

# Durham E-Theses

---

## *The primipilares of the Roman army*

B. Dobson

### How to cite:

---

Dobson, B. (1955) The primipilares of the 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/8434/> 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.

THE PRIMIPILARES OF THE ROMAN ARMY

Thesis submitted in candidacy for the Degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy  
in August, 1955.

by

B. DOBSON

of

HATFIELD 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.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VOLUME I

INTRODUCTION	1
HISTORICAL BIBLIOGRAPHY	4
THE REPUBLICAN PRINIPILATE	22
THE AUGUSTAN PRINIPILATE	27
THE DEVELOPING PRINIPILATE	42
THE LATE PRINIPILATE	69
THE ORIGINES OF PRINIPILARES	89
THE PRINIPILARIS AND THE LEGIONS AS SOLDIER AND CENTURION	112
THE PRINIPILARIS AND THE ROLE COLONTS AS SOLDIER AND CENTURION	124
THE PRINIPILARIS AND THE EQUESTRIAN ORDER	145
THE PRIMUSPILUS AND THE PRINIPILARIS	161
THE PREFECTS OF THE CAMP AND OF THE LEGIONS	178
THE ROLE TRIBUNATES	202
PRIMUSPILUS ITERUM	224
THE PRINIPILARIS PROCURATOR	234
THE SOCIAL STANDING OF THE PRINIPILARIS	286
THE PRINIPILARIS IN THE MUNICIPALITIES	299
CONCLUSION	309
<u>APPENDICES</u>	
THE PRINIPILARIS AND THE CASTRA PEREGRINA	317
THE PRINIPILARIS AND THE FLEET	320
THE PRINIPILARIS AND THE PROTECTORES	321

TRECENTARIUS	323
PRINCEPS PRAETORII	326
OFFICIAL PRAEUSPILUS DEDICATIONS	329
DOMIS DONATUS	335

VOLUME II

PROSOPOGRAPHY OF PRIMIPIILARES	1
SUPPLEMENT TO PROSOPOGRAPHY	391
DOUBTFUL AND REJECTED PRIMIPIILARES	393
SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY	407
NOTES	411
INDEX OF ROLE TRIBUNES	424
INDEX OF COGNOMINA	430

## INTRODUCTION

The function of the introduction to a work of this nature would seem to be a definition of the subject and an explanation of the reasons for its selection, a review of the present state of the material and the work done on it, and an explanation of the form that the thesis has taken.

The term primipilaris is of course derived from the word primuspilus, the chief centurion of the Roman legion, commander of the first century of the first cohort. After holding this post men were known as primipilares and under the Empire they were employed in a wide variety of further posts, notably as prefects of the camp to the legions, tribunes of the cohorts at Rome, commanders of the Egyptian legions and later of others, and as procurators. These facts are of course generally known, but the last full study of the primipilares was by J. Karbe in 1880 (1). This was a useful study, but by no means exhaustive. It was overshadowed by A. von Domaszewski's great book on the Roman Army (2), which appeared in 1908. This has profoundly influenced all subsequent thought on the primipilares, with the result that certain of his conclusions, though false, have been unchallenged. It was the work of M. Durry on the praetorian cohorts which provided the immediate stimulus for a re-examination of the primipilares. He put forward there (3) a view of the primipilares which seemed to Mr. Birley mistaken, and he made an initial investigation of the Durry thesis in a paper

reprinted in his omnibus volume (4). Clearly however what was necessary to prove or disprove the views of M. Durry was a full examination of the primipilares, and so he introduced me to the subject at the end of my first degree course. The results of what examination appear in this thesis. I have not sought to examine every aspect of the primipilares, but have concentrated on their geographical origins, the corps from which they were recruited, and the pattern of their careers.

The review of the present state of our knowledge about the primipilares follows in the next chapter, so I need not touch on it here. As far as the construction of my own work is concerned, it falls into two broad divisions, the general discussion of the primipilares, and the prosopography of primipilares. The first begins with a survey of the historical development of the primipilate. It is seen as a military post without a future in the Republic, and then it is shown how Augustus shaped this institution into one of the valuable contributions he made to the administrative machinery of the Principate. There follows the evolution of the career, and a glance at the primipilaris of the fourth and fifth centuries.

