfus	Flavius Valens
Herculanus	Valentinus
Flavius Iovianus	Valerianus
Leontius	Verinianus
Leucadius	Vitalianus
Macedonius	Anon (VI 32947)

With regard to access to this rank, the protectores domestici fall into two groups, firstly those who were already experienced soldiers on receiving their commissions, and secondly those commissioned directly on entering the army. With regard to the former category, it is noticeable that they normally served in palace units, where inherent ability would attract the emperor's attention more quickly.

Daia	<u>Scutarii</u>	<u>Schola Palatina</u>
Flavius Memorius	<u>Ioviani</u>	<u>Legio Palatina</u>
Valerius Thiumpo	<u>Lanciarri</u>	" "
Vitalianus	<u>Heruli</u>	<u>Auxilium Palatinum</u>

With regard to the second group, ability, education, and above all, perhaps, influence, seem to have been the deciding factors. The duties

of a staff officer would obviously require some measure of education in the prospective candidate, especially if his superior had himself risen from the ranks, as in the case of Arbitio, Ursicinus and Vetrano<sup>137</sup>. Hence the appointment of such officers as Ammianus Marcellinus. On the other hand, Herculanus, Flavius Iovianus, Masaucio and Flavius Valens were presumably helped by the influence of their fathers, who were all high ranking generals. When the magister militum, Ursicinus, was sent to overthrow Silvanus in 355, he was accompanied by a staff of 10 tribuni vacantes and protectores domestici. Of these, all were either relatives or friends of Ursicinus, with the exception of Ammianus and Verinianus<sup>138</sup>. A law of 364-5 specified that the sons and close kinsmen of protectores domestici were to be attached to the scholae of domestici and enrolled on the official register, even though too young as yet to bear arms<sup>139</sup>.

As a rule, promotion within the scholae of domestici seems to have followed a fairly rigid pattern, depending on seniority of service<sup>140</sup>. Within each schola there were 10 decemprimi. This was the highest grade, next to that of primicerius, and was reached according to seniority<sup>141</sup>. Provision was made that if an officer temporarily lost his position in the schola, but was reinstated within two years as a result of the emperor's decision, he was not to lose any of his seniority<sup>142</sup>. Normally, it seems that an officer served in a schola for about 5 years<sup>143</sup>. Promotion was automatic up to the grade of decemprimus. Thus it is evident that in normal circumstances 10 fresh protectores domestici were selected for service in each schola every year. The post of primicerius of a schola was apparently viewed

as a special distinction. Patronage and an impressive physique seem to have been factors influencing an appointment to this position, which was probably important in court ceremonial<sup>144</sup>. Those commissioned direct as protectores domestici were normally young men, aged about 19<sup>145</sup>. Those who had commenced service in the ranks tended to be appointed to this position in their forties<sup>146</sup>.

After having served on the staff of the emperor, or a high ranking general, an officer was normally promoted to the rank of tribunus<sup>147</sup>. Thus, when Ursicinus was sent to assume control once more of the eastern field army as magister equitum per orientem in 357, he appointed the more senior members of his staff to the command of units<sup>148</sup>. Altogether, the further careers of five staff protectores in the fourth century are known. In each case they went on to hold the post of tribunus<sup>149</sup>. In the latter part of the third century, staff protectores seem to have been appointed to command frontier legions, before returning to the field army as praepositi in charge of a pair of legionary vexillations<sup>150</sup>. It seems highly probable that most of the officers who commanded field army units in the fourth century had previously passed through the grade of protector domesticus.

(x) The duties assigned to protectores serving as staff officers.

This seems a convenient point at which to examine the duties assigned to the various types of staff protector in the fourth century. Firstly, as has been shown, the protectores domestici were staff officers, attached either to the emperor himself, or to the various magistri militum. It is interesting to note that the heart shaped design which appears on the shields of the protectores domestici

in the Notitia Dignitatum also constitutes the decoration for the emperor's chariot on the Arch of Constantine<sup>151</sup>. As a protector domesticus one had to be engaged in the emperor's service, having definite duties, and carrying out public orders<sup>152</sup>. It was decreed that those who had been of no assistance either to the emperor himself, or any of his military expeditions, were to be dismissed<sup>153</sup>. Another law states that the name of domestici was given to them in first place because of the intimate personal service which they rendered to the emperor<sup>154</sup>. In 354 Constantius II withdrew the bulk of the ~~Caesar~~ Gallus's forces in order to weaken his position, preparatory to overthrowing him. As an excuse, he stated that they might mutiny if left inactive over a long period. However, he allowed Gallus to retain his scholae palatinae and protectores domestici<sup>155</sup>. Two implications emerge: firstly, that the loyalty of an emperor's bodyguard and staff officers was normally considered as being beyond doubt; secondly, that no emperor could be expected to dispense with their services. When Constantius II died at Mopsucrenae in Cilicia in 361, it was a protector domesticus, Flavius Iovianus, who was selected to escort the funeral cortege back to Constantinople<sup>156</sup>.

Besides acting as an escort to the emperor, protectores domestici could also be sent on distant service<sup>157</sup>. Thus, they occasionally acted as messengers, as in the case of Herculanius, who brought news to Constantius II in Gaul of Gallus's actions in the east<sup>158</sup>. When the rebellion of Procopius broke out in 365, Valentinian I sent Masaucio as a special emissary to Africa. He was the son of Cretio, a former comes Africae; hence he would know what places to guard, in order to prevent the revolt spreading to this important

grain province<sup>159</sup>. The duties assigned to Ammianus Marcellinus by the magister militum, Ursicinus, throw an interesting light on the various functions which a protector domesticus serving on a general's staff might be called on to perform.

The arrest and guarding of prisoners was perhaps the most frequent of the duties performed by protectores<sup>160</sup>. In a general reference to the cruelty of Valentinian I, Ammianus mentions that it was the protectores who were sent to arrest suspected persons<sup>161</sup>. In 354 Gallus ordered his protectores domestici to arrest the praetorian prefect, Domitianus<sup>162</sup>. At the same time, they also arrested Apollinaris, Domitianus's son-in-law, who had been sent to Mesopotamia to enquire from the soldiers stationed there as to whether Gallus was planning a revolt<sup>163</sup>. The actual arrest of Gallus himself, at Poetovio, was carried out by the comes domesticorum, Barbatio, with a picked band of protectores<sup>164</sup>. In 355, the protector domesticus, Teutomeres, was sent, together with a colleague, to arrest those present at a banquet given by Africanus, governor of Pannonia Secunda, since treasonable talk was alleged to have taken place on this occasion<sup>165</sup>. A decree of 382 prescribed that Natalis, the former dux et praeses of Isauria, was to be conducted back to the province which he had despoiled, sub custodia protectorum, and there be made to repay fourfold what he had stolen<sup>166</sup>. In 373, the magister equitum, Theodosius, who had been sent to Africa to suppress the revolt of Firmus, gave orders to his protectores domestici to arrest the comes Africae, Romanus, because of his suspected extortion<sup>167</sup>. Ordinary protectores apparently were also used for this purpose. Thus, when a governor of the Thebaid

was converted at the time of Diocletian's persecution, the prefect of Egypt ordered some protectores and sagittarii to arrest him<sup>168</sup>.

Protectores were also employed to organise the work of frontier defence. Thus in 359 when it became obvious that Sapor intended to invade Mesopotamia, staff tribuni and protectores were sent to ensure that the fortifications on the right bank of the Euphrates were in a state of readiness<sup>169</sup>. Protectores could also be sent to supervise the defences of a particular area of frontier<sup>170</sup>. In this respect an inscription of 334 mentions a certain Vincentius, protector agens Basie<sup>171</sup>. Another of the duties frequently assigned to protectores, was that of recruiting officer. In this case they were sent out into the provinces to summon to the levy deserters, sons of veterans, vagrants, and persons whose birth status made them eligible for military service<sup>172</sup>. Flavius Abinnaeus seems to have been employed as a recruiting officer in the period 339-42. In the latter year he led the recruits he had assembled to the emperor's headquarters at Hierapolis. An inscription from Italy mentions a certain Flavius Concordius, protector divinorum laterum et praepositus Iuniorum. He also seems to have been engaged in conducting recruits to the emperor's headquarters. When Aelianus, as protector, led a night sally of the Praeventores from Singara in 348, he was probably acting as praepositus in command of this recently recruited unit.

The supervision of the public post, with respect to the size of the vehicles, and the weight of the loads placed in them was another of the duties which the protectores carried out<sup>173</sup>. Also, protectores were appointed to ensure that no illicit goods were

exported to barbarian tribes by sea or land<sup>174</sup>. Soldiers were sometimes employed in raising a tax on goods bought and sold at markets<sup>175</sup>. On such occasions, the officer in command was a protector<sup>176</sup>. Protectores also sometimes received the annona on behalf of the troops to whom they were attached<sup>177</sup>. Apparitores serving on the staff of a magister militum or dux were sometimes granted the title of protector. Thus Iacobus and Caesius were numerarii on the staff of the magister equitum per orientem, and apparently had the status of protector. Similarly, Antoninus seems to have acquired the title of protector while serving as a numerarius on the staff of the dux Mesopotamiae. However, a law of 354 decreed that no apparitor serving on the staff of a magister militum was henceforth to be granted the status of protector, unless he had actually borne arms in the imperial service during his career, and assisted in all the military expeditions<sup>178</sup>.

(xi) The status of protectores.

As has already been shown, protectores in the latter part of the third century all held ducenarian status. The ducena dignitas by this time seems to bear no relation to the salary of the official who held it. Instead, the evidence suggests that it was a term employed to designate a wide cross section of officials belonging to the equestrian order.

Septimius Vorodes	262-5	<u>v.e. procurator</u>	PIR <sup>I</sup> III S 350
Aurelius Marcellinus	265	<u>v.p. dux</u>	IIS 544
Aelius Faustus	267	<u>v.e. epistrategus</u>	P. Oxy. XVII 2130
C. Iulius Priscianus	270-5	<u>v.e. curator reipublicae</u>	IIS 583
M. Aurelius Valerius	280	<u>v.e. ex prot. lat. div.</u>	III 1805 & p 2328 <sup>119</sup>
Laitila	306	<u>primicerius</u>	AE 1933 185

Apparently all the centenarii and the majority of the ducenarii had the status of viri egregii in the third century<sup>179</sup>. The highest grades among the ducenarii, however, had the status of viri perfectissimi<sup>180</sup>. This order of precedence is shown clearly by two laws of 317<sup>181</sup>. During the latter part of the third century, protectores apparently ranked as viri egregii ducenarii<sup>182</sup>.

During the fourth century, protectores seem to have continued to hold ducenarian status<sup>183</sup>. However, during this period two protectores are attested with the status of vir perfectissimus<sup>184</sup>. One of the inscriptions mentioning Flavius Concordius is dated to 361. Ammianus states that the duces were still viri perfectissimi under Constantius II, and the first inscription attesting a dux as vir clarissimus is dated to 369<sup>185</sup>. It may be that it was felt necessary to promote the duces to the status of clarissimi, because the protectores, a far lower grade, had gained the perfectissimate. During the early fifth century, the primicerius and decemprimi within each schola of protectores domestici were accorded senatorial status<sup>186</sup>. In 416 the clarissimate was also conferred on primicerii and decemprimi within the protectores<sup>187</sup>.

(xii) The acquiring of the title, protector.

The acquiring of the title of protector was closely linked with the ceremony of adoratio. This practice, in its finally developed form, seems to have been introduced by Diocletian, and in all probability was modelled on the court procedure of the Sassanid kings<sup>188</sup>. In order of rank and seniority, those privileged to be admitted to an audience with the emperor were required to prostrate themselves before

him, and kiss the hem of his purple robe<sup>189</sup>. The protectores constituted the lowest class of officials qualified to participate in this ceremony. During the fourth century the dignitas of protector was attained merely through participation in the ceremony of adoratio<sup>190</sup>. Thus Flavius Abinnaeus may have obtained the title of protector by this means. Apparently, at a later stage, some officers with the status of protector were termed simply adorator, without further qualification<sup>191</sup>. The ceremony of adoratio constituted an essential part in the new absolutist regime established by Diocletian and Constantine. It was no doubt one of the factors which ensured that the fourth century, unlike the third, should be relatively free from pretenders. Each officer, at a certain essential stage in the cursus, had to adore the emperor in order to secure promotion. Thus the emperor preserved contact with his officers, though still remaining aloof. All senior centurions were his protectores, but at the same time they were the protectores lateris divini.

It was customary to pay a fee for the privilege of becoming protector domesticus. Those who had already served for some time prior to reaching this rank only paid 5 solidi to the primicerius scholae, but those admitted to adore the purple through patronage or favour were required to pay ten times this amount<sup>192</sup>. On becoming protector, one acquired a testimonial letter certifying one's right to claim this status<sup>193</sup>.

(xiii) The title, ex protectoribus.

The title of protector is not to be confused with that of ex protectoribus. The latter was normally only granted to veterans

who had attained the rank of protector prior to their discharge. It was held by various officials, both military and civil in the latter part of the third century<sup>194</sup>. It seems to have conferred special privileges on its holder<sup>195</sup>. In the fourth century, soldiers could receive three main types of discharge, honesta missio, causaria missio and emerita missio. Soldiers who had served their full complement of 20 years were entitled to honesta missio, while those discharged on account of wounds before completing this length of service were granted causaria missio<sup>196</sup>. A law of 325 lists the privileges conferred on protectores, milites comitatenses and ripenses while still serving<sup>197</sup>. It then goes on to list the privileges accorded to various categories of veterans, commencing with those holding emerita missio, the first dated mention of this type of discharge. The property of these veterans, and that of their wives, was exempt from taxation. Those discharged with honesta missio, however, were only permitted to exempt their own capitum. Thus the former category were granted double the privileges allowed to the latter. A law of 364 shows that veterans discharged as ex protectoribus received twice the amount of corn and oxen granted to those holding honesta missio<sup>198</sup>. Thus it seems likely that discharge with emerita missio was normally synonymous with discharge with the title, ex protectoribus. The wording of the law of 328 suggests that the protectoria dignitas was among the distinctions obtained by veterans pro meritis suis<sup>199</sup>.

An examination of the careers of those protectores who commenced service in the ranks shows that none attained this status prior to their completion of at least 20 years service. In the third

century most officers seem to reach the rank of protector while in their forties<sup>200</sup>. In the fourth century, Valerius Thiumpo served 20 years, Flavius Marcus 23 years, and Flavius Memorius 28 years, before attaining the dignitas of protector. It seems likely that most soldiers, having completed 20 years service, were granted their honesta missio and discharged. However, a small percentage, of those with recognised ability, were apparently encouraged to remain, with a view to their later promotion as protectores. Martinianus held the title, ex protectoribus, at the age of 60, having previously served for 45 years. Albinus, specifically termed veteranus ex protectoribus on his inscription, died at the age of 80. Contemporary references to the rank of protector show that in normal circumstances it was only reached after considerable service<sup>201</sup>.

During the principate, personnel officially attached to the army had often in reality been concerned with purely civil duties. In the third century there was an increasing tendency towards specialisation, culminating in the final separation of the civil and military organisations under Constantine. In the fourth century, however, many civil officials retained their military titles, and among these was that of protector. A law of 321 emphasised that ideally it was to be viewed as an essentially military distinction<sup>202</sup>. In the case of apparitores serving on the staffs of magistri militum, a law of 354 prescribed that none were to be allowed to adore the purple, unless they had previously borne arms in the imperial service, and participated in all the military expeditions<sup>203</sup>. Caesius and Iacobus, attested as numerarii on the staff of the magister equitum per orientem

in 359 had presumably fulfilled this stipulation.

The Notitia Dignitatum presents a somewhat confused picture with relation to the appointment of the principes at the head of the various officia, both civil and military. Probably this is because the chapters are not all contemporaneous and administrative changes were introduced at different periods. Some principes were evidently appointed de eodem officio<sup>204</sup>. Others, on the staffs of various western duces, were apparently appointed in alternate years from the officia of the various magistri militum praesentales<sup>205</sup>. The principes on the remaining staffs, both civil and military, appear to have been drawn from the agentes in rebus. Most of the principes at the head of the various officia in the eastern section of the Notitia are specifically attested as having gained the title of protector on completion of service<sup>206</sup>. It may be significant that this is not the case with any of the principes in the western section, but there is no reason to suppose that they did not receive this privilege. Some principes in the eastern section apparently served for two years prior to their retirement<sup>207</sup>. The same is also true in the case of the primicerius fabricae<sup>208</sup>. The agentes in rebus seem to have obtained the same privileges as soldiers and court officials<sup>209</sup>. The cornicularii on the staff of the praetorian prefect were evidently permitted to adore the purple on completion of their service<sup>210</sup>. The same is true of the numerarii, on completion of three years service. The officiales serving on the staff of the praefectus urbis evidently also gained the title of protector, on completion of their service<sup>212</sup>. Notarii, apparently, were also entitled to the status of protector<sup>213</sup>.