The chapter on the geographical origins of the primipilares follows, and then the equally important chapters on the corps from which the primipilares were recruited, and in which they served. This leads us naturally to the consideration of what the primipilate itself involved. The next group is of posts the primipilaris almost exclusively supplied, the

prefectures of the camp, the Rome tribunates, and the posts of primipili iterum. Under the first are considered the prefects of the camp in Egypt. The contribution of the primipilares to the procurators is then assessed, and finally their importance in Imperial and municipal society. The conclusion seeks to summarise all this, and in particular to give a final estimate of the importance of the primipilares.

The second part owes its inspiration to H.G. Pflaum's these complémentaire, (5). It gives a complete list of all primipilares of the first three centuries of the Empire. It also gives the few cases of men holding Rome tribunates and prefectures of the camp or ducenarian commands of legions who were not primipilares. Inscriptions and literary references are given wherever it has seemed desirable, particularly to facilitate discussion. Much that is dismissed briefly in volume I will be found at length in the prosopography, and the book is planned on the assumption that the reader will treat the two as dependent the one on the other. Appendices are given on a few topics that cannot be ignored, but are not sufficiently important to find a place in the main body of discussion.

## HISTORICAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

Before giving a historical survey of the work on the primipilares a word should be said on the material. This takes the form mainly of inscriptions on stone, a type of evidence which is far greater in bulk than that from literature. The literary references have their own importance, however, for whereas the inscriptions give us the origin and career of the primipilaris, literature tells us what he did. Of the other types of evidence, that from inscriptions is the most likely to increase, and much has been learned from quite recent finds, e.g. the very important new inscription relating to Marcius Turbo which is given under him in the prosopography. As explained in the Introduction, however, it is not the discovery of new material so much as the in some respects inadequate treatment of the subject so far which has led me to make a new study of this subject.

I may be forgiven perhaps if I begin my survey with the work of J. Karbe in 1880. (The books mentioned are all fully detailed in the select bibliography, so the titles are only mentioned in the notes to this chapter when a specific reference to a page is made). This is <sup>the</sup> most modern study of which I am aware that attempts to deal with the primipilate comprehensively. A. Von Domaszewski dealt with the subject in the Rangordnung, but only as part of a far greater scheme. Karbe recognised clearly the distinction between primuspilus and primipilaris,

while noting that often the terms are used interchangeably (1). He demonstrated clearly the existence of an ordo primipilarius(2) and that there was both a numerus of primipilares at Rome and primipilares attached to commanders in the field. Rightly he concluded that the primipilaris was an Augustan creation, and he made the fundamental distinction between those who retired after the primipilate, and those who went on to further service. He saw clearly that the tenure of the primipilate was short, and that the commoda so lauded in verse and prose alike included as their most important item the sum of 600,000 sesterces received by the primuspilus on his retirement (3). He noted also the special claims of the emperors on the primipilares. He took the view that the primipilares were not automatically equestrians on the basis of the inscriptions of primipili ex equite Romano and similar arguments (4). His views on this subject brought him into grave difficulties (5).

In discussing the primipilares in the municipalities Karbe noted the high posts held and the extreme rarity of magistracies lower than the rank of duovir in primipilaris careers (6). Further he noted how the retired primipilaris was often the prefect or the curator of the emperor in the municipalities. He covered competently the extraordinary posts given to primipilares (7). In discussing Wilmanns on the prefect of the camp he disputed the former's argument that the prefect of the camp was of equestrian rank, because it conflicted with his own interpretation of the primipilaris as plebeian (8). Karbe's treatment of

the tenure of posts by primipilares which were held by equestrian officers almost exclusively after the reign of Claudius was unsatisfactory, precisely because he did not realise the different situations before and after that emperor's reign (9). This fault also affected his treatment of the Rome tribunes. Here should be quoted Karbe's famous explanation of the grant of Rome tribunes to primipilares (10).

cuius rei nullam aliam invenio causam, nisi ut militibus illis diu et optime meritis, quos plerosque etiam equestri loco ortos esse verisimile est, post longam castrorum solitudinem Urbis gaudia et delicias tandem revisendi occasio daretur.

As appears from my chapter on the Rome tribunes, for some at least of the tribunes this was the main value of their tribunes, but hardly the prime motive of the emperors in giving primipilares these tribunes. Karbe saw clearly moreover, that few primipilares reached the great prefectures (11). He gave the reign of Hadrian as the period before which primipilares came rarely or never to the procuratorships (12), which is to some extent borne out by my fuller study. Further he noted that primipilares rarely received urban procuratorships, and drew the correct conclusion that they were more suited for provincial posts (13).

Karbe's treatment of the primuspilus iterum was fair rather than good (14). He realised that pp. bis could have two possible meanings, but he regarded the second primipilate as indistinguishable from the first, and again he was in difficulties because of his assertion that the primipilaris was a plebeian. Again he failed to realise the difference between the pre-Claudian and

post-Claudian career. Nevertheless, he realised clearly that this post of primuspilus iterum was the pathway to the procuratorships. Finally, his conclusion is well-worth quoting (15),

Sed ut extremum habeat aliquid disputatio mea, primum atque proprium primipilariū institutionis illud fuit, quod imperatores hac ratione ordinem virorum fidelissimorum ac peritissimorum sibi creaverunt, quorum fidei unum quodque officium locis vel disiunctissimis maximeque diversis concedere liceat; nam quibus omnia dederant, ab iis omnia repetere poterant.

Karbe's second part is also of interest to us, for he treated of the centurion by direct commission, the importance of whom is stressed in this thesis. As far as reaching the primipilate was concerned, he asserted that they received no particular preference (16). On the other hand, he asserted that they comprised the vast majority of the men who, having reached the primipilate, were promoted beyond it. His arguments were sound as far as the superior qualifications of such men were concerned, but in arguing that they formed the vast majority he fails to realise that silence about their origin was not the mark of a particular class of primipilares, but a characteristic of most of those who reached the procuratorships and prefectures. He became even more muddled in discussing the third-century ducenarian legionary prefects and the centurionate as a militia equestris (17).

I have given the conclusions of Karbe in considerable detail, as he was the last to survey all the aspects of the primipilate in a work devoted primarily to it. Apart from the errors I have already noted, and the general need to bring his work up to date, he has failed to comprehend the pre-Claudian situation, and the special nature of the primuspilus iterum. Further, he did not

discuss the question of recruiting of the primipilares in terms of provinces or corps, and generally his study needs to be expanded and elaborated. It is fair to say that he probably did as much as was possible with his material, and his whole study is still well worth reading and is constantly stimulating.

We come now to the work of Wilmanns. It was earlier than Karhe in date, being published in 1872, but as it treats of a part of the primipilaris career, and not of the whole, I place it in the second position. He laid down that the prefecture of the camp existed only in the first two centuries of our era (18). The post was held by primipilares, who rarely advanced further, and never obtained procuratorships (19). Their decorations included hastae and vexilla. He recognised that the prefect of the camp in Egypt was commander of the legions there (22), and recognised Liternius Fronto as such. In his opinion in the first century the prefects were appointed to camps, not to legions, till Domitian forbade the quartering together of legions (21). He did not think that in the first period referred to the prefect was subject to legionary legates. Wrongly he thought that the prefect was the legionary legate's deputy, forgetting about the tribunus laticlavus. He identified the prefect of the camp with the prefect of the legion, but stated that Severus officially changed the name (22). He admitted that the former title appeared on a number of examples from the second century. He did not understand the post of L. Cirpinus. He saw that the prefects began commanding the legions from the time of Gallienus onwards,

but he failed to distinguish the prefects of the Egyptian legions from the rest. The fact that if the prefect of the camp in Egypt was ducenarian, the prefect-commander of the Egyptian legion II Traiana must be also, escaped <sup>him</sup>.

One further work must be mentioned before we come to Domaszewski, which like Karbe has tended to be forgotten, that of W. Baehr in 1900. Though his dissertation was not mainly concerned with the primipilares it contributed a number of useful points. He collected the evidence for promotion of primipilares beyond the primipilate as far as it was available at that time(23). From the first he took more notice of chronology than Karbe, and was thus able to observe that the reign of Vespasian seemed to be the dividing-line after which the primipilares rarely or never received equestrian appointments, apart from the Rome tribunates (24). He concluded that from the beginning the Rome tribunates were reserved for the primipilares. He noted further, in connection with the withdrawal of the primipilares from the equestrian militiae, the fact that Vespasian<sup>s</sup> appeared to have brought to an end the practice of foreign princes commanding their own auxiliaries. He rejected firmly, against the opinion of his time, the idea that the primipilate was the quarta militia, and Karbe's opinion, shared by others, that in the third century the centurionate was an equestrian militia (25). He noted cases of non-Italian primipilares before Severus. The rest of the thesis is devoted to a study that is not uninteresting for us, for it demonstrated that the pattern of centurions' recruitment followed

that of the legions.