(xiv) The privileges granted to protectores.

With regard to the privileges granted to the protectores, practically all the evidence is contained in a series of laws in the Theodosian Code. However, it is almost certain that the title carried with it certain privileges in the latter part of the third century<sup>214</sup>. The subject is perhaps best examined from four different points of view, firstly, the privileges of those actually holding the title of protector, and secondly, of those holding the title, ex protectoribus. Thirdly, the series of laws directed against the illegal solicitation of the title, ex protectoribus, shows that the privileges involved were considerable, and many persons therefore were anxious to obtain it. Finally, it remains to examine the special category of the protectores domestici.

The promotion which soldiers coveted, and which influential friends solicited for them, was advancement to the dignitas of protector<sup>215</sup>. A general reference to the privileges enjoyed by the protectores occurs in a law of 326, which seems to imply that these privileges were dependent on length of service<sup>216</sup>. More specifically, officers with the title of protector had the right of osculation, when greeting vicarii of the praetorian prefect<sup>217</sup>. Punishment similar to that meted out in cases of sacrilege was to be inflicted on those who refused to grant this privilege to persons who had been considered worthy enough to touch the sacred purple. A law of 416 prescribed that protectores with the rank of decemprimus were to be accorded the status of clarissimi, without being subject to any of the compulsory public services incumbent on senators<sup>218</sup>. Like ripenses and comitatenses,

protectores while serving were permitted to exempt from personal taxes themselves, together with their fathers, mothers and wives<sup>219</sup>. Where they did not have these relatives, they were allowed to exempt a certain restricted number of persons. In accordance with ancient custom, protectores obtained prices of the open market when selling their annona<sup>220</sup>. When on distant service, both protectores domestici and ordinary protectores obtained annona, provided that they renewed their letters of instruction (commonitorium) for the following consular year<sup>221</sup>.

A reference to the privileges of those qualified to hold this title, ex protectoribus, occurs as early as the reign of Diocletian<sup>222</sup>. A law of 320 sought to ensure that only those who had legitimately obtained the title of ex protectoribus should be allowed to enjoy the concomittant privileges<sup>223</sup>. The property of those qualified to hold the status of ex protectoribus cannot have been negligible, since their sons could be attached to the municipal councils if unsuited for military service on health grounds. The same also applied to those protectores serving in praesenti who were enervated by luxurious living<sup>224</sup>. The title of ex protectoribus qualified its holder for exemption from the municipal council, the service guildsmen owed to their cities, and the payment in gold of the established sum due from tradesmen<sup>225</sup>. Veterans who held the title of ex protectoribus could not be arrested on charges incongruous with their rank. Instead, the governor of the province concerned had to refer the matter to the court of the praetorian prefect<sup>226</sup>. Veterans discharged as ex protectoribus received 2 yoke of oxen and 100 measures of each kind of grain<sup>227</sup>. Others, however,

discharged with honesta or causaria missio only received half this amount. A person who had obtained the title, ex protectoribus, after military service, was exempted up to the price of one vagina from the payment of the collatio lustralis, if engaged in trade<sup>228</sup>. Apparently, therefore, those who obtained the distinction, ex protectoribus, could expect to have amassed sufficient capital to engage in trade. A further law guaranteed them an exemption from taxation of 15 solidi in all trading transactions. On sums involving a larger capital investment, however, they were required to pay duty<sup>229</sup>.

The advantages which the title of ex protectoribus conferred on its holder made it much sought after, and a series of laws was directed against those persons attempting to gain it illegally, either by patronage or favour, when in fact they had never been engaged in the imperial service. Whereas those with previous service paid a fee of only 5 to 10 solidi to the primicerius scholae on obtaining the position of protector domesticus, those obtaining it through patronage had to pay a fee of 50 solidi<sup>230</sup>. Such a considerable sum indicates the worth of the privileges involved. A law of 365 is directed against persons adorning the purple, and thereby qualifying for the status of ex protectoribus, before the completion of their period of service<sup>231</sup>. This law also ordered that all who had obtained the title through patronage were to return to their former units. In 382 it was decreed that numerarii who had acquired the title before completing the statutory three years service in this position were to be executed<sup>232</sup>. A law of 400 was issued to prevent persons being certified as veterans by the grant of testimonial letters obtained fraudulently, as these people had never been soldiers, or had deserted

in the prime of life<sup>233</sup>, Persistent offenders in this respect were the clerks serving on the various officia. A law of uncertain date prescribed that if an apparitor from any officium had managed to obtain imperial letters entitling him to the status of ex protectoribus, he was to be returned to his former office<sup>234</sup>. This was repeated in a law of 354<sup>235</sup>. A further law of the same year specified that no apparitor of the praetorian prefects or magistri militum was to be permitted to adore the purple, unless he had fought in the army, and assisted in all the imperial expeditions<sup>236</sup>. Other persistent offenders were the decurions, compelled by birth to serve on the town councils. These often sought to evade their hereditary burdens by obtaining the title, ex protectoribus. It was decreed that such persons were to be returned to their original status, provided that they had not already served for five years in the army<sup>237</sup>. This arrangement, however, apparently did not work, and in a second law, dated to 397, decurions were forbidden to obtain honorary discharges of any kind, whether as ex protectoribus, or ex domesticis<sup>238</sup>. By the terms of the previous law they had been allowed to retain the title, though not to enjoy the privileges which it conferred on military veterans. This law implies that the title, ex protectoribus, protected its holder from compulsory service of a menial nature, and the punishment of flogging.

The protectores domestici, as one would expect, enjoyed greater privileges than the remainder of the protectores, though it seems that the differentiation became less marked towards the close of the fourth century. Thus the decemprimi within each schola of

protectores domestici were granted the status of clarissimi in 416, while at the same time being exempted from the compulsory services normally incumbent on senators<sup>239</sup>. But a month later, the same privilege was granted to the rest of the protectores<sup>240</sup>. In 432 it was decreed that if a protector domesticus should die before retirement, his heirs should enjoy the perquisites due to him<sup>241</sup>. Each of the protectores domestici actually in attendance at court was granted an allowance of 6 capita. All others, however, who were at court in addition to the prescribed number were to receive nothing, and be compelled to return to their homes<sup>242</sup>. In 365 it was decreed that the sons and close kinsmen of protectores domestici, though under age, were to be attached to the scholae, enrolled on the official registers, and granted an allowance of four annonae, as long as they remained in fixed official residences<sup>243</sup>.

THE PRAEPOSITI

(i) Introduction

During the principate the term, praepositus, is employed to denote a variety of ad hoc commands. For example, it can be applied to legionary centurions acting as commanders of auxiliary cohorts or numeri, or as drill instructors to the Equites Singulares<sup>1</sup>. On other occasions it is used to describe a primipilaris in charge of a detachment of the fleet, or of the Equites Singulares<sup>2</sup>. As a rule, however, it signifies the commander of one or more legionary vexillations. Small detachments of provincial armies were frequently entrusted to a legionary centurion, acting as praepositus vexillationis. Such troops were employed in police and garrison duties, as well as in building and other types of work<sup>3</sup>. Senatorial praepositi in command of large field forces are attested on several occasions up to the beginning of the third century<sup>4</sup>. Equestrian praepositi in command of vexillations are known from the reign of Marcus Aurelius onwards<sup>5</sup>. Primipilares on occasion also acted as praepositi in charge of vexillations. During the first century they were apparently employed only to lead reinforcements on the march from one province to another. By the reign of Severus, however, they were commanding vexillations on campaigns.<sup>6</sup>

During the period with which this thesis is concerned, the term seems to preserve its flexibility, and is applied to a variety of miscellaneous commands. These can be divided into roughly

twelve different types, and for purposes of clarity it is proposed to examine each category separately.

(ii) Praepositi commanding pairs of vexillations.

During the latter part of the third century the term, praepositus, is frequently used to describe the commander of a pair of legionary vexillations. At least six belonging to this category are attested during this period.

Flavius Aper	<u>V Macedonica &amp; XIII Gemina</u>	260-8
Iulianus	<u>VII Claudia &amp; IV Flavia</u>	295
Traianus Mucianus	" " " " "	c. 275 (?)
Mucianus	<u>I Italica &amp; XI Claudia</u>	295
C. Rufius Synforianus	<u>II Parthica &amp; III Augusta</u>	260-8
Victorinus	<u>I Illyricorum &amp; III Gallica</u>	315-23

The following were probably also in command of pairs of vexillations.

Valerius Statilius Castus	256-8
Claudianus	295
Domnius	"
Anastasius Fortunatus	298
Ianuarus	295
Lucianus	"
Mucianus	"
Olympus	"
Terentianus	"
Valerianus	"
Vitalianus	260-8
Anon, <u>IIS</u> 8940	317-24

An inscription, dated to 269, mentions praepositi in charge of legionary vexillations and Equites. These units comprised a field force based on Gratianopolis in Gallia Narbonensis, under the overall command of the praefectus Vigilum, Iulius Placidianus<sup>7</sup>.

In order to discover why these vexillations were paired, it is necessary to return to the reign of Septimius Severus. Following the murder of Pertinax in 193, the three principal contenders for the throne were governors of provinces in which three legions were garrisoned.

Thus Severus himself was legate of Pannonia Superior, Clodius Albinus legate of Britain, and Pescennius Niger legate of Syria. After the reign of Caracalla, however, no province was allocated more than two legions. Dio, writing in the early third century, reports Maecenas as stating, in a supposed discussion with Augustus, that no provincial governor ought to be assigned more than two legions<sup>8</sup>. Later, when detachments were required for campaigns or other purposes, each was formed from a pair of legions stationed in the same province. Where only one legion was quartered in a province, its detachment was normally paired with another from an adjacent province of the same type<sup>9</sup>.

The system of pairing legionary vexillations probably had three main advantages. In the first instance, one legion alone might not have been able to provide enough suitable troops to form a mobile vexillation of sufficient strength. Secondly, drawing men from two legions would avoid weakening the frontier defences of a province in one particular area. Finally, although there would be a strong link between the two vexillations, in that they both originated from the same frontier section, there would also be a certain amount of rivalry between the two, which would enhance their fighting spirit<sup>10</sup>. After Constantine became sole ruler of the empire in 324, each separate legionary detachment was assigned its own officer. However, the practice of pairing legionary vexillations was not abandoned in the fourth century, as is shown by the writing of Ammianus Marcellinus and the field army lists of the Notitia<sup>11</sup>. Indeed, the system was extended to include cavalry units and auxilia. It seems that one of the two officers commanding a paired vexillation assumed

precedence over the other.

The earliest example of a pair of legionary vexillations occurs in an inscription dated to c. 45, where Q. Cornelius Valerianus, tribunus angusticlavus, commands vexillations from the two legions then in Moesia, together with attached auxiliaries<sup>12</sup>. Numerous other instances occur during the first two centuries<sup>13</sup>. After this examples multiply, as one would expect. Under Severus a senatorial praepositus commanded vexillations of the two Dacian legions<sup>14</sup>. The unknown praepositus vexillationis Raetorum et Noricorum, attested on an inscription from Manchester, was probably commanding a pair of vexillations from III and II Italica in the early third century<sup>15</sup>. In 219, a vexillation from the two legions of Britannia Superior was engaged in repairing the fort at Netherby<sup>16</sup>. At some stage during the third century, Aurelius Cervianus was commanding a pair of vexillations from these legions<sup>17</sup>. Under Philip, an equestrian dux was in charge of vexillations from the two Dacian legions<sup>18</sup>. About the same time, L. Petronius Taurus Volusianus also commanded a detachment of these legions, perhaps the same one, and then was put in charge of vexillations from the two legions of Pannonia Superior<sup>19</sup>.

Although only two praepositi commanding pairs of legionary vexillations are attested for certain during Gallienus's reign, namely Flavius Aper and Rufius Synforianus, the coin evidence shows that his new, permanent field army contained a large number of <sup>paired</sup> ~~pair~~ vexillations, which were presumably commanded by praepositi. Many of his coins bear the legend, 'Fides Militum', showing an eagle on a globe between two ensigns, or Fides standing holding two ensigns<sup>20</sup>. Pairs of legionary vexillations from all the Rhine and Danube provinces, as well as

Britannia Superior, were drafted into his field army, and their names are recorded on numerous coins<sup>21</sup>. During the continuous fighting which characterised his reign, it is obvious that these vexillations could not have been returned to their parent legions. Many of the latter in fact were in parts of the empire controlled by usurpers.

Because of the constant succession of civil wars, and the repeated barbarian attacks, the second half of the third century saw few intervals of peace. Throughout this period the system of pairing legionary vexillations under a single praepositus must have continued. A papyrus of 295 records the names of ten such officers commanding paired vexillations in a field force which Diocletian had sent to Egypt<sup>22</sup>. The last praepositus of this category to be attested is Victorinus, who commanded a detachment of III Gallica and I Illyricorum, the two legions of Phoenice, stationed in Egypt in the period 315-23.

As far as can be seen, the normal strength of a legionary vexillation during the principate was 1,000. Thus during Hadrian's second British campaign the primipilaris, T. Pontius Sabinus, superintended the passage to Britain of three military vexillations, drawn from legions VII Gemina, VIII Augusta and XXII Primigenia<sup>23</sup>. ~~Again, a~~

~~military vexillation of the newly restored III Augusta is recorded at Quesada in 257<sup>24</sup>.~~

The third century paired vexillations were presumably also 1,000 strong, consisting of a cohort from each legion. The bronze roundel which mentions Aurelius Cervianus shows an eagle flanked by the standards of II Augusta and XX Valeria Victrix, together with their emblems, the capricorn and the boar. On each side also, however, stand five soldiers holding shields. These could symbolise

the five centuries from each cohort<sup>25</sup>. An inscription from Sitifis, which Cagnat has dated to the time of Maximian's campaign in Africa in 298-9, mentions cohorts X and VII of Legion II Herculia<sup>26</sup>. Evidently cohorts from the same legion were sometimes paired<sup>27</sup>. After the reign of Constantine, each legionary vexillation was assigned its own commander though vexillations continued to be paired. Thus Vegetius could state that the cohorts of a legion, apart from the first, were commanded by tribuni or praepositi, according to the emperor's pleasure<sup>28</sup>.

Praepositi commanding pairs of legionary vexillations had the status of vir egregius under Gallienus, and probably this did not alter throughout the third century<sup>29</sup>. It is probable that for a brief time during the period of Gallienus's sole rule some were accorded the status of protector, though only one praepositus is attested with the title<sup>30</sup>. It is almost certain that they also ranked as ducenarii<sup>31</sup>. The officiales serving on their staffs included a cornicularius, actarii, codicarii and librarii<sup>32</sup>. With regard to their prior career, they seem to have risen from the centurionate. Thus in the first half of the third century one reached the rank of praepositus or dux in command of a pair of legionary vexillations after holding the post of primus pilus<sup>33</sup>. Traianus Mucianus was evidently centurio protector, primus pilus, and legionary prefect, before being placed in charge of a pair of vexillations from Moesia Superior. Keyes has pointed out that it was customary under the principate to give the command of vexillations to an officer who had previously commanded a legion<sup>34</sup>. By 286 the primipilate had become a hereditary post in the civil administration,

and it is clear that future praepositi would no longer hold it<sup>35</sup>. It is safe to assume that the praepositi stationed at Oxyrhynchus in 295 had risen from the ranks, holding the intervening posts of centurio protector and legionary prefect, in the same way as Valerius Thiumpo. The status of protector was normally attained by soldiers who rose from the ranks after a minimum of 20 years' service, so that most officers on attaining the rank of praepositus would be aged about 45. The inscription of Traianus Mucianus sheds some light on the later career of a praepositus. Gradually, if he showed ability, he would be given command over larger detachments, and eventually, under Diocletian, might rise to the rank of dux in charge of a provincial army. It is possible that Flavius Aper rose to the post of praetorian prefect. It seems safe to assume that the majority of officers who rose to high rank in the latter half of the third century had previously held the post of praepositus in charge of a pair of legionary vexillations.

It seems necessary to touch briefly on the question of the difference between the terms praepositus and dux as applied to commanders of vexillations during this period. Under the principate, both are used to describe senators commanding field forces<sup>36</sup>. The term, dux, however, is never employed in the case of equestrian commanders until the third century, except in the case of Velius Rufus, 85-91, and perhaps of L. Artorius Castus<sup>37</sup>. Domaszewski has shown that under Severus the title of dux is used to describe an independent, extraordinary command<sup>38</sup>. The last senatorial dux attested is in 238<sup>39</sup>. After the beginning of the third century, however, the title of dux is given to equestrian officers who command vexillations or legions<sup>40</sup>. It is still somewhat vague, since a legionary prefect under Philip is termed

both dux devotissimus and praepositus optimus, though it seems that in this inscription neither term is being used in an official sense<sup>41</sup>. However, the title of dux still retains its character as denoting the commander of an independent force. Thus the officer commanding the troops stationed at the outpost fort of Dura Europos on the Euphrates frontier during the period 245-51 is termed dux Ripae<sup>42</sup>.

The reign of Gallienus seems to represent an important stage in the development of the titles praepositus and dux as applied to field army officers. Assuming Pflaum's dating of the inscription to be correct, Valerius Claudius Quintus in 253 is first dux legionis III Italicae, and then dux et praepositus legionis III Augustae. The explanation seems to be that he was appointed to the first post during a campaign against the Alamanni in Raetia. After Valerian's successful putsch, he was appointed praepositus commanding a vexillation of III Augusta, and sent to Africa with the powers of a dux to quell a revolt of the Mauri. From the reign of Gallienus onwards, in connection with the field army, the term, praepositus, is only used to denote the commander of a pair of legionary vexillations, and presumably also of cavalry detachments. The title of dux, however, seems now to be confined to field army generals<sup>43</sup>. In the early fourth century it becomes the official term for the commanders of armies stationed in frontier provinces<sup>44</sup>. It is noticeable that praeses also becomes recognised as the official title for provincial governors after the mid-third century. Thus the first two equestrian governors to be styled vir egregius praeses agens vices legati occur under Gallienus<sup>45</sup>.

(iii) Praepositi commanding cavalry detachments.

As in the case of commanders of paired legionary vexillations, the officers in charge of cavalry units from the reign of Gallienus until some time in the first half of the fourth century are called praepositi. The inscription from Gratianopolis dated to 269 shows this to be the case<sup>46</sup>. The pairing of field army cavalry detachments is not as well attested as that of legionary vexillations. However, it is worth noting that in 260 Q. Gargilius Martialis was praepositus cohortis Singularium et vexillationis Equitum Maurorum, and towards the close of the third century Traianus Mucianus was in charge of detachments of Mauri and Osrhoeni. Furthermore, in the Notitia the cavalry units of the field army seem to be listed in pairs. Each unit no doubt numbered 500 men.

The importance of cavalry in this period is unquestionable. Gallienus was the first emperor to unite the cream of the cavalry under a single command<sup>47</sup>. During the early part of the third century cavalry units levied on a tribal basis termed vexillationes begin to be attested<sup>48</sup>. Many of these no doubt were drafted into the field army. It is probable also that Gallienus separated the legionary cavalry from their parent units to form the Equites Promoti, though the earliest reference to these occurs in a papyrus of 293<sup>49</sup>. Led by Aureolus, the field army cavalry played a decisive role in the victories over usurpers such as Ingennus and Macrianus<sup>50</sup>. Coins of Gallienus with the legends, 'Fidei Equitum', 'Concordia Equitum', and 'Alacritati Augusti', the latter depicting a flying Pegasus, testify to the prowess of the new force, and the swiftness with which it acted<sup>51</sup>. Under Claudius II

the Equites Dalmatae especially distinguished themselves in the fighting against the Goths, and, together with the Equites Mauri, were chiefly responsible for Aurelian's victory over Zenobia's army at Emesa<sup>52</sup>.

Ritterling noted that large numbers of cavalry units, such as Mauri, Dalmatae, Scutarii, and Promoti are listed in the Notitia as garrisoned in the eastern frontier provinces<sup>53</sup>. In his view, they were settled here by Aurelian, after his victory over Zenobia, to act as a counterpoise to latent particularist tendencies in the area formerly subject to Palmyra. On the other hand it seems doubtful that Aurelian would weaken the strength of his field army cavalry to such an extent before he had marched against the Gallic Empire. Again, field army units with these names are also listed in the Notitia as stationed in all the Danubian ducates. Alföldi's view that it was Diocletian who settled these units in the frontier provinces seems more probable<sup>54</sup>. This emperor is known to have taken special pains to fortify the frontier defences. Furthermore, in the interval of peace at the close of his reign he could afford to disband a large section of the field army, a policy perhaps foreshadowed by Probus<sup>55</sup>. The existence of a large field army in the latter half of the third century was undoubtedly one of the major factors responsible for the instability which characterised this period. Reinforcing the frontier defences would not only safeguard the empire against barbarian attacks, but also help to preserve its internal equilibrium. The praetorian prefecture provided the stepping stone to the throne for Florian and Carus. The post of commander-in-chief of the field army

cavalry probably fulfilled the same function in the case of Aurelian and Probus.

The praepositi commanding cavalry units in the fourth century can be divided into two categories, firstly those in charge of limitanei, and secondly, those in charge of field army units. With regard to the former category, the following nine are attested.

Alaesianus	<u>vexillatio Equitum Scutariorum Maurorum</u>	347
Goutha	<u>Equites Scutarii Illyriciani</u>	
Italicus	<u>Equites Sagittarii</u>	
Macrobius	" <u>Promoti Legionis II Traianae</u>	302
Margus (?)	" <u>Margenses (?)</u>	
Ursicinus	<u>comitatus Equitum Stablesianorum (?)</u>	369
Aurelius Valens	<u>vexillatio Equitum Scutariorum Capidavensium</u>	
Veracus	<u>Equites Dalmatae</u>	
Anon ( <u>BGU I 21 col. 2</u> )	" <u>Mauri</u>	340

The earliest of these is Macrobius in 302. Italicus, Margus and Veracus are mentioned in a series of brick stamps, which probably dates to the reign of Valentinian I, who made great efforts to strengthen the frontier defences along the Danube. Such units as these, together with the legionary detachments garrisoned in the frontier provinces, could be drafted into the field army if the need arose. This did not happen in the case of those units listed in the minus laterculum, namely the alae and cohorts. Only two praepositi commanding Equites stationed on the frontier are mentioned in the Notitia<sup>56</sup>.

The following praepositi commanding field army units are attested during the early fourth century.

Castinus	<u>Equites Catafractarii</u>	342-51
Flavius Nuvel	<u>Equites Armigeri Iuniores</u>	
Romanus	" <u>Catafractarii Pictavenses</u>	342-51
Valerius Sambarra	" <u>Dalmatae Aquiesiani Comites</u>	310
Valerius	" <u>Stablesiani</u>	

These units are presumably vexillationes comitatenses, forming part of field army divisions which under Constantine, and probably under Diocletian

also, were stationed in Gaul, Illyricum, Africa and the east to act as strategic reserves. At some stage during the first half of the fourth century, perhaps after Constantine's culminating victory over Licinius in 324, all officers in charge of comitatensian troops seem to have been upgraded to the rank of tribunus. There is little evidence for field army officers in this period, however, and the papyrus of 359 which mentions Dorotheus is the earliest reliable evidence for a tribunus commanding a  vexillatio comitatensis<sup>57</sup>.

(iv) Praepositi commanding frontier legionary detachments.

It is in the reign of Gallienus that senators cease to command legions, and are replaced by equestrian praefecti<sup>58</sup>. The inscription of Traianus Mucianus shows that these praefecti were appointed after holding the post of primus pilus. By 286, however, the primipilate had become a hereditary office in the civil administration, and it is clear that from this date onwards, if not before, legionary prefects were appointed after holding the post of centurio protector<sup>59</sup>. The following praefecti legionis are attested under Diocletian, though after his reign no more are known.

284	Aelius Paternianus	<u>II Adiutrix</u>	III 3469
290	Aurelius Firminus	" "	" 10406
284-92	Aurelius Maximianus	<u>IV Flavia</u>	" 1646
289-93	Clodius Honoratus	<u>III Augusta</u>	VIII 2572
295	Aurelius Sintus (?)	<u>I Minervia</u>	XIII 8019
293-305	Trocundus	<u>I Pontica</u>	III 6746
Post 284	Valerius Thiumpo	<u>II Herculia</u>	" 6194

As far as can be seen, each of these officers was commanding an entire legion, and not merely a detachment. Except in the case of Aurelius Maximianus, who had retired, and Trocundus and Thiumpo, who were commanding legions raised by Diocletian, each inscription was found

at the old third century headquarters of the legion concerned. It seems therefore that under Diocletian each legion still retained an overall commander.

The frontier defence system as depicted in the Notitia Dignitatum seems in essence to date <sup>to</sup> ~~of~~ Diocletian's reign. Thus the names of at least six of the legions, fourteen of the alae, and twelve of the cohorts show that they were raised by him. The basic system of frontier defence seems to be shown by the chapter listing the units stationed in Moesia Secunda. Here each legion retains an overall commander at the old third century headquarters. However, the lines of the province is divided between the two legions, I Italica and XI Claudia, and each legionary sector is in turn subdivided into two sections, a pedatura superior, and a pedatura inferior, each of which is patrolled by five cohorts <sup>60</sup>.

The splitting up of the lines within each frontier province had already been foreshadowed in the third century. Thus an inscription of this period mentions a certain Aurelius Pervia, praepositus quinquagesimae ripae Rheni legionis I Minerviae <sup>61</sup>. The Euphrates frontier was probably also divided into sections, since two third century inscriptions from Palmyra mention a certain Celsticus, who, after holding centurionates in III Gallica, IV Scythica, and VI Ferrata, became curator ripae superioris et inferioris, before his appointment as praefectus cohortis <sup>62</sup>. Apparently he also was concerned with the collection of customs duties. Goodchild has suggested that, following the disbandment of III Augusta in 238, the lines in Africa was split up into local zones, each under a praepositus <sup>63</sup>.

During the reign of Severus Alexander, Licinius Hierocles held the post of praepositus Equitum itemque Peditum Iuniorum Maurorum iure gladii. It is possible that he was in charge of a detachment of Moorish irregulars which had been settled on a pars inferior of the Mauretanian limes. The Notitia Dignitatum lists a praepositus limitis inferioris in Mauretania<sup>64</sup>. A numerus Hemesenorum Iuniorum was stationed at El Kantara in Numidia in the same reign, and an inscription mentioning a detachment of Iuniores Bessi, 1,000 strong, being brought into Mauretania Tingitana also seems to date to this period<sup>65</sup>. On the other hand, seniores are never mentioned at this stage, and therefore it seems more likely that in this context iuniores denotes recruits. The Augustan History specifically records that Severus Alexander presented lands captured from the enemy to soldiers garrisoned on the frontier, on condition that their sons entered the army<sup>66</sup>.

To return to the main point, the legionary detachments termed seniores and iuniores which appear in the fourth century field army had probably been originally withdrawn from a pedatura superior or inferior on the frontier at some stage. Within each of these pedaturae, as they are called in the eastern section of the Notitia, or partes, as they are termed in the western section, cohorts were stationed at regular intervals. Most of the chapters relating to frontier defence in the Notitia seem to date to the reigns of Diocletian and Constantine, and it is obvious from the gaps in the defences that many cohorts of the best troops had already been withdrawn for service in the field army. Many of the detachments stationed on the Danube

seem to have been used to man liburnae patrolling the river, or were even concerned with the transport of supplies by boat<sup>67</sup>.

It is obvious that as time went on each of these cohorts would tend to become more like an independent unit. It seems likely that after Constantine became sole ruler in 324 each legionary detachment stationed on the frontier was placed under the command of an independent praepositus. Thus in 325 Severianus is attested as praepositus in command of the detachment of XIII Gemina quartered at Babylon in Egypt. The following, <sup>nineteen</sup> ~~nineteen~~ praepositi belonging to this category are attested in the fourth century.

Bonio	<u>IV Flavia (?)</u>	
Bonitus	<u>VII Claudia</u>	
<del>Constantinus</del>	<del><u>V Macedonica (?)</u></del>	<del>342-51</del>
Colluthus	" "	" "
Dinitius	<u>IV Flavia</u>	
Foscamus	<u>I Martia</u>	371
Heraclius	<u>Milites Fortenses</u>	
Hermogenes	<u>VII Claudia</u>	
Flavius Iovinus	<u>Milites Histrici</u>	
Leontius	<u>Milites Auxiliares Lauriacenses</u>	370
Mucater	<u>VII Claudia</u>	
Severianus	<u>XIII Gemina (?)</u>	325
Tara	<u>VII Claudia</u>	
Taurus	<u>VI Ferrata</u>	
Flavius Traianus	<u>Thebani</u>	367-75
Valens	<u>IV Flavia</u>	
Victorinus	<u>VII Claudia</u>	
Aurelius Vincentius	<u>X Gemina</u>	
Anon (XIII 11538)	<u>VIII Augusta</u>	371
Anon (BGU I 21 col. 3)	<u>II Flavia Constantia (?)</u>	340

In the Notitia the legionary detachments quartered along the Danube frontier are called riparienses<sup>68</sup>. The full title of the officers commanding them was praepositus ripae legionis, as is shown by the inscriptions which mention Hermogenes and Tara. These, together with Bonio, Bonitus, Dinitius, Mucater, Valens and Victorinus are all

attested in a series of brick stamps which seems to date to the reconstruction of the frontier defence system on the Danube under Valentinian I. The infantry units which the Notitia lists under the comes litoris Saxonici as commanded by praepositi were probably legionary detachments<sup>69</sup>.

(v) Praepositi commanding legiones pseudocomitatenses.

The legiones pseudocomitatenses are first attested in a decree of 365<sup>70</sup>. However, it seems fairly certain that they were in existence at an early stage in the fourth century. They were evidently legionary detachments which had formerly been quartered on the frontier, but had recently been withdrawn to reinforce the field army. They might eventually hope to reach comitatensian status, but in the meantime did not receive the same privileges as regular field army troops. Thus in a decree of 400 they are coupled with the riparienses, in contrast to the field army soldiers<sup>71</sup>. They were commanded by praepositi, in the same way as frontier detachments, whereas the officers in charge of regular field army troops were tribuni. Only two praepositi belonging to this category are attested in the fourth century.

Flavius Martidius	<u>Auxilarii Miliarienses</u>
Flavius Ziperga	<u>I Martia Victrix</u>

It is interesting to note that Martidius had served for 38 years, whereas Ziperga had already gained this rank at the age of 27, after only eight years service.

(vi) Praepositi Limitis.

The Notitia Dignitatum shows that in the case of Africa,

Mauretania and Tripolitana the provincial frontier was divided into a series of zones, each under the command of a praepositus limitis<sup>72</sup>. These sectors are not listed in their geographical order, and it is difficult to plot their exact position on a map, though Courtois has recently attempted to do this<sup>73</sup>. This type of frontier defence system apparently originated during the first half of the third century. The earliest mention of a praepositus limitis occurs on an inscription from Gasr Duib in Tripolitana, which is dated to 244-6<sup>74</sup>. It commemorates the building of a new centenarium at this point in order to close the region of the limes Tentheitanus and its road to raids by desert tribes. The work was carried out by the troops commanded by Numisius Maximus, tribunus, under the supervision of Gallicanus, praepositus limitis Tentheitani. The post of commander of this frontier zone is listed in the Notitia<sup>75</sup>. Evidently this sector of the frontier derived its name from the fort of Tentheos, where the praepositus would have his headquarters.