We come now to the greatest single work on the Roman army, Domaszewski's Rangordnung. This great work was influenced throughout by what I may term the "Barbarisation" concept, that the entry of provincials into the cadres of the army and administration was fatal, that the policy of Severus in this matter was a deliberate exclusion of Italians in favour of provincials, and that in this respect that emperor was deliberately reversing the policy of his predecessors. This influenced his conclusions on the recruiting of centurions (26). He laid down as far as the primipilate was concerned the following maxims. With exceptions made in the case of certain praetorian centurionates, the primipilate was always preceded by the centurionate of a legion (27). There were two primipili in each legion, of whom one did not command a century, and was the primuspilus iterum (28). The primipili were almost all Italians, recruited from the guard (29). Even the men ex equite Romano rarely obtained the primipilate, and that is why they were so careful to mention their origin. Hadrian made Italian nationality a rule, in order to keep for Italians the posts to which primipilares were promoted. One observes how A. von Domaszewski sees all this as an elaborate system of protection against "Barbarisation". He suggested that the cohorts and alae to which primipilares were appointed before the reign of Claudius were milliary (30). In this connection there is a beautiful example of a Domaszewski proof by restoration. He spoke of the equestrian service before Claudius as

built on the primipilate (31). He suggested that the pp. bis strictly was attached to the emperor's headquarters, and his attachment to a legion was regarded as a temporary posting. He stated further without explanation that under the Republic auxiliary posts were entrusted to primipilares. He regarded the pp. iterum as the instrument of unifying the discipline of the guard and of the legions (33). He thought that the age of entering on the primipilate under Vespasian was about forty-nine, and that as a consequence of Domitian's raising of the pay the age went up, though this could be often lowered in special cases, particularly for the men from the guard (34).

On the prefect of the camp he stated that till Claudius this officer was the head of the equestrian militia (35). Further he asserted that such prefects commanded auxiliary camps also. But from Claudius they were commanders of fixed camps, and the appointment marked the end of the career of the inferior primuspilus who had not been called to Rome. (36) He accepted Wilmanns on the prefects of the legions, but added inevitably that these officers were the instruments of Imperial distrust of the legates, and therefore they were brought into the procuratorial career. He realised that the prefect of the camp in Egypt was ducenarian but made him the commander of the auxiliary camp (37). He mentioned further the fact that the Parthian legions were recruited by prefects.

Of course this survey is not meant to be exhaustive. A list of those conclusions arrived at by Domaszewski that

affect directly or indirectly the primipilares would be longer than this chapter. The conclusions given above are the main ones, all of which have influenced those that have come after him. Though I have had to join issue with him on a large number of his conclusions, the worth of the book is immeasurable. If one had to put his contribution to the study of primipilares into a few words, one would say that he touched on every possible aspect, and said something worth thinking about on each.

Five years after the Rangordnung appeared the thesis of Wegeleben. The most important feature of this thesis for us was its simple and convincing explanation of promotion within the centurionate. He also dismissed Domaszewski's theory of two primipili in a legion (38). His reasons for rejecting Domaszewski's statement that the post of princeps must precede that of primuspilus were less convincing (39), and he seems at times to fall into a mechanical rigidity regarding his own system. Regrettably he repeated Mommsen's remarks to V 867, where the latter made the second primipilate a device to ensure that primipilares who had taken other posts lost no privileges i.e. they were made pp. II so they could claim to have been discharged from the primipilate (40). In other words, in Mommsen's view a man who had been primuspilus and became praetorian tribune couldn't claim his 600,000 sesterces unless by a legal fiction he became primuspilus again. Karbe had seen long before that it was nonsense to suppose that the men who were promoted beyond the primipilate lost their privileges

thereby (41).