In 238 III Augusta was disbanded by Gordian III, following its support for Maximinus Thrax<sup>76</sup>. Goodchild and Ward Perkins have pointed out that during the eight years which followed, the Roman staff may well have evolved a decentralised system of defence, dividing the frontier up into a series of zones under the command of praepositi limitis<sup>77</sup>. In this respect, it is interesting to note that the vir egregius dux ripae at Dura Europos, who was responsible for the defence of part of the limes of Syria Coele, is attested at latest in 245<sup>78</sup>. Generally speaking, each limes sector seems to be named after the fort where the praepositus had his headquarters. Sometimes, however, the

name of the zone affords some clue as to the troops stationed at the headquarters fort. Thus one of the sectors in Mauretania is termed the limes Fortensis, which suggests that a detachment of II Traiana Fortis was garrisoned there<sup>79</sup>. Another unit of Fortenses is recorded at Lepcis in Tripolitana<sup>80</sup>. It seems likely that a number of cohorts from this legion, stationed in the adjacent province of Egypt, were withdrawn to reinforce the African provinces following the disbandment of III Augusta. On the other hand it is probable that some troops of III Augusta still remained, since another sector in Mauretania is termed the limes Augustensis<sup>81</sup>. In fact it seems likely that each praepositus was commanding a legionary cohort, or perhaps a cavalry unit. Gallicanus, the praepositus limitis attested in 244-6, had the status of vir egregius. He was probably a senior centurion. Another inscription from Mauretania Caesariensis which seems to date to the third century mentions a centurion called Clodius Largus, who held the post of praepositus limitis<sup>82</sup>. During the period with which this thesis is concerned, only two praepositi limitis from Africa are recorded.

301	L. Iulius Capito Alaris	Mauretania	<u>Limes Auziensis</u>
303	Valerius Ingenuus	Africa	" <u>Tubunensis</u> (?)

The inscriptions mentioning them reflect the strengthening of the frontier defence system in Africa during Diocletian's reign.

Within each frontier zone, a number of small outpost forts called centenaria was built. These varied in size, that at Aqua Viva being about 90 metres square, whereas the centenarium at Gasr Duib was more like a fortified farmhouse<sup>83</sup>. The term, centenarium, is presumably derived from the title of the officer commanding the unit stationed

there. This was probably a centurion with centenarian status. The unit which he was commanding as tribunus was perhaps a numerus recruited from local tribes<sup>84</sup>. The names of several of these tribuni are preserved in a series of fourth century inscriptions from centenaria in Tripolitana<sup>85</sup>. Goodchild and Ward Perkins have pointed out that as these limitanei gradually became more absorbed in farming, their economic independence may have led them to neglect the defence of the hinterland. The invasion of 363, in which Sabratha was sacked and Lepcis besieged, would not have met with such success had the limitanei been a loyal and efficient force<sup>86</sup>.

One may speculate on the extent to which this system of frontier defence was also in operation in other provinces. Some features of it are peculiar to Africa, in that there was a long frontier to patrol, with the threat of occasional raids by desert tribesmen. However, there seems to be a certain similarity between the praepositi limitis on the African frontier and the praepositi ripae legionis on the Danube, and doubtless also, the Rhine limes<sup>87</sup>. Evidently centenaria are to be equated with burgi, since the Notitia lists a tribunus cohortis, stationed 'ad burgum Centenarium', in Valeria<sup>88</sup>. The numerous small burgi built by Valentinian I along the Rhine frontier in Switzerland no doubt were divided into groups, each zone being under the control of a praepositus in one of the large forts, such as Basilia, Augusta Raurica or Tenedo<sup>89</sup>. Similarly, the Yorkshire signal stations were probably supervised by a praepositus whose headquarters were at Malton<sup>90</sup>. Again, it seems likely that the praepositus commanding the detachment of V Macedonica at Memphis exercised certain supervisory

powers over the alae and cohorts stationed in the province of Heptanomia in Egypt<sup>91</sup>.

(vi) Praepositi Castrorum.

The following <sup>six</sup> ~~seven~~ praepositi castrorum are attested during the fourth century.

Flavius Abinnaeus	<u>Ala V Praelectorum</u>	Egypt	342-51
Castorion	<u>Cohors IV Numidarum</u>	"	
Flavius Dragilis	<u>Equites Dalmatae</u>	Valeria	
" Lucianus	?	Arabia	337-61
<del>Salvius</del>	†	<del>Egypt</del>	<del>342-51</del>
Salvitus	<u>Cohors IV Numidarum</u>	"	307
Anon, P. Amh. 142	<u>Ala Apriana</u>	"	

The earliest record of the title occurs in the papyrus relating to Salvitus, which is dated to 307. If one is correct in assuming that Flavius Dragilis was commanding the detachment of Equites Dalmatae listed as quartered at Constantia in the Notitia, it seems that the title could be applied to the commanders of frontier units which might later be drafted into the field army. However, as a rule it seems to be confined to the officers commanding the alae and cohorts listed by the Notitia in the minus laterculum. In contrast to the legionary detachments and Equites, such troops were never selected for field army service.

The correspondence of Flavius Abinnaeus shows that he was addressed as praefectus alae and praepositus castrorum in equal proportion, but the former seems more characteristic of official documents. His duties were by no means entirely military, and his main function seems to have been the maintenance of law and order in the area around Dionysias. Thus he received petitions complaining of burglary, sheep stealing, kidnapping, theft and assault, and urging

him to arrest those suspected. On one occasion part of the ala was requisitioned to assist in collecting rents due on imperial estates. While most of the troops were doubtless quartered at Dionysias itself, evidently others were stationed at various posts in the vicinity. Praepositi castrorum were apparently recruited from protectores who had served in the field army<sup>92</sup>. Probably it was intended that in this way some standard of discipline and efficiency would be preserved among the sedentary frontier troops.

A number of edicts also mention the post of praepositus castrorum. Apparently it had been obtained by certain officials employed in the chartae and ratiocinia, who had thus evaded their obligatory duties. A decree of 371 states that if this is discovered, the persons concerned are to be compelled to return to their former posts<sup>93</sup>. A law of 443 prescribes that in regions where the barbarians are threatening the frontier, the duces, their primicerii and the praepositi castrorum are to obtain a twelfth part of the annona normally distributed among the limitanei as compensation for their additional duties<sup>94</sup>. Finally, a mid-fifth century decree implies that in the past the duces and their apparitores, together with the praepositi limitis and praepositi castrorum had been under the control of the magistri militum<sup>95</sup>.

(viii) Praepositi commanding auxiliary units.

Only one such praepositus is known during this period, namely Flavius Martinus, who is attested as centurio praepositus in command of cohors I Aelia Dacorum at Birdoswald in the period 296-305. During the principate centurions were sometimes appointed to command

auxiliary units<sup>96</sup>. From the reign of Severus onwards this practice seems to have become more frequent, and during the fourth century no doubt all auxiliary troops were commanded by ex-field army centurions, as in the case of Flavius Abinnaeus and Salvitius.

(ix) Praepositi commanding detachments of the fleet.

In the Notitia the officer commanding a detachment of the fleet is normally referred to as a praefectus<sup>97</sup>. However, as in the case of commanders of legionary detachments, this seems to be another instance of the Notitia's use of anachronistic terminology. Praepositi classis are mentioned in a decree of 369, which states that they are not entitled to the same privileges as those who have served in the palace or the field army<sup>98</sup>. The only praepositus in this category who is attested in the fourth century is Flavius Senilis, praepositus reliquationis classis. He was apparently in charge of a naval supply depot at Lydney Park on the Severn estuary in the late fourth century.

(x) Praepositi Laetis.

From the reign of Marcus Aurelius onwards, large numbers of barbarian tribesmen were settled in increasing quantities on the perimeter of the empire as a source of future recruits for the army<sup>99</sup>. The Laeti were Germans from the opposite bank of the Rhine who were settled in Gaul at various points from the third century onwards. They were fairly independent, probably retaining their native law, but were not permitted to move from the territory allotted to them<sup>100</sup>. The Notitia lists twelve such settlements of Laeti in Gaul, under the

overall command of the magister peditum<sup>101</sup>. According to the Notitia the officer in charge of each group was a praefectus, but an edict of 369 refers to them as praepositi<sup>102</sup>. The same law states that they could be given the status of tribune.

(xi) Praepositi Fabricarum.

Under the principate, the manufacture of arms was left to private enterprise, except in the case of Britain<sup>103</sup>. Vegetius records that each legion in this period had had 120 smiths and leather workers, whose duty it was to repair arms and armour<sup>104</sup>. Probably during the latter half of the third century, but at any rate by the reign of Constantine, the manufacture of arms was confined to certain state factories. This is but one aspect of the growing specialisation which characterised this period of crisis, and was essential if the Roman army was to function as an efficient force. However, as Crosse points out, the setting up of arms factories would help to guard against usurpations, since they were situated at strategic points, rather than in outlying areas, and each factory specialised in the production of one particular type of weapon or armour<sup>105</sup>. They are listed in the Notitia under the overall command of the magister officiorum<sup>106</sup>. The officer in charge of each factory was termed praepositus fabricae. He was not entitled to the same privileges as those who had served in the palace or in the field army<sup>107</sup>. The following officers in this category are attested in the fourth century.

312-37 Sertorius Silanus  
364-75 Anon (AM XXIX 3 4)  
c. 400<sup>Chorv</sup> A (V 8721)

Ravenna

-

Concordia Fabrica Loricaria  
Fabrica Sagittaria

The inscription of Sertorius Silanus shows that praepositi fabricarum had the status of vir perfectissimus. Harsh penalties were sometimes imposed on officers whose factories produced arms the quality of which was below the requisite standard<sup>108</sup>.

(xii) Praepositi Iuniorum.

The following officers belonging to this category are attested during the fourth century.

- Flavius Abinnaeus c. 330
- Aelianus c. 348
- Flavius Concordius c. 370
- Arrius Germanus

They were evidently protectores who had been selected to lead recruits from the frontier provinces to field army headquarters. It is likely that this duty had been performed by centurions during the principate. One of the inscriptions relating to Flavius Concordius shows that they held the status of vir perfectissimus. The use of the term, iuniores, to designate recruits is attested in fourth century edicts and the writings of Vegetius<sup>109</sup>.

(xiii) Praepositi Scholarum.

A decree of 413 refers to the praepositi et tribuni scholarum<sup>110</sup>. Perhaps originally the commanders of the scholae were termed praepositi, but long before this date they had obtained the status of tribuni.

(xiv) Conclusion.

As has been shown, the term, praepositus, can be used to describe a multiplicity of commands, and as late as 416 a law refers

to officers commanding field army units as praepositi labarum<sup>111</sup>. In general, however, after the reign of Constantine it is confined to officers in charge of limitanei, whereas tribunus as a rule denotes a field army commander. Thus, whenever the two terms are mentioned in decrees, the latter almost invariably assumes precedence<sup>112</sup>. This is also the case when a praepositus and a field army tribune are mentioned on the same inscription<sup>113</sup>. It is proposed to examine those decrees which mention both tribuni and praepositi in the chapter which deals with tribunes. A number of laws, however, make reference in a general sense to praepositi alone, and it seems appropriate to examine these at this juncture. A decree of 323, clearly relating to frontier officers, states that if a praepositus grants soldiers leave of absence in peacetime, he is to be banished and his property confiscated. If this happens during a barbarian attack, however, he is to be sentenced to death<sup>114</sup>. Praepositi were forbidden to enter houses against the owners' will, and forcibly commandeer such articles as oil and wood<sup>115</sup>. The status of ex praepositis, like that of ex protectoribus, could be obtained by someone who had served his full period in the army<sup>116</sup>. Finally, the sons of praepositi, who were medically unfit to enlist, had to serve on municipal councils, which shows that these officers were not without wealth<sup>117</sup>.

## THE TRIBUNI

### (i) Introduction.

It seems necessary by way of introduction to examine the use of the term tribunus under the principate, before embarking on a study of its later employment. With regard to the legion, there were two main types of tribune. Firstly, there was the tribunus laticlavus, a senatorial officer, who was second in command to the legate<sup>1</sup>. Also attached to the legion were five tribuni angusticlavii, recruited from the equestrian class<sup>2</sup>. Their duties were primarily administrative, and they were not normally employed in commanding troops<sup>3</sup>. The post ranked second in the three normal equestrian militiae of praefectus cohortis, tribunus angusticlavus, and praefectus equitum. With regard to auxiliary units, there was the post of tribunus cohortis milliariae, which equestrian officers might hold as an alternative to the legionary tribunate<sup>4</sup>. Sometimes a praefectus cohortis was granted a brevet tribunate, thereby upgrading him to the second militia<sup>5</sup>. During the second century, the numeri, recruited from barbarian tribesmen, had been commanded by praepositi who were legionary centurions<sup>6</sup>. During the third century, however, equestrian tribuni were appointed to command some numeri<sup>7</sup>. The explanation may be that they were commanding larger units, or more probably that during the third century the numeri ceased to be regarded as inferior troops. The cohorts of vigiles, the urban cohorts, and the praetorian cohorts were always commanded by tribuni<sup>8</sup>.

(ii) Praetorian tribunes.

Such was the power of the praetorian prefect during the third century that it is no exaggeration to state that he often acted as vice-emperor<sup>9</sup>. At the same time, the praetorian prefecture combined so many varied duties that it was impossible for one man to fulfil them competently by himself, any more than it was possible for one man to rule efficiently as emperor. Thus already as early as the reign of Caracalla agentes vices praefectorum praetorio begin to be attested, having the status of vir perfectissimus<sup>10</sup>. The two most important duties of the praetorian prefect lay in the military and judicial spheres, but during the almost constant warfare that characterises the third century from the reign of Philip onwards the military duties of the praetorian prefect came to predominate. He seems to have accompanied the emperor on campaigns, while the agentes vices praefectorum praetorio remained at Rome, presumably taking charge of the administrative and legal business<sup>11</sup>.

Again, praetorian prefects were appointed to lead expeditions, e.g. Heraclianus under Gallienus, or to administer parts of the empire, e.g. Priscus under Philip, Silvanus under Gallienus, and Carus under Probus<sup>12</sup>. This explains why there are often several praetorian prefects in office at the same time. Thus, after their division of the empire, Valerian in the east and Gallienus in the west each seem to have had two praetorian prefects by 260<sup>13</sup>. Under the Tetrarchy it is uncertain whether there were only two prefects, or whether one was attached to each Augustus and Caesar<sup>14</sup>. However, it seems that while the prefects remained attached to the emperor,

some of the agentes vices praefectorum praetorio were assigned sections of the empire to administer. An increase in the number of deputy prefects is noticeable during the reign of Diocletian<sup>15</sup>. The earliest definitely attested territorial vice-prefect is dated to 303<sup>16</sup>.

As has been stated, the military duties of the praetorian prefects seem to predominate after the reign of Philip. Thus Heraclianus (267-8), Iulius Placidianus (c. 270), M. Aurelius Carus (c. 282), Aper (284) and Iulius Asclepiodotus (285-97) all appear to have been generals. At the same time, the large number of edicts issued by Diocletian, some of which refer to the judicial powers of the prefects, indicates a revival in their civil powers towards the close of the third century. Under Maxentius, praetorian prefects such as Rufius Volusianus and Ruricius Pompeianus continued to command armies. But it is evident that Constantine finally deprived the prefects of their military powers, probably after his victory over Licinius in 324<sup>17</sup>.

This increase in the number of the praetorian prefects and of their deputies is important when one considers the praetorian tribunes during this period. A feature of the third century seems to be the creation of extra praetorian tribunates. Thus when the Equites Singulares were doubled by Septimius Severus (193-211), two praetorian tribunes were appointed to command both numeri<sup>18</sup>. An inscription dated to 256-8 shows that under Gallienus two praetorian tribunes were in charge of the castra peregrina<sup>19</sup>. In fact it is under Gallienus that the praetorian tribunates seem to gain a special prominence. Coin evidence shows that the praetorian guard constituted

an important part of Gallienus's mobile field army<sup>20</sup>. Praetorian tribunes were the first officers to be given the title of protector Augusti, showing that Gallienus viewed them with special favour, and attached great importance to their loyalty.

In this regard the career of L. Petronius Taurus Volusianus is of key importance, being unique in two respects<sup>21</sup>. Firstly, he did not hold a single procuratorship during his rise to the praetorian prefecture, which shows that he was a military specialist. Secondly, he held two praetorian tribunates in succession, in charge of the fourth and first cohorts. It was this latter tribunate which gave him the status of protector, and his next post as praefectus vigilum constituted a huge advance in promotion, if judged by previous standards. Other praetorian tribunes who held the title of protector under Gallienus were the anonymous tribunus cohortis VI praetoriae and Aurelius Sabinianus<sup>22</sup>. It is noticeable that the latter does not specify which cohort he commanded. Again, M. Plavonius Victorinus terms himself merely tribunus praetorianorum in an inscription set up before 268<sup>23</sup>. The inscription of C. Petilius Venustus, tribunus praetorianorum, may also date to this period, and Dobson has argued that the tribunus praetorianus, Liberalinius Probinus, could have served under the Gallic emperors<sup>24</sup>.

Although the evidence is so scanty, the conclusion to which it points does not seem unreasonable when taken in conjunction with what is known of the general historical background during this crucial phase of the empire's history. Gallienus's creation of a

mobile field army, organised on a permanent footing, would have necessitated the organisation of a large headquarters staff. The importance of the centurions who served on the emperor's staff at this time has already been demonstrated in the chapter devoted to the protectores. Obviously, however, officers of higher rank than centurion would serve in this capacity. At the same time, it is during the reign of Gallienus that members of the senatorial class cease to enter on a military career. It seems likely that extra praetorian tribunes were appointed to act as staff officers, and to command crack units of troops. There is a parallel in the case of Iulius Placidianus, who in 269 was commanding a detachment of the field army with the rank of praefectus vigilum<sup>25</sup>. Similarly, it is interesting to note that the inscription of Traianus Mucianus does not specify the numbers of the cohorts in which he served as centurion in the vigiles and in the urban cohorts. It is likely that while holding these ranks he was in fact serving away from Rome on the emperor's staff.

The connection of the praetorian tribunes with the praetorian guard and Rome must have become more obviously fictitious towards the close of the third century, when the guard ceased to play such an important role. Admittedly under Aurelian it took part in the campaign against Zenobia in 271-5<sup>26</sup>, and new walls were constructed around its camp<sup>27</sup>. Again, as late as 297-8 praetorians apparently fought in the army which Maximian led to Africa to suppress the revolt of the Quinquegentanei, a confederation of Moorish tribes<sup>28</sup>. However, three soldiers' epitaphs of this period suggest that the praetorian

-30-

barracks at Rome were viewed more as a place of retirement after a long and active career<sup>29</sup>. Certainly it is recorded that Diocletian reduced the numbers of the praetorians<sup>30</sup>. He may have feared a revolt, but in any case the emperor was henceforth comparatively rarely resident in Rome. It is possible that the remaining praetorians rebelled in favour of Maxentius in 306 because the Caesar Severus had decided to abolish the praetorian guard. At any rate, they formed the nucleus of Maxentius's army in this final attempt of Rome to re-assert her old predominance<sup>31</sup>. They alone resisted to the last man at the Battle of the Milvian Bridge in 312, thereby symbolising the end of the old order<sup>32</sup>. Constantine abolished the praetorian guard and demolished its barracks<sup>33</sup>.

But who replaced the praetorians? It is interesting to note that Zosimus on one occasion refers to them as 'court troops'<sup>34</sup>. Again, an inscription from Rome mentioning a cohors praetoriana was later altered to cohors Romana palatina<sup>35</sup>. Finally, the palatini themselves are attested under Constantine, taking part in the Battle of Chalcedon in 324<sup>36</sup>. It is likely that officers commanding units of palatine troops, whether vexillationes, legiones or auxilia, would also have the status of tribune. In this respect it is interesting to examine two inscriptions giving the career of Stilicho<sup>37</sup>. In the first he is described as tribunus praetorianus, an obviously anachronistic title. In the second, at the identical stage in his cursus, he is termed comes sacri stabuli. In other words, the fourth century post of tribunus stabuli, a key position, developed from a praetorian tribunate. Since the tribunus stabuli is classed with the tribuni scholarum, it is likely that the latter posts also originated from

praetorian tribunates<sup>38</sup>. The scholae were already in existence by 303<sup>39</sup>.

In the chapter relating to the protectores, it was pointed out that the two praetorian tribunes at the head of the castra peregrina during the third century could be the precursors of the comites domesticorum equitum and peditum of the fourth century. Certainly the reference to Valerius Diocles as comes domesticorum in 284 is an anachronism. The assembled troops who witnessed and accepted without protest the summary justice meted out on the praetorian prefect, Aper, probably realised that Diocles, as head of the castra peregrina, was best qualified to assign the blame for Numerian's murder. They even appointed him emperor. His defeat at the Battle of the Margus in 285 perhaps indicates the comparative inexperience of a former staff officer as a commander in the field<sup>40</sup>. However, it is naive to assume that Carinus's assassination, and his army's defection to his rival, were entirely fortuitous. Diocletian the emperor displays superlative powers of diplomacy, which prior service in the castra peregrina during the third century would have afforded him ample opportunity to develop.

In fact it seems safe to assume that many of the important offices of the fourth century had in fact developed from praetorian tribunates. Thus in edicts issued by Constantine dated to 321 and 323 reference is made to Heraclianus and Proculianus, who hold the post of tribunus et magister officiorum<sup>41</sup>. It seems likely that the posts of magister peditum and equitum were also originally praetorian tribunates, as will have been the case with the regional magistri militum. Again, the notarii were in existence by 316<sup>42</sup>,

and the tribuni et notarii will also have developed from praetorian tribunates. A law of 381 states that while the primicerius notariorum is to be classed as a proconsul, the praetoriani are to be assigned a rank not much lower, so that those who have risen to the rank of tribunus will obtain insignia similar to those of the comes Orientis or Aegypti<sup>43</sup>. Finally, an inscription from Rome mentions tribuni et notarii de praetorio<sup>44</sup>.

It seems that Daia and Constantine were praetorian tribunes in 305. The case of the latter is especially interesting in that he is termed by Lactantius, a contemporary observer, tribunus primi ordinis<sup>45</sup>. Already under Constantine the comitiva had three grades, primi, secundi, and terti ordinis<sup>46</sup>. Constantine in 305 may well have had the title of comes primi ordinis, and held the status of vir clarissimus. Thus it appears that Diocletian had held a suffect consulship in 283 prior to his accession<sup>47</sup>. However, Lactantius's statement seems to imply that there were three classes of tribune. These may have corresponded to the three grades of vir egregius, vir perfectissimus, and vir clarissimus. Thus Valerius Statilius Castus, vir egregius praepositus vexillationum, seems to have held the title of comes in the period 256-8<sup>48</sup>. However, Professor Birley has pointed out to me that since Gallienus seems to have increased the number of praetorian tribunates, it may be that he also introduced three grades of tribune. Thus Volusianus was successively tribune of the fourth praetorian cohort, and then of the first, a promotion without precedent. Again, if it is granted that posts so widely differing in rank as those of magister peditum,

magister equitum, regional magister militum, magister officiorum, comes domesticorum, tribunus scholae and tribunus stabuli all developed from praetorian tribunates, it seems probable that there was already a hierarchy of grades for praetorian tribunes by the end of the third century. Finally, it is noticeable that among the tribuni et notarii, whose offices also originated from praetorian tribunates, one tribune has a higher grade than the rest<sup>49</sup>. It is clear from a law of 440-1 that by this date there were five grades of official, though only the first three are of interest here, since the last two consisted of honorarii. The first grade was made up of active officials, holding definite posts. The vacantes constituted the second grade. They acted as staff officers, and had no definite commitments, but could be appointed to extraordinary commands in the event of an emergency. The third class did not reside at court, and their insignia of office were sent to them<sup>50</sup>.

Summing up, it would appear that during the third century a large number of supernumerary praetorian tribunates was created, a process perhaps accelerated under Diocletian, and it is from these tribunates that many fourth century civil and military posts develop<sup>51</sup>. At first the tribunate was confined to the higher grades in the army. It is obviously to be distinguished from the rank of tribune as applied to commanders of numeri or cohorts stationed on the frontier. Thus Vegetius states: 'Tribunus maior per epistolam Sacram imperatoris iudicio destinatur. Minor tribunus pervenit ex labore'<sup>52</sup>. Here the term maior tribunus evidently denotes

the commander of a field army unit, which would be listed on the maius laterculum; conversely, minor tribunus denotes the commander of a unit of limitanei, which would be entered on the minus laterculum. It seems probable that all officers commanding palatini were granted the tribunate by Constantine, if one accepts the view that the palatine troops replaced the praetorian guard. During the latter half of the third century, and the early stages of the fourth century, commanders of paired legionary vexillations were termed praepositi. By 354, if Ammianus's account is exact, praepositi fabricae could gain the tribunate<sup>53</sup>. In 359, Dorotheus, commander of a vexillatio comitatensis, has the rank of tribune<sup>54</sup>. Presumably all commanders of comitatensian units had acquired this rank by that time. By 369 praepositi legionis, or cohortis could be elevated to the tribunate<sup>55</sup>. In this respect, a statement of Vegetius shows that tribuni or praepositi were appointed to command units, 'prout principi placuisset'<sup>56</sup>. In edicts the tribuni almost unfailingly assume precedence over the praepositi<sup>57</sup>.

(iii) Comes domesticorum.

As has been demonstrated, the post of comes domesticorum seems to have developed from one of the supernumerary praetorian tribunates created during the third century, and it seems not unlikely that the two praetorian tribunes attested in charge of the castra peregrina under Gallienus are the precursors of the comites domesticorum equitum and peditum listed in the Notitia in the eastern and western sections of the empire<sup>58</sup>. The earliest attested comes domesticorum equitum is dated to 409, and the earliest comes domesticorum peditem

to 452<sup>59</sup>. However, it is clear that Gallienus introduced a separate overall command for the field army cavalry, and it is logical to suppose that infantry and cavalry staff officers had separate commanders. Again, Constantine I differentiated between field army cavalry and infantry when he created the separate posts of magister peditum and equitum praesentalis<sup>60</sup>. However, since each Caesar had his own comes domesticorum<sup>61</sup>, it may be that as a rule one comes domesticorum supervised both cavalry and infantry staff officers. Even so, there are occasions during the fourth century when two officers hold the post of comes domesticorum simultaneously under the same emperor, discounting the fact that one could have served under a Caesar. Thus Barbatio and Latinus served as comites domesticorum under Constantius II in the period 351-4, and Mallobaudes and Richomeres under Gratian in 378. Altogether, fourteen comites domesticorum are known during the fourth century<sup>62</sup>.

The key role which the holders of this office could play is stressed by Ammianus Marcellinus, when he states that in 354 Latinus was one of the three officials regarded as controlling the destinies of the state<sup>63</sup>. It is significant that on occasion the emperor appointed his relatives to the post, as is demonstrated in the case of Serenianus and Stilicho. A consideration of the duties of the comes domesticorum explains this state of affairs. The protectores domestici acted as the emperor's staff officers. Their services were indispensable to him, and their loyalty was normally beyond doubt. As a rule they acted as an escort to the emperor, but they could be employed on special missions, or to carry out

arrests. It was from their ranks that the future generals of the Roman army were selected. The comes domesticorum was head of the protectores domestici, and therefore acted as the emperor's chief of staff. He supervised the enrolment of new candidates, and saw that the correct fee was paid to the primicerius scholae<sup>64</sup>. He was responsible for removing from the official register the names of those who had gained the status of protector domesticus by illegal means<sup>65</sup>. An edict of 408 empowers him to dismiss those protectores who are opposed to the Catholic sect<sup>66</sup>. Finally, he had the power to degrade or dismiss those who failed to fulfil their duties properly<sup>67</sup>.

In addition to these regular administrative duties, the comes domesticorum was frequently assigned special tasks. The importance of these shows the high degree of trust which emperors reposed in this officer. Often he was appointed to command troops, either independently, or in conjunction with others. Thus Severus in 367 was appointed to command an expedition sent to Britain to repulse an invasion of the Picts, Attacotti and Scots. Bacurius in 394 distinguished himself in the Battle of the Frigidus, while commanding the foederati sent on ahead to force a way through the pass. In 361 Dagalaifus was sent on ahead by Julian with a force of light-armed troops to capture Lucillianus at Sirmium. The same officer, together with the magister militum, Victor, commanded the rearguard during Julian's Persian campaign. Again, Mallobaudes, in conjunction with the comes Nannienus, commanded a force which repulsed an invasion by the Alamanni in 378. An anonymous comes

domesticorum campaigned with Arbogastes against the Franks in 394. Secondly, the comes domesticorum could be appointed to conduct reinforcements from one point to another. Thus Richomeres was sent by Gratian to bring aid to Valens in 377, and again in the following year. Thirdly, there were various miscellaneous duties. In 354 Barbatio supervised the arrest of the Caesar Gallus with a picked force. In 364 Valens sent Serenianus to Cyzicus to guard the treasure there. During Julian's Persian campaign, Dagalaifus, together with Nevitta, magister equitum, was placed in charge of mining operations at the siege of Maiozamalcha. Finally, a comes domesticorum could act as vices agens magistri militum. Thus a decree of 414 is addressed to Maurianus while serving in this capacity<sup>68</sup>.

In fact it was normal practice during the fourth century for those holding the post of comes domesticorum to be promoted to the office of magister militum. This is shown by the examples of Addeus, Barbatio, Dagalaifus, Lucillianus, Richomeres, Severus and Stilicho<sup>69</sup>. During this period only two magistri militum are known who did not hold this post at some stage in their careers, namely Silvanus and Agilo. In the latter instance, however, Ammianus makes it clear that this was a most unusual promotion<sup>70</sup>. One cannot say for sure what post was customarily held immediately before that of comes domesticorum, because there is not enough evidence concerning their prior careers. Stilicho's previous post was that of tribunus stabuli, but with regard to the others one can only state that in their earlier careers they had held the office of dux or tribune

of a palatine unit<sup>71</sup>. Regarding their origins, most seem to have been barbarians, usually of noble stock<sup>72</sup>.

As far as can be seen, the comes domesticorum had the status of vir clarissimus from the reign of Constantius II up to the close of the fourth century. He is so described in a decree of 346, and an inscription of 394<sup>73</sup>. By 415, however, he had gained the title of vir illustris<sup>74</sup>. Undoubtedly the comitiva primi ordinis was automatically associated with the post throughout the fourth century, since he is never referred to as tribunus. Little is known concerning the privileges associated with the post, but a decree of 412 exempts the comes domesticorum, in company with other high officials, from the duty of providing recruits<sup>75</sup>.

(iv) Tribunus stabuli.

Altogether, seven tribuni stabuli are attested during the fourth century<sup>76</sup>. As in the case of the comes domesticorum, the post developed from a supernumerary praetorian tribunate created during the third century. The case of Gintonius Sintula shows that not only each Augustus, but also each Caesar, had his own tribunus stabuli. There can be no doubt as to the importance of the post. In 354 its holder, Agilo, is referred to as being one of the three officers then regarded as controlling the destinies of the state<sup>77</sup>. Again, emperors very often appointed relatives to this office<sup>78</sup>. In the case of Valens, his appointment was evidently intended to facilitate his accession to the throne shortly afterwards.

The tribunus stabuli had a number of important duties. Firstly, he was the emperor's chief stablemaster, and was in charge

of all the horses and grooms in the imperial stable. Thus Cerialis in 375 was able to postpone the cruel punishment of a negligent groom which Valentinian I had ordered just before his death. Secondly, he supervised the provision of horses for the army, as is shown by two edicts of 401<sup>79</sup>. Thirdly, despite the fact that most of the edicts regarding the imperial post are addressed to the praetorian prefect<sup>80</sup>, one should not exclude the hypothetical possibility that the official directly responsible for its administration was the tribunus stabuli. Thus Cerialis in 375 journeyed 100 miles in a litter to fetch the younger Valentinian from a villa, following the sudden death of the emperor. Again, in 360 Sintula was ordered to select the best troops from Julian's scholae palatinae, and transport them to the east, using wagons of the imperial post. Finally, it is doubtful whether an official could have effectively superintended the transport of the emperor's baggage train without also exercising control over the imperial post.