The next important work was that of Keyes, published in 1915, entitled The Rise of the Equites. He repeated Domaszewski's belief in the command of auxiliary camps by prefects of the camp (42). He asserted that the prefect of the camp declined in rank after the reign of Claudius, though Domaszewski had seen that he must rank above the equestrian tribunes still. Keyes saw clearly and demonstrated that the title praefectus legionis came gradually into use in the second century (43), and that there was no warrant to attribute the change to any official action by Septimius Severus. The difference in rank between the prefect of the camp and the primuspilus was slight, in his opinion (44). He presumed two declines in power by the prefect, first when the prefecture ceased to be held after prefecture of cohorts and the like, and the second when the prefect became attached to a particular legion (45). His treatment of Egypt was based on the hypothesis that the Egyptian prefect of the camp was in charge of an auxiliary camp (46). He argued that the prefect never acted as the legate's deputy, in his efforts to prove that the ducenarian prefect-commanders of legions were distinct from the prefects of the camp, ~~but~~ not the latter up-graded (47). He then proceeded to demonstrate that the ducenarian prefect was almost certainly the primuspilus iterum (48). The point that he failed to note and act upon was that the Domaszewski explanation of the latter post was unsatisfactory.

The next important work was Der Römische Ritterstand, by

A. Stein. In the thirty or so pages that he devoted to the equestrians of military origin (49) he gave lists of the cases known to him. Of most interest to us in the discussion is the fact that he did not regard the primipilaris as automatically an equestrian (50), and he believed that equestrians who accepted commissions as centurions lost their status, though they did not do so if they had already held a militia. Otherwise he simply referred to Domaszewski. His most valuable feature is his naming of examples, so characteristic of his method of presenting his arguments.

Next to be noted is a "jeu d'esprit" of the year 1937, which has been taken seriously by a number of people (51). This paper by G. Ch. Picard and H. Le Bonniec made the following assertions. It took the Domaszewski thesis of two primipili, the superior being the primuspilus iterum, putting aside the arguments of Wegeleben, some of them admittedly not being strong. Accepting the latter's point that the pp. iterum should have some distinguishing name, and yet maintaining the two primipili, they arrive at the conclusion that that name was princeps praetorii, and try and demonstrate it from two other inscriptions. I deal with this in an appendix on the princeps praetorii.

In 1938 come two works of great value as far as the primipilate is concerned, but one of them is spoilt by the acceptance of the ideas of Domaszewski and improving on them. The first I wish to consider is the work of Lopuszanski, the last word at the moment on the prefect of the camp. He undertook

to examine the development of a professional officer corps. He differed from Keyes in that he took the prefect of the camp in Egypt to have been the ducenarian legionary prefect (52). He also denied the Deomaszewski theory that prefects of the camp sometimes commanded auxiliary camps (53). Further he saw that it was wrong to call the prefecture of the camp the summit of the militia equestris before the reign of Claudius, as in fact the order ~~of~~ tenure of posts was fixed. He believed that the primipili and the prefects of the camp did not belong to the equestrian order (54). Like others he devoted much space to the problem of Liternius Fronto, and referred to the supposed inscription of Pliny and Elder. He repeated the Durry conclusions relating to the "praetorian" career and recruitment (55). On the vital question of who the ducenarian prefects of Gallienus were, he decided for the pp. II rather than the prefect of the camp (56). He did not believe that the prefect of the camp survived this change long.

We turn back slightly <sup>t</sup> in time to the work of Durry, which appeared early enough in the same year to be referred to by Lopuszanski. Like others he based himself largely on the work of Domaszewski. Thus he described the primipili as "prétoriens ~~d'~~ origine~~x~~" without a justifying footnote (57). He took the career of M. Vettius Valens as a particularly brilliant example of a typical career, contrasting it with the career of legionaries who reached the centurionate. He stated that the praetorian centurion in the first two centuries was always an old praetorian

soldier (59). He claimed that the three higher grades of the legionary centurionate were mostly reared for praetorian centurions. On the pre-Claudian system he repeated that the primipilate was the foundation of the whole equestrian career at that time (61). He distinguished clearly the primipilaris procuratorial career from the equestrian, but asserted concerning the latter that equestrians rarely reach the top (62). He therefore interpreted the career of T. Pontius Sabinus as a transfer aimed at reaching this better primipilaris career. To this point he added the fact that the primipilares served at Rome as officers and commanded citizen troops. He noted that the primipili bis were always ex-praetorian tribunes. (63) In his treatment of the prefecture of the camp he remarked that from Domitian onwards this post was held by primipilares who had been Rome centurions (65). In the third century these men could proceed to the Rome tribunates.

M. Durry's work, with its clear delineation of the career of the primipilaris-procurator, is of considerable importance. Where it fails in my opinion, and in a sense was bound to fail, is in the fact that it is based on too slight a foundation of evidence. Clearly M. Durry had not the time to study all the material on the primipilares, so he has tended to concentrate on notable careers, which has tended to over-simplify his picture, and exaggerate the proportion of primipilares rising to the heights. In a number of matters, as will be clear to the reader, he has simply followed Domaszewski. Nothing can

detract from the merit of his treatment of the subject of his book, the praetorian cohorts.

The picture given by M. Durry was not modified by Passerini, in his work on the Rome cohorts which appeared in the following year. Also in 1939 appeared the paper of A.N. Sherwin-White on "Procurator Augusti", which made clear the relationship to the development of the Imperial Civil Service of the posts held by primipilares up to 69.

In 1941 E. Birley challenged the conclusions of M. Durry on a number of points, the paper tending to be overlooked by those who wrote on the subject later (66). In that paper, after first examining the evidence for the legionary centurionate, and reaching conclusions similar to those of Baehr, he turned to the primipilares. He noted that in the majority of cases men promoted beyond the primipilate give no information concerning the posts held before it. He examined the conclusions of M. Durry on a statistical basis, from various approaches, and concluded that his and Domaszewski's assertions were based on too slight a foundation of fact. There are a number of interesting pointers in this paper, and it showed the need for a full examination of the primipilares.

In 1944 H. Zwicky wrote a doctoral dissertation on the use of the soldier in administration. It was used in a review of the evidence for the particular subject in which he was interested. Here however we are concerned with the question, what was his new contribution to the subject of the primipilares

The answer is that in the main he followed Domaszewski and M. Durry. Notably he repeated the claim that the prefect of the camp commanded auxiliary camps also (66). His attempt to straighten out the pre-Claudian career is interesting (67). The statement that the procuratorships were awarded to primipilares in recognition of distinguished service, and were not thought of as the natural goal of the career, is much nearer the truth than the picture given by M. Durry (68). One can hardly see the point, however, in saying that the legionary tribunate could still be held by primipilares after Claudius on the basis of two inscriptions nearly two centuries apart ! (69). His statement that the primipilaris career is proved to be confined to ex-praetorian soldiers because all the cases known to us of primipilares are men from the guard or the army-staff is inaccurate (70). He repeated M. Durry's conclusions as to the general superiority of the primipilaris procuratorial career over the equestrian, though he added the important point that the primipilares could never compete numerically, so there was never a serious overall threat to the equestrian order (71). The best thing in the whole thesis is his discussion of the men ex equite Romano, where he set the expression in its context, among several similar expressions, and showed that there is no need to suppose that these men lost their social status.

Finally, we come to the work of H.G. Pflaum on the procurators, of supreme importance in its chosen field. He has accepted unreservedly Domaszewski and M. Durry. On the

other hand, his treatment of the primipilaris procurators is of great importance. He saw that the promotion to the centenarian procuratorships from the first primipilate did not begin till the time of Hadrian (73). He noted that in the period Vespasian to Trajan primipilaris procurators rarely went beyond their first post, and drew the conclusion that the post was a reward, not a prelude to a further career (74). The role of the castra peregrina was noted by him also (75). Finally, his threefold division of procuratorial careers and remarks on promotion clarify the picture enormously (76). He noted the apparent speed of promotion in primipilaris careers, and drew the conclusion that this was because of their already advanced age (77). All this is of course in addition to the fact that without his book there would have been no possibility of the type of analysis of the primipilaris procuratorial career I have attempted. The assistance rendered to me personally, and soon to the world at large, by his book, originally intended as a companion for the first, Les carrières procuratoriennes, is incalculable, though some reflection will be found in the constant references to the proofs of it in my prosopography.

More than these books I do not need to mention, for I am only concerned with books that in one way or another make fundamental contributions to the study of the primipilares. There are a number of other works, but they cover so small portions of the field that I have thought it better to refer