The tribunus stabuli was classed with the tribunes commanding scholae palatinae<sup>81</sup>. Agilo, after holding this post in 354, went on to become tribune of the Gentiles and Scutarii, and in 360 was appointed magister peditum. Stilicho's next appointment was that of comes domesticorum. The tribunus stabuli could be granted the comitiva primi ordinis, but this was in the nature of a personal distinction during the fourth century<sup>81</sup>. It was not until the fifth century that this status became automatically associated with the post, and then, as Seeck points out, the rank of tribune is no longer mentioned<sup>82</sup>. In 401 the tribunus stabuli

held the title of vir clarissimus<sup>83</sup>. By 413, however, in the eastern empire his status had been raised to that of vir illustris<sup>84</sup>. With regard to his privileges, he was exempted from the duty of providing recruits and horses<sup>85</sup>. In addition, a decree of March 21st 401 mentions the custom whereby the tribunus stabuli was entitled to a sportula, or fee, of two solidi for every horse provided for the army<sup>83</sup>. A decree issued a few days later, however, abolishes this practice<sup>86</sup>. Clearly, from this fee alone the tribunus stabuli would have drawn a large income during the fourth century. Little is known concerning his officium, but an inscription from Concordia mentions a ducenarius princeps stabuli dominici<sup>87</sup>.

(v) Tribunus cura palatii.

Little is known concerning this post. In a decree of 413 it is classed with that of tribunus scholae<sup>88</sup>. Only one of its holders is known, namely Rumitalca, who commanded a section of the usurper Procopius's forces.

(vi) Tribunus scholae.

The scholae palatinae are first attested in 303, but may well have developed from units created earlier during the third century<sup>89</sup>. In the Notitia, as court troops, they appear under the overall command of the magister officiorum, seven being listed in the east, and five in the west, exclusive of the agentes in rebus<sup>90</sup>. They acted as a cavalry escort to each Augustus and Caesar, and most of the soldiers appear to have been of barbarian origin<sup>91</sup>. They received higher pay than other soldiers, and were accorded numerous

other privileges<sup>92</sup>. A certain proportion of the scholares were promoted to be officers in other units<sup>93</sup>, and it seems likely that these higher ranking scholares are to be equated with the candidati<sup>94</sup>. Each schola was 500 strong<sup>95</sup>, and was commanded by a tribune. Nineteen of the officers who held this post during the fourth century are known.

Agilo	<u>Gentiles et Scutarii</u>
Arintheus	<u>Armaturae</u>
Bacurius	<u>Scutarii Sagittarii (?)</u>
Bainobaudes	<u>Scutarii</u>
Balchobaudes	<u>Armaturae</u>
Barzimeres	<u>Scutarii</u>
Cassio	"
Cella	"
Danielus	-
Equitius	<u>I Scutariorum</u>
Comoarius	<u>Scutarii</u>
Malarichus	<u>Gentiles</u>
Mallobaudes	<u>Armaturae</u>
Nestica	<u>Scutarii</u>
Romanus	<u>I Scutariorum</u>
Scudilo	<u>Scutarii</u>
Silvanus	<u>Armaturae</u>
Valentinianus	<u>II Scutariorum</u>
Vincentius	" "

As one would expect, they often played an important role in the empire's affairs. In 354 Scudilo, tribune of a schola of Scutarii, was considered to be one of the three officers who controlled the destinies of the empire at that time<sup>96</sup>. In 350 Gomoarius, tribunus Scutariorum, betrayed Vetranio to Constantius II, while the desertion of Silvanus, tribunus scholae Armaturarum, was an important factor in the latter emperor's victory over Magnentius at Mursa in 351. Finally, in 364 Equitius and Valentinian, tribuni Scutariorum, were considered as possible candidates for the throne, the latter being eventually chosen as emperor.

The scholae normally acted as the emperor's bodyguard,

but they sometimes participated in campaigns which were not led by him in person. Thus Cella served under Barbatio, magister peditum, in 357, and Balchobaudes took part in the campaign of Iovinus, magister equitum in 366. As with other field army units, the scholae apparently operated in pairs, and thus two officers are frequently mentioned together. For example, Romanus and Vincentius, tribunes commanding scholae I and II Scutariorum, were accused of treason and sentenced to exile in 366. Similarly Cassio and Bacurius, commanding the Scutarii and Sagittarii, together precipitated the Battle of Hadrianople in 378 by rushing forward before the signal had been given. It seems clear that one tribune will have had seniority over the other. In the case of Danielus and Barzimeres, it is obvious that the former, holding the comitiva primi ordinis, was the superior officer. Agilo seems to have held the comitiva primi ordinis in 360, since he was commanding the Gentiles and Scutarii.

In virtue of their higher rank, tribuni scholarum could also exercise control over other units and their commanders. Bainobaudes and Valentinian in 357, apparently commanding vexillationes palatinae, obeyed the instructions of Cella, tribunus Scutariorum, when he forbade them to intercept a band of Alamanni. Again in 377 Barzimeres at Deultum in Thrace was commanding his own unit, the Scutarii, together with various infantry numeri. Often tribunes commanding scholae were entrusted by the emperor with important tasks. Thus Valens sent Danielus and Barzimeres to recapture Papa, the Armenian prince who had escaped from his court. During a campaign

against the Alamanni in 358, Nestica was commissioned by Julian to capture one of the enemy to act as a guide. In 354 Scudilo was sent by Constantius II to visit the Caesar Gallus, to persuade him to come to Milan, and Mallobaudes was one of three officials sent to interrogate the unfortunate Caesar during his imprisonment at Pola.

Regarding their position in the Rangordnung, tribunes of this class who were not awarded the comitiva primi ordinis were considered equal in rank to the duces<sup>97</sup>. Very little is known concerning their previous careers. However, Agilo, who was tribunus Gentilium et Scutariorum in 360, had been tribunus stabuli in 354, while Valentinian seems to have been tribune of a vexillatio palatina prior to his appointment as tribunus scholae II Scutariorum in 364. More is known about their later careers. Bacurius was first dux Palaestinae, and then comes domesticorum, and Mallobaudes also obtained the latter post. It is striking that five of these tribunes should have later gained the rank of magister militum, namely Agilo, Arinthaesus, Equitius, Gomoarius and Silvanus. Agilo and Silvanus were promoted to the post of magister peditum without holding an intervening grade. In addition, Malarichus was offered the post of magister equitum per Gallias by Jovian, but declined to accept. As one would expect, the names of most of these officers suggest Germanic birth. Malarichus, Mallobaudes and Silvanus were Franks, and Agilo and Scudilo were Alamanni. Bacurius, however, was a prince of the Hiberi, and Equitius and Valentinian were Pannonians.

The privileges of these officers are listed in a decree

of 413<sup>97</sup>. It shows that they had long had the right of adoratio by that date, and that they were entitled to dine at the emperor's table. According to the emperor's will, they could be awarded the comitiva primi ordinis, and on retirement, if they did not obtain a higher rank, would have equal status with the comites Aegypti or comites diocesis Ponticae. Those gaining the comitiva primi ordinis would hold the status of viri clarissimi. Since the duces only had the status of viri perfectissimi as a rule up to the end of Constantius II's reign, it seems safe to assume that tribuni scholarum who did not gain the comitiva primi ordinis will also have had this status<sup>98</sup>. With regard to discipline, tribuni scholarum had the right to flog or degrade soldiers, though a decree of 441 forbids them to punish senatores and ducenarii in this way<sup>99</sup>.

(vii) Tribunus vacans.

These tribunes were staff officers serving with the emperor or one of his generals. There is little evidence concerning them<sup>100</sup>, but it seems that they could be assigned a variety of duties. For example, in 359 Julian sent Hariobaudes as an envoy to the court of Hortarius, a prince of the Alamanni, in order to discover the intentions of neighbouring tribes, which had not yet made peace. There are other occasions also on which officers of this category seem to have been employed. In 359 Constantius II sent two tribunes, each with an interpreter, to question the Limigantes as to why they were menacing the Pannonian frontier<sup>101</sup>. In the same year certain tribuni and protectores were sent to supervise the fortification of the Euphrates lines, in view of the impending Persian attack<sup>102</sup>.

Ten tribuni and protectores domestici accompanied Ursicinus, magister equitum, on his dangerous mission to suppress the revolt of Silvanus in 355<sup>103</sup>. These tribunes were presumably also vacantes. It is worth noting that, apart from Ammianus and Verinianus, all were relatives or close friends of Ursicinus. Two references in the Augustan History suggest that certain generals maintained too many staff tribunes<sup>104</sup>. At the same time, they could be appointed to command troops. Thus Vegetius states that in battle reserves of picked soldiers stationed in the rear were commanded by vicarii comites and tribuni vacantes<sup>105</sup>.

An edict of 397 shows that the tribuni vacantes at court occupied an intermediate position between those officials with definite posts, and those not present at court, whose insignia were forwarded to them<sup>106</sup>. By this date they seem to have gained the comitiva primi ordinis automatically, and a law of 412 states that, performing approved tasks, they had precedence over those who gained this distinction by bribery or favouritism<sup>107</sup>. Little is known about their earlier careers and origins, except that Marinus had held the post of campidoctor, and that Hariobaudes seems to have been of Alamannic stock.

(viii) Tribunes commanding field army units.

Field army tribunes can be divided into two main categories, firstly those commanding palatini, and secondly those in charge of comitatenses. As has been shown, the palatini, who are first attested in 324, were probably in existence at an earlier date. They evidently replaced the praetorian guard, which was reduced in

numbers by Diocletian, and finally abolished by Constantine in 312. In that they replaced the praetorians, one would imagine that they were always commanded by tribuni. It seems certain that they received higher pay and more privileges than the comitatenses. The palatine units are listed first in the Notitia, and the vast majority appear under the command of the magistri praesentales<sup>108</sup>. The palatini are themselves divided into three groups, namely the vexillationes, legiones and auxilia. The following tribunes commanding palatine troops are attested during this period.

Vexillationes Palatinae

Bainobaudes	<u>Cornuti</u>
Menelaos	<u>Comites Sagittarii Armeni</u>
Valentinianus	<u>Cornuti</u>
Anon, VI 37279	<u>Equites Promoti</u>

Legiones Palatinae

Avenus (?)	<u>Tungrecani Seniores</u>
Derdio	<u>Ioviani Seniores</u>
Heraclius	" "
Iulianus	--
Macrobius	--
Magentius	<u>Ioviani et Herculiani Seniores</u>
Maximus	--
Flavius Memorius	<u>Lanciarri Seniores</u>
Severianus	<u>Divitenses et Tungrecani Seniores</u>
Varronianus	<u>Ioviani</u>

Auxilia Palatina

Iustinus	<u>Valentinianenses</u>
Libino	<u>Celtae et Petulantes Seniores</u>
Flavius Marcaridus	<u>Iovi Iuniores</u>
Varius	<u>Auxiliares Constantiaci</u>
Anon, <u>AM XXVII 2 9</u>	<u>Ascarii</u>

The comitatenses are divided into two sections, vexillationes and legiones, discounting the pseudocomitatenses, who were commanded by praepositi, as has already been noted. Comitatusian

units were also commanded by praepositi during the early fourth century, but the example of Dorotheus shows that officers commanding comitatenses had obtained the status of tribune by 359. In fact they probably obtained this status much earlier. The following tribunes commanding comitatensian units are attested during the fourth century.

Vexillationes Comitatus

Curandius	<u>Equites IV Sagittarii</u>
Dorotheus	<u>Equites Catafractarii</u>
Innocentius	" "
Vahalus	<u>Equites IX Dalmatae</u>
Anon, <u>AM XXV 1 8</u>	<u>Equites III Dalmatae</u>

Legiones Comitatus

Flavius Gaiolus	<u>V Macedonica</u>
Macius Severinus	<u>Secundani Italiciani</u>
Vetranio	<u>Tzanni</u>
Anon, <u>AM XXIX 5 20</u>	<u>Constantiani</u>

Each individual numerus, whether of palatini or of comitatenses, seems to have been 500 strong, and commanded by its own tribune; but the field army units listed in the Notitia seem to be grouped in pairs, and Ammianus frequently mentions paired detachments<sup>109</sup>. It seems that one officer will have had overall command of both units, and in such cases, as far as palatini are concerned at any rate, he held the comitiva primi ordinis. This is shown in the case of Libino, Magnentius and Severianus.

Little is known concerning the careers of field army tribunes. The majority apparently rose from the ranks<sup>110</sup>. Sons of officers, as in the case of Potentius and Valentinian, presumably first passed through the grade of protector domesticus. Others were

commissioned as tribuni on entering the army. Thus Pusaëus, the commander of the Persian garrison at Anatha, who surrendered to Julian in 363, was appointed to this rank. Similarly, Bitheridus, Fraomarius and Hortarius, princes of the Alamanni who surrendered to Valentinian in 372, were also commissioned as tribunes. Those who rose from the ranks obtained the status of protector before being appointed to command units<sup>111</sup>. Most officers seem to have gained the rank of tribune in their late thirties or early forties<sup>112</sup>. Flavius Memorius, however, whose career was rather slow at first, did not become tribunus Lanciariorum Seniorum before the age of fifty-two. He held this post for three years, and Valentinian was tribune of the Cornuti for at least four years. Regarding their later careers, Gratian, Flavius Memorius and Pusaëus became military governors of provinces. Valentinian was appointed tribunus scholae II Scutariorum, and Varronianus obtained the rank of comes domesticorum.

A tribune was expected to set an example to his men, so that they would be led to emulate his dexterity as a fighter and bravery on the battlefield<sup>113</sup>. Ability as an archer (cf. Menelaos) or physical strength (cf. Gratian) were attributes which won a fourth century officer the respect of his troops. Bravery in battle was a sure way to win promotion, as is shown by the careers of Arinthaëus and Nevitta, though one wonders whether too high a premium was not placed on daring, in view of the rashness of some officers and generals<sup>114</sup>. A striking feat of arms, such as that of Aliso, might even win pardon for an officer who had supported a usurper. Cowardice, on the other hand, was unforgiveable. Thus on several occasions during his Persian campaign Julian cashiered tribunes who fled from

the battlefield<sup>115</sup>, and Theodosius, while campaigning in Africa in 373, ordered the execution of Curandius, on the grounds that he was reluctant to fight against the rebels himself, and had not encouraged his men to do so either.

Tribunes were also responsible for the maintenance of discipline within their units. Vegetius states that a good officer will ensure that his men perform their exercises with dexterity, seeing that their uniforms are neat and clean, and their arms polished and in good order<sup>116</sup>. An edict of 384 shows that it was the duty of the tribune to see that his troops remained with their standards, and did not wander through private landholdings<sup>117</sup>. Vegetius shows that tribunes were expected to see that their troops kept together while on the march, and to try to prevent circumstances arising which might lead to mutiny<sup>118</sup>. The tribune was held responsible for the actions of his troops. An officer whose men gibbeted a prince of the Alamanni would have been condemned to death by the magister equitum, Iovinus, in that this action had been taken without prior consultation of a higher authority. Luckily for the tribune concerned, there was convincing evidence that his troops had got out of hand<sup>119</sup>. In fact it was not an easy task to maintain discipline during this period. For instance during the siege of Amida the Magentiaci and Decentiaci demanded a sally, and threatened to kill their tribuni and primi ordines when they tried to prevent this rash action.<sup>120</sup> Eventually the troops had their way. Presumably, like the commanders of scholae palatinae all field army tribunes had the power to flog or degrade soldiers.

With regard to recruitment, a law of 325 shows that duces commanding auxiliary cunei received licences to admit recruits, provided that the provincial governor was first informed, and sent a reply stating whether the recruit was a decurion<sup>121</sup>. An edict of 386 orders duces, tribuni and praepositi to see that persons who are decurions by birth, and have enlisted, should return to their town councils<sup>122</sup>. Apparently many soldiers often led away with them men of freeborn condition, pretending that they were near kinsmen or camp followers. In 367 it was decreed that the soldiers in question were to hand them over to their tribuni or praepositi. They in turn were to send them to their magistri militum, in order to provide more recruits for the army<sup>123</sup>. Tribunes were sometimes appointed to search for brigands and deserters, though it may be that these officers were tribuni vacantes, rather than commanders of units<sup>124</sup>. Finally, the tribune saw that his men received their daily rations from the horrea<sup>125</sup>. For example, hay was supplied to the commanders of all numeri, verillationes and scholae<sup>126</sup>.