to them in the individual chapter to which they are relevant. The time has now come to try and assess the results achieved by these writers, and to indicate where I have particularly sought to improve on them. The basic study is that of the Rangordnung, and there has been little serious attempt to modify certain of the views expressed there. Karbe's work, on the whole, is seldom quoted, though he gives a good cover of the subject. Since the work of Domaszewski the tendency has been to concentrate on particular aspects. Thus the prefecture of the camp has been explained to a large extent, with the exception of its relationship to the post primuspilus iterum. It will be seen that in the studies referred to this difficulty has been passed over to a large extent. The career through the Rome tribunates to the procuratorships has also on the whole been adequately dealt with. What has not been done is to examine more closely the claims of Domaszewski regarding the primipilares being mostly Italians and mostly from the guard. Refutations of these claims have been produced, but these have been largely ignored, and a full-scale examination is called for. Further, *claims of M. Dumy in relation to the importance of the primipilares procuratorships* the/required examination, and probability of primipilares receiving procuratorships. Most of all, there is the need for all these lines of investigation concerning the primipilate to be presented in a single study, so that a view of the value and importance of the primipilares may be fairly made. To such a study an examination of the careers of individual primipilares is necessary concomitant. I believe the results have justified

the attempt.

THE REPUBLICAN PRIMIPILATE

The centurio primi pili was among the primi ordines, who are frequently cited with the tribuni militum as being present at councils of war (1). The primi ordines also appear as the spokesmen of the legions (2). A very interesting passage bearing on the primi ordines and the primipilate in particular is Livy XLII 32. Thirty-two centurions, qui primos ordines duxerant, complained that not only had they been recalled to service, but that they had been given lower ranks. P. Licinius in reply cited senatus consultum which fixed fifty as the age above which exemption was granted. Clearly therefore these men had not yet reached that age. Spurius Ligustinus, a tribune of the plebs, received permission to speak, and recounted his military career. After two years as miles he had become decimus hastatus. His next commander made him primus hastatus. In the next campaign he became primus princeps, and then he served as primus pilus four times in a few years. He had been awarded six civic crowns, and had been decorated thirty-four times. He had done twenty-two years' service, and was now over fifty. Nevertheless he was willing to re-enter service and take the rank allocated to him by the tribuni militum. Amid acclaim he was made primuspilus, and the centurions' resistance collapsed. The date was 171 B.C.. The system clearly emerges from this passage. Rank was allocated for one campaign, by the commander. The rank of primus pilus could thus be held for one campaign without the holder having the

right to claim the same rank for the next. Hence Spurius is justifiably proud of the fact that he had been primuspilus four times in a few years. A campaign normally was regarded as lasting one year, as is implied by the phrasing of Spurius, with its reference to paucis annis, and by the case of P. Salonius, who had held the primipilate and the military tribunate alternis prope annis. (3). This was in 342 B.C., and in 359-8 B.C. there was the case of F. Tullius - septimum primum pilum iam Tullius ducebat (4). He acted as a representative of the soldiers, who wanted battle.

The position of the primuspilus in the legion in battle-array is given by Livy (5) as in the third line, the triarii. Presumably his position would be on the right of the line, the place of honour. Some ideas of the quality necessary for this post can be gained from Livy's description of the two primipili of the opposing forces, the Roman strenuus vir peritusque militiae, the Latin viribus ingens bellatorque primus. While personal fighting ability is required the value of the experience of these men is also recognised. In the panic of Hannibal's invasion in 212 B.C. we even find a retired primuspilus given the command. He is described as insignis inter primipili centuriones et magnitudine corporis et animi. (6).

Our next main body of information is from the Commentaries of Caesar, and we should remember that in his day the army was tending to become more and more professional. The tribuni militum and centuriones primorum ordinum still act together as representatives of the legions (7), and appear at the legate's council (8).

The qualifications are courage, experience, and virtus (9). That the post of primus pilus was still an appointment for one year is suggested by the reference to Titus Balventius qui superiore anno primum pilum duxerat, viro forti et magnae auctoritatis (10).

A clue to the age of one primus pilus is given by the fact that he was killed bringing help to his son, which suggests an age above forty at least (11). Of special interest are the cases of men re-enlisting as evocati during the civil wars: Erat Crastinus evocatus in exercitu Caesaris, qui superiore anno apud eum primum pilum in legione X duxerat, vir singulari virtute. (12). It is also noted in the case of L. Pupius that he had held the primipilate at least twice (13).

On the question of promotion of the primuspilus we have already noted the case of P. Salonus, and there the demand was that the tribune should not afterwards be primuspilus. The interesting question of whether Salonus was originally a centurion or originally a tribune is not answered. More positive evidence for promotion is the case of L. Septimius, one of Pompey's murderers. He had been at least a centurion, for Caesar says of him that bello praedonum apud