In connection with this duty, the tribunes gained several privileges. Thus any surplus annonae became the property of the officer concerned, though he was expected to sell them at the normal market price<sup>127</sup>. Again, tribuni, like duces, were allowed to retain a certain proportion of the annonae allotted to the troops serving under them<sup>128</sup>. A law of 443 fixes this proportion at one twelfth for praepositi commanding limitanei<sup>129</sup>. In addition, tribuni and praepositi were exempted from the need to furnish recruits<sup>130</sup>. With regard to the imperial post, tribuni militum were allowed the

use of three posthorses, one less than the comites, but one more than the protectores domestici<sup>131</sup>. Other rights are mentioned by Ammianus. For instance, on the death of Julian in 363, the generals and tribunes met to select his successor<sup>132</sup>. In 361 some distinguished retired tribunes were among those chosen to greet Constantius II when he returned to Antioch from Mesopotamia<sup>133</sup>. In the same year, the tribunes of the Ioviani and Herculiani, legiones palatinae, were present at the trial of some of Constantius's old officials, who had offended the army<sup>134</sup>. On campaign, pack animals carried a large quantity of food reserved for tribuni, and during Julian's Persian campaign some of this was distributed to the soldiers when provisions became scarce<sup>135</sup>. As has been mentioned, officers commanding a pair of palatine units seem to have been granted the comitiva primi ordinis, and thus would have the status of viri clarissimi. The status of the normal field army tribune after the reign of Constantine was probably that of vir perfectissimus. It is evident that a number of people tried to claim the privileges of a field army officer. A decree of 369 emphasises that praepositi in charge of legions, cohorts, fabricae, classes or Laeti are not entitled to the same privileges as those who have served in the field army or the palace<sup>136</sup>. A later edict draws a distinction between those who reach the rank of tribune or praepositus by the normal system of promotion, and those who gain it by patronage. Only the former were to obtain the privileges associated with the rank<sup>137</sup>.

However, it seems that field army officers frequently abused their privileges. Libanius complains of tribunes who continue

to draw annonae for soldiers who are dead, but whose names are still on the regimental roll<sup>138</sup>. Again, edicts show that some tribuni and praepositi used to demand extra annonae. These were then re-sold at a profit to the provincials, or alternatively left to rot in the granaries. A law of 325 prescribes heavy penalties for this offence. A comes, tribunus or praepositus who charged more than the customary market price when selling surplus rations to provincials was liable to lose his rank and property<sup>139</sup>. However, the situation was no better at the close of the fifth century, since a decree of Anastasius states that tribuni, vicarii or other officers who break the law regarding the distribution of the annona will be sentenced to death<sup>140</sup>. In order to ease the burden of the provincials still more, it was made illegal for officers to permit their soldiers to demand mattresses, wood or oil from the people with whom they were billeted, and severe penalties were prescribed for those who failed to observe this regulation<sup>141</sup>. Some officers seem to have been demanding that the municipal councils should heat private baths for their use. However, a decree of 406 makes it clear that this privilege was confined to magistri militum and viri illustres comites<sup>142</sup>. An edict issued in 412 shows that the tribunes appointed to search for brigands and deserters in Africa had themselves caused so much destruction that in future no more were to be appointed<sup>143</sup>. Tribuni and praepositi were not allowed to grant their troops leave of absence, and were liable to a fine of 5 lb. of gold for each soldier if such a breach of regulations was discovered<sup>144</sup>. Tribuni or vicarii who ordered the execution of persons who should have been tried in court

were themselves liable to the death penalty<sup>145</sup>.

(ix) Tribuni commanding static frontier units.

Tribunes of this type can be divided into two main categories, depending on whether they command numeri or cohorts. With regard to the former, during the principate units of barbarian tribesmen settled on the frontier were termed numeri. During the fourth century, numerus is employed as a general term to denote field army units. However, the old type of numerus apparently continued to exist throughout this period. The Notitia lists two of them, one in Raetia, and the other in Britain<sup>146</sup>. In addition, inscriptions from Tripolitania, dating to the fourth century or later, give the names of six tribunes commanding numeri.

Flavius Isiguar	Flavius Masinthan
" Macarcum	Iulius Nasif
Masigama	Flavius Saicham

The men under their command acted as a static frontier militia, and were no doubt settled on the frontier and given land to cultivate in return for defending the area against the attacks of nomad tribesmen. As has been shown in the previous chapter, the praepositus limitis would exercise control over the centenaria within his sector of the frontier. The names of the above officers show that they were native Libyans<sup>147</sup>.

Officers commanding cohorts are frequently listed in the Notitia, and it is striking that they are all termed tribuni<sup>148</sup>. The same is true of edicts<sup>149</sup>. During the principate, prefects of cohorts were occasionally granted brevet tribunates, thereby upgrading them to the second militia<sup>150</sup>. By the fourth century,

this had evidently become standard practice. Only three commanders of cohorts are attested during this period.

Castorion	<u>IV Numidarum</u>	Egypt
Salvitiu	" "	"
Flavius Lucianus	--	Arabia

It seems safe to assume that, like Salvitius, all such officers had the status of ex protectoribus, having previously served in the field army. This fits in with Vegetius's statement that tribunes commanding units listed on the minus laterculum were appointed according to length of service<sup>151</sup>. Those holding the rank of tribunus cohortis were ipso facto praepositi castrorum, and the duties of the latter have already been outlined in the previous chapter. In addition, a law of 323 stresses that tribuni cohortium, in company with praepositi and decurions are not to grant leave of absence to any of their troops. Failure to observe this regulation in peacetime was to be punished by deportation and confiscation of property, but if it occurred during a barbarian invasion, the penalty was death<sup>152</sup>.

(x) Miscellaneous tribuni.

A law of 369 shows that by this date the tribunate could be conferred on praepositi in charge of legionary detachments, or cohorts<sup>153</sup>. The same edict, however, makes it clear that these officers were not entitled to the same privileges as tribunes who had served in the field army. Ammianus mentions three tribuni fabricarum<sup>154</sup>. In addition, the Notitia lists a tribunus gentis Marcomannorum in Pannonia prima, and a tribunus gentis per Raetias deputatae<sup>155</sup>. Praefecti gentium are attested in Africa and on the Euphrates frontier during the principate<sup>156</sup>. Perhaps these two officials had been

upgraded to the tribunate. Van Berchem has put forward the attractive theory that the first such tribune in Pannonia Prima was Attalus, a Marcomannic prince, whose people were settled by Gallienus in part of this province<sup>157</sup>. The Notitia also lists a tribunus Militum Nerviorum in Belgica Secunda<sup>158</sup>. Units of Milites often appear in the Notitia as garrisoned along the Danube, Rhine and the Saxon Shore. Normally their commanders are termed praefecti<sup>159</sup>. Evidently they were mobile troops, which could be drafted into the field army. This officer could also have been upgraded to the rank of tribune, though the reason for this is uncertain.

(xi) Vicarius tribuni.

The vicarius tribuni acted as deputy commander of a unit, and it is evident that the post is to be equated with that of primicerius<sup>160</sup>. Only two vicarii are attested during this period, namely Arinthaëus and Viatorinus. The latter holds the status of protector. Grosse has pointed out that the tribune of one unit in a pair could be vicarius of the other<sup>161</sup>. He also shows that the same officer could act as vicarius for both units in a pair<sup>162</sup>. The vicarii will normally have fulfilled the same functions as the tribunes, and hence the two are classed together in edicts and in the writings of Vegetius<sup>163</sup>. In addition, like the tribuni vacantes, they were sometimes put in charge of a picked force acting as a reserve during a battle<sup>164</sup>.

(xii) Ex tribunis.

The names of seven persons with this status are known:-

Amphilochius  
Flavius Bulicus  
Derdio  
Flavius Florianus  
" Heliodorus  
" Marcarius  
" Syrus

All had presumably served as tribunes in the field army, though this may not necessarily be true in every case, since apparently some people tried to gain the status in order to claim the associated privileges<sup>165</sup>. It is perhaps worth noting that Florianus and Derdio had served for 39 and 40 years respectively. This seems to indicate that field army tribunes tended to retire when aged about 60.

PROTECTORES

[Names are listed in alphabetical order of cognomina]

Flavius Abinnaeus	<del>P. Theod. 23, etc.</del> <u>P. Abinn. I, etc.</u>
Aelianus	<u>AM XVIII 9 3; XIX 9 2</u>
Aelius Aelianus	<u>III 3529; ILS 4495</u>
Aelius Aelianus	<u>ILS 9478</u>
Agricola	<u>XII 5385</u>
Albinus	<u>V 1796</u>
Antoninus	<u>AM XVIII 5 I, etc.</u>
Aquilinus	<u>P. Oxy. X 1253</u>
Flavius Aurelius	<u>V 6226</u>
Babes	<u>Schriftt. z. Alt. Lat. Paläogr. 21</u>
Aurelius Baia	<u>III 14165'</u>
Florius Baudio	<u>ILS 2777</u>
Bennafer	<u>Schriftt. z. Alt. Lat. Paläogr. 21</u>
Besas	<u>Schriftt. z. Alt. Lat. Paläogr. 21</u>
Marcus Bitianus	<u>III 14412</u>
Caesius	<u>AM XIX 9 2</u>
Flavius Concordius	<u>ILS 9204; VI 32011</u>
Conon	<u>Schriftt. z. Alt. Lat. Paläogr. 21</u>
T. Flavius Constans	<u>XIII 8291</u>
Flavius Valerius Constantius	<u>Anon. Vales. I, 1-2.</u>
Galerius Valerius Maximinus Daia	<u>Lactant. De. Mort. Pers. XVIII</u>
Flavius Dalmatius	<u>III 4185</u>
Dionysius	<u>P. Princeton III 119</u>

Claudius Dionysius	<u>ILS</u> 2775
Donatus	<u>AE</u> 1956 251
Eareter	VI 32939
Flavius Fandigilus	V 8747
Aurelius Faustus	<u>ILS</u> 4002
Aurelius Firminus	III 10406
Firmus	<u>Symmach.</u> III 67
Frontinus	<u>ILS</u> 2783
Flavius Gabso	XIII 3681
Flavius Gaudentius	VI 32940
Gratianus	III 12900
Gratianus	<u>AM</u> XXX 7 2
Hariulfus	XIII 3682
Heraclius	<u>AE</u> 1903 357
Herculanus	<u>AM</u> XIV 10 2
Claudius Herculanus	<u>ILS</u> 2775
Iacobus	<u>AM</u> XVIII 9 2
Iohannes	<u>AE</u> 1938 II
Flavius Iovianus	<u>AM</u> XXI 16 20; XXV 5 4
Iovinus	<u>AE</u> 1891 105
Flavius Italus	<u>AE</u> 1950 253
Flavius Iulianus	III 8741
M. Aurelius Iulius	III 7440
Acesonius Kalandinus	III 10509
Leontius	<u>Julian.</u> Ep. 22
Leucadius	<u>AE</u> 1938 30

Licinianus	<u>AE</u> 1939 45
Limenius	<u>AE</u> 1937 96
Macarius (?)	<u>P. Gen.</u> II 45 = <u>Mitt. Wilck.</u> I II 464 = <u>P. Abinn.</u> 2
Macedonius	VI 32944
Flavius Magnus Magnentius	<sup>n</sup> <u>ZoMar.</u> XIII 6 p 11 13 A, etc.
Flavius Magnianus	III 8742
Ammianus Marcellinus	<u>AM</u> XIX 8 6; XIV 9 I, etc.
Clementius Valerius Marcellinus	<u>IIS</u> 545; <u>IIA</u> 609; 610; 621.
Marcellus	<u>AM</u> XXVI 10 I; <u>Zos.</u> IV 6 4.
Marcianus	<u>Symmach. Rel.</u> XLI I & 6
Marcus	<u>P. Aberdeen</u> 21
Flavius Marcus	<u>IIS</u> 2783
Flavius Martialis	III 14594
Martinianus	V 6244
Masaucio	<u>AM</u> XXVI 5 14
Maxentius	<u>IIS</u> 2783
M. Aurelius Maximianus	XI 835
Ulpius Maximinus	<u>AE</u> 1919 74
Flavius Memorius	<u>IIS</u> 2788
Traianus Mucianus	<u>IIS</u> 9479
Sennius Paternus (?)	V 5833
Perula	<u>IIS</u> 2783
Flavius Pomentius	III 4186
M. Aurelius Processanus	<u>IIS</u> 2778
Valerius Proclianus	<u>AE</u> 1946 127
Valerius Pusintulus	III 3335

Aurelius Romanus	XII 2576
Superinius Romanus	XIII 8273
Sabinianus	<u>AE</u> 1910 171
Aurelius Sabinianus	III 8571
Sabinus	V 8282
Salvitus	<u>P. Thead.</u> 4
Flavius Sanctus	<u>ILS</u> 9205
Servantus	<u>P. Oxy.</u> I 43 Recto, col. IV
Superianus	<u>ILS</u> 2783
Tauriscus	<u>P. Oxy.</u> X 1253
Terentius	<u>P. Oxy.</u> I 43 Recto, col. IV
Teutomeres	<u>AM</u> XV 3 10; II, <u>Liban. Ep.</u> 1288
Theodorus	<u>Symmach. Rel.</u> XXXII I.
Theodorus	<u>P. Amh.</u> II 137
Valerius Thiumpo	<u>ILS</u> 2781
Aelius Titus	<u>ILS</u> 2760a
Ursinus	<u>ILS</u> 2783
Flavius Valens	<u>AM</u> XXXI 14 I, etc.
Valerius Valens	<u>ILS</u> 2776
Valentinianus	<u>Symmach.</u> II 74
Valentinus	<u>AM</u> XVIII 3 5
Valerianus	<u>AM</u> XXVII 10 16
M. Aurelius Valerius	<u>ILS</u> 5695, cf. III p 2328 <sup>119</sup>
Verianus	VI 2855 = 32610
Verinianus	<u>AM</u> XV 5 22; XVIII 8 II
Flavius Viator	VI 1595

Viatorinus	<u>ILS</u> 2784
Aurelius Victor	III 14165 <sup>I</sup>
M. Aurelius Victor	<u>AE</u> 1920 108; VI 1106; III 7596
Vincentius	<u>AE</u> 1948 136
Valerius Vincentius	<u>ILS</u> 2779
Vitalianus	<u>AM</u> XXV 10 9; <u>Zos.</u> IV 34 I
Vitalianus	<u>ILS</u> 546, cf. III p 2328 <sup>182</sup>
L. Petronius Taurus Volusianus	<u>ILS</u> 1332
Anon	III 3126, cf. p 2172 & III 10125
Anon	III 10488
Anon	VI 32945
Anon	VI 32947
Anon	<u>IGR</u> III 10
Anon	<u>AE</u> 1924 131
Anon	<u>AE</u> 1954 135
Anon	<u>Sammelbuch</u> V 7624

PRAEPOSITI

Flavius Abinnaeus	<del>P. Thead. 23, etc.</del> <u>P. Abinn. 1, etc.</u>
Flavius Abraam	<u>P. Gron. 10, 1. 26</u>
Aelianus	<u>AM XVIII 9 3, etc.</u>
Alaesianus	<u>P. Caire Preis. 39, ls. 1-6</u>
L. Iulius Capito Alaris	VIII 9025
L. Flavius Aper	<u>AE 1936 53; 54; 57, etc.</u>
Bonio	<u>AE 1934 184c</u>
Bonitus	<u>AE 1910 90</u>
Ulpius Candidus	V 7405
Castinus	<u>P. Lond. II 411, ls. 18-23 = P. Abinn. 28</u>
Castorion	<u>P. Thead. 48, ls. 4-11</u>
Valerius Statilius Castus	<u>IGR III 481 = IIS 8870</u>
Claudianus	<u>P. Oxy. I 43 Recto col. IV, 1. I</u>
Aelius Claudianus	VI 32987
Colluthus	<u>P. Lond. II 403, ls. 1-6 = P. Abinn. 49</u>
Flavius Concordius	XI 6222 = <u>IIS 9204</u>
T. Flavius Constans	VI 3555
Aurelius Crescentio	III 12377
Flavius Dalmatius	III 13810
Dinitius	<sup>n</sup> <u>Ost. Jahresh. VI, 1903, Beibl., col. 52, ns. 65 &amp; 66</u>
<sup>n</sup> A Dominus	<u>P. Oxy. I 43 Recto col. III, ls. 29-31</u>
Flavius Dragilis	III 15172 b
Felix	<u>PSI IX 1077, ls. I-II</u>
M. Aurelius Fidelis	III 3523

L. Romanus Fortis	XI 140
Anastasius Fortunatus	<u>Acta S. Marcelli</u> = <u>Ruinart</u> , pp 302-4
Foscanus	III 3653 = <u>IIS</u> 775
Arrius Germanus	X 1778
Goutha	<u>AE</u> 1911 244
Sextus Arnius Gratus	VI 32997
Heraclius	VI 32969 a & b
Hermogenes	III 13814 a & b
Ianuarius	III 70-2
Ianuarius (?)	<u>P. Oxy.</u> I 43 Recto col. III, ls. 24-8
Valerius Ingenuus	<u>AE</u> 1942-3 81
Flavius Iovinus	III 3370 = <u>IIS</u> 2787
Italicus	<u>Öst. Jahresh.</u> VI, 1903, <u>Beibl.</u> , col. 56, n. 82
Iulianus	<u>P. Oxy.</u> I 43 Recto col. V, ls. 9-15
Flavius Iulianus	III 8741
Aemilius Iuncus	VI 32995
Iustinianus	VII 268
Varius Karus	VI 32995
Flavius L..p.chem	<u>P. Gron.</u> 10, 1. 28
Clodius Largus	VIII 9755
Aemilius Leo	IX 3921
Leontius	III 5670 a = <u>IIS</u> 774
Lucianus	<u>P. Oxy.</u> I 43 Recto col. II, ls. 12-13
Flavius Lucianus	<u>AE</u> 1959 196
Flavius Luppio	V 4370
Macrobius	<u>P. Grenf. &amp; Hunt</u> II 74

Margus	<u>AE</u> 1910 91
Q. Gargilius Martialis	VIII 9047 = <u>ILS</u> 2767; VIII 20751
Flavius Martidius	<u>AE</u> 1891 103
Flavius Martinus	<u>AE</u> 1931 82
Agileius Modestus	IX 3921
Mucatra	III 6325 <sup>2</sup> = 8275 <sup>4</sup> a & b
Mucianus	<u>P. Oxy.</u> I 43 Recto col. II, ls. 9-11
Traianus Mucianus	<u>ILS</u> 9479, etc.
Mucinianus	<u>P. Oxy.</u> I 43 Recto col. I, ls. 24-6, etc.
Flavius Nuvel	VIII 9255
Olympus	<u>P. Oxy.</u> I 43 Recto col. II, ls. 14-16
Petronius	<u>AM</u> XXVI 6 7, etc.
Probianus	III 10686
Valerius Claudius Quintus	III 4855 = <u>ILS</u> 2772
Romanus	III 14406 a
Flavius Romulianus	V 8662
M. Aurelius Rufinus	V 4320
Sabicas	<u>P. Gen.</u> II 62, ls. 1-2 = <u>P. Abinn.</u> 16
Salvitus	<u>P. Thead.</u> 4, ls. 1-5
Valerius Sambarra	III 5565, cf. ad. 11771 = <u>ILS</u> 664
Flavius Senilis	VII 137
Severianus	<u>P. Oxy.</u> X 1261, ls. 7-9
Severinus	III 14184 <sup>9</sup>
Sertorius Silanus	XI 9 = <u>ILS</u> 699
C. Rufius Synforianus	<u>AE</u> 1934 193
Tara	III 1700 <sup>4</sup> , etc.

Taurus	<u>PSI IX 1077</u> , ls. I-II
Terentianus	<u>P. Oxy. I 43</u> Recto col. V, ls. 1-8
Flavius Traianus	<u>AE 1909 108</u>
Aurelius Uranius	<u>P. Gen. 49</u> = <u>P. Abinn. 57</u>
Ursicinus	III 6159 = 7494 = <u>IIS 770</u>
Valens	<u>AE 1903 300</u> , etc.
Aurelius Valens	<u>AE 1935 171</u>
Flavius Valens	III 410
Valerianus	<u>P. Oxy. I 43</u> Recto col. V, ls. 16-22
Valerius	VIII 8490 = <u>IIS 2794</u>
Veracus	<u>AE 1903 297</u>
Viator	<u>CI IX 9 19</u>
Victorinus	<u>IIS 8882</u> , etc.
Victorinus	<u>Öst. Jahresh. VI, 1903, Beibl.</u> , col. 54, n. 74
Aurelius Vincentius	XI 1016
Vitalianus	III 3228, cf. ad p 2328 <sup>182</sup> = <u>IIS 546</u>
Flavius Ziperga	<u>AE 1891 102</u>
Anon	V 8721
Anon	XIII 11538
Anon	<u>IIS 8940</u>
Anon	<u>AE 1951 196 a</u>
Anon	<u>P. Amh. 142</u> , l. 16
Anon	<u>BGU I 21</u> col. 2, l. 19
Anon	<u>BGU I 21</u> col. 3, ls. 12-14
Anon	<u>AM XXIX 3 4</u>

TRIBUNI

Abdigildus	<u>AM</u> XVIII 6 12
Addeus	<u>CT</u> VI 24 5 etc.
Agilo	<u>AM</u> XIV 10 8 etc.
Aiadalthes	<u>AM</u> XVIII 8 10
Aliso	<u>AM</u> XXVI 8 9; 10
Amphilochius	<u>AM</u> XXI 6 2; 3
Antonius	<u>AM</u> XXVI 5 10
Arcadius	<u>Zos.</u> II 51 4
Arintheus	<u>AM</u> XV 4 10 etc.
Averus (?)	XIII 5190
Bacurius	<u>AM</u> XXXI 12 16 etc.
Bainobaudes	<u>AM</u> XIV II 14
Bainobaudes	<u>AM</u> XVI II 6; 9; XVI 12 63
Balchobaudes	<u>AM</u> XXVII 2 6
Bappo	<u>AM</u> XV 4 10
Barbatio	<u>AM</u> XIV 11 19-24 etc.
Barchalba	<u>AM</u> XXVI 9 8; 10
Barzimeres	<u>AM</u> XXX I II etc.
Bellovaedius	<u>AM</u> XXV 7 13
Bitheridus	<u>AM</u> XXIX 4 7
Flavius Bulicus	VI 31979
Caris	III 3766 a - c = 10680 a; 10680 b
Cassio	<u>AM</u> XXXI 12 16
Cella	<u>AM</u> XVI II 6; 7; 16
Cerealis	<u>AM</u> XXX 5 19

Claudius	<u>AM XXIX 3 7</u>
Constantianus	<u>AM XXVIII 2 10</u>
Flavius Valerius Constantinus	<u>Lact. De. Mort. Pers. XVIII etc.</u>
Constantius	<u>AM XXV 9 12; Liban. Ep. 803</u>
Flavius Valerius Constantius	<u>Anon Vales., Pars I 1-2 etc.</u>
Curandius	<u>AM XXIX 5 20; 24</u>
Dagalaifus	<u>AM XXI 8 1</u>
Galerius Valerius Maximinus Daia	<u>Lact. De. Mort. Pers. XIX</u>
Danielus	<u>AM XXX 1 11-17</u>
Derdio	<u>V 6213 = ILS 2789</u>
Valerius Diocles	<u>Vict. Caes. XXXIX 1 etc.</u>
Dorotheus	<u>BGU I 316</u>
Epigonus	<u>AM XIV 7 18; XIV 9 4</u>
Equitius	<u>AM XXVI 1 4</u>
Eugenius	<u>Liban. Or. XI 159; XIX 45; XX 18</u>
Eusebius	<u>AM XIV 7 18; XIV 9 4</u>
Excubitor	<u>AM XX 4 21</u>
Flavius Florianus	<u>XIII 1855</u>
Fraomarius	<u>AM XXIX 4 7</u>
Flavius Gaiolus	<u>Schriftt. z. Ält. Lat. Paläogr. 21</u>
Gerontius	<u>XIII 3680</u>
Gomoarius	<u>AM XXI 8 1</u>
Gratianus	<u>AM XXX 7 2 - 3</u>
Hariobaudes	<u>AM XVIII 2 2; 7</u>
Flavius Heliodorus	<u>P. Gron. 10</u>
Heraclius	<u>Greg. Tur. II 8</u>
Hortarius	<u>AM XXIX 4 7</u>

Innocentius	<u>AM</u> XVI 12 63
Flavius Isiguard	<u>IRT</u> 886 k
Iulianus	<u>AM</u> XXV 6 3 etc.
Iustinus	<u>ILS</u> 9481
Iustus	VI 1110
Laipso	<u>AM</u> XVI 12 63
Leniogaisus	<u>AM</u> XV 5 16
Latinus	<u>AM</u> XIV 10 8; <u>Zos.</u> II 48 5
Lexus	<u>P. Flor.</u> I 36
Libino	<u>AM</u> XXI 3 2 - 3
Licinianus	IX 2111
Flavius Lucianus	<u>AE</u> 1959 196
Lucillianus	<u>AM</u> XIV 11 14 etc.
Lupicinus	III 3767 = 10681 a - e
Macarcum	<u>IRT</u> 886 c
Flavius Macarius	<u>P. Gron.</u> 10
Machameus	<u>AM</u> XXV 1 2
Macrobius	<u>AM</u> XXV 6 3
Flavius Mactans	III 3768 = 10682
Flavius Magnus Magnentius	<u>Zonar.</u> XIII 6 p 11 13 A etc.
Magnus	<u>AM</u> XXIV 4 23; <u>Zos.</u> III 22 4
Malarichus	<u>AM</u> XXV 5 6-7 etc.
Mallobaudes	<u>AM</u> XIV II 21; XV 5 6; XXXI 10 6 - 7
Manadus	<u>Zos.</u> II 50 2
Flavius Marcaridus	V 8753
Marcellianus	<u>Zos.</u> II 9 3

Marcellinus	<u>Passio Donati et Advocati</u> (cf. <u>St. Optatus</u> , edit. Dupin, p.191)
Marcellus	<u>Zos.</u> II 9 3
Marcianus	III 6159 = 7494 = <u>ILS</u> 770
Marinus	<u>AM</u> XV 3 10 - 11; <u>Julian</u> , Ad Athen. 273 d
Masigama	<u>IRT</u> 886 d
Flavius Masinthan	<u>IRT</u> 886 j
Mauricius	<u>AM</u> XXV 8 7; <u>Zos.</u> III 33 1
Maximus	<u>AM</u> XXV 6 3; <u>Zos.</u> III 30 4
Maxys	<u>Euseb. Mart. Pal.</u> IX
Flavius Memorius	XII 673 = <u>ILS</u> 2788
Memoridus	<u>AM</u> XXV 8 8 - 9; XXV 10 6
Menelaus	<u>Zos.</u> II 51 4; II 52 1 - 2
Traianus Mucianus	<u>ILS</u> 9479 = <u>IGR</u> I 1496
Iulius Nasif	<u>IRT</u> 886 f
Nemota	<u>AM</u> XXV 7 13
Nestica	<u>AM</u> XVII 10 5
Nevitta	<u>AM</u> XVII 6 3, etc.
Nigrinus	<u>AM</u> XXI II 2; XXI 12 19; 20
Numerius	<u>AM</u> XXIX 2 17
Potentius	<u>AM</u> XXXI 13 18
Pusaeus	<u>AM</u> XXIV 1 9; <u>Zos.</u> III 14 4
Richomeres	<u>AM</u> XXI 7 4 ff, etc.
Romanus	<u>AM</u> XXII II 2
Rumitalca	<u>AM</u> XXVI 8 1
Aurelius Sabinianus	III 8571

Flavius Saicham	<u>AE</u> 1951 II = <u>IRT</u> 886 a
Sallustius	<u>AM</u> XXIX 3 7
Scudilo	<u>Zos.</u> II 50 2; <u>AM</u> XIV 10 8; XIV II II; 24
Seniauchus	<u>AM</u> XV 4 10; XXV 10 6; 7
Serenianus	<u>AM</u> XXVI 5 3, etc.
Severianus	<u>AM</u> XXVII I 2; 4; <u>CT</u> V 7 1 = <u>CI</u> VIII 50 19
Macius Severinus	XII 1356
Severus	<u>CT</u> VI 24 2 - 3
Silvanus	<u>AM</u> XV 5 33, etc.
Gintonius Sintula	<u>AM</u> XX 4 3, etc.
Sol	III 10684 a; c
Flavius Stilicho	<u>ILS</u> 1277; 1278, etc.
Flavius Syrus	<u>P. Gron.</u> 10
Terentianus	III 10683 a; b
Thomas	V 304
Vahalus	III 88 = <u>ILS</u> 773
Flavius Valens	<u>AM</u> XXVI 4 2, etc.
Flavius Valentinianus	<u>AM</u> XVI II 6-7, etc.
Valentinus	<u>AE</u> 1953 8 a; b
Valentinus	<u>AM</u> XVIII 3 5
Valerianus	<u>AM</u> XXXI 13 18
Varius	<u>BGU</u> I 316
Varronianus	<u>AM</u> XXV 5 4, etc.
Vetranio	<u>AM</u> XXV I 19, etc.
Viatorinus	XIII 8274 = <u>ILS</u> 2784

Victor	<u>AM</u> XXV 7 13
M. Flavius Victorinus	XIII 3679 = <u>ILS</u> 563
Vincentius	<u>AM</u> XXII II 2
Vincentius	<u>AM</u> XXIX 5 19
L. Petronius Taurus Volusianus	XI 1836 = <u>ILS</u> 1332
Anon	III 3126
Anon	VI 1110
Anon	VI 37279 = <u>ILS</u> 9212
Anon	XIII 8740 = <u>ILS</u> 790 = <u>AE</u> 1953 271
Anon	<u>AM</u> XV 5 9
Anon	<u>AM</u> XVI 12 39
Anon	<u>AM</u> XVI 12 63
Anon	<u>AM</u> XXIV 3 1
Anon	<u>AM</u> XXIV 5 8
Anon	<u>AM</u> XXV I 8
Anon	<u>AM</u> XXV I 9
Anon	<u>AM</u> XXV 7 13
Anon	<u>AM</u> XXVII 2 9
Anon	<u>AM</u> XXIX 5 20
Anon	<u>AM</u> XXX 1 7
Anon	<u>Sulpicius Severus. Vit. St. Martin, II =</u> <u>Corp. Script. Eccl. Lat. I, pp 111-12</u>
Anon	<u>Claud. De Cons. Stil. I 35-46</u>

DOUBTFUL OR REJECTED PROTECTORES

Callistus	<u>Socrat.</u> III 21 14; <u>Liban. Ep.</u> 1233
Hatena	III 6439
Herodes	<u>IGR</u> I 1481
Martinus	<u>ILS</u> 2782
Severus	<u>AE</u> 1897 94
Aurelius Severus	<u>ILS</u> 2208
Iulius Spectatus	XIII 7535a
Flavius Vitalis	XI 830
Valens	VI 32946
Voteporix	<u>EE</u> IX 1030
Anon	<u>EE</u> VIII 218
Anon	<u>Glasnik</u> XXXIX, 1927, p. 260

DOUBTFUL OR REJECTED PRAEPOSITI

Bonus	III p 2328 <sup>43</sup>
Aurelius Cervianus	<u>RBRA</u> , dust cover
Laurentius	XI 285
C. Iulius Maximus	VIII 9790 = <u>ILS</u> 3251
Q. Maximus	VIII 9791
Anon	XI 3104 = <u>ILS</u> 2765
Anon	<u>p. Abinn.</u> 10, ls. 9-15

DOUBTFUL OR REJECTED TRIBUNI

Aelianus	<u>AM</u> XVIII 9 3
Aligildus	<u>AM</u> XXI 15 4; XXII 2 1
Arbitio	<u>Oros.</u> VII 35 16
Asclepiodotus	<u>AM</u> XV 6 4
Frumentinus	<u>Acta S. Basilii</u>
Flavius Gemellus	<u>AE</u> 1902 155
Gerontius	<u>AM</u> XIV 5 1
Gerontius	<u>Zos.</u> IV 40 1 - 6
Inmo	<u>AM</u> XXI 12 3
Lutto	<u>AM</u> XV 6 4
Maudio	<u>AM</u> XV 6 4
Salonius Mauricus	<u>AE</u> 1909 51
Liberalinius Probinus	XIII 8267b
Saturninus	VIII 9255
Thalassius	<u>Zos.</u> II 48 5
Theolaiphus	<u>AM</u> XXI 15 4
Flavius Ursacius	VI 1156 = <u>ILS</u> 722
Ursicinus	<u>CT</u> VII 4 12
Valericus	<u>AE</u> 1903 302
C. Petilius Venustus	V 748 = <u>ILS</u> 4871, etc.
Verissimus	<u>AM</u> XVI 6 1; 3
Flavius Victorinus	V 1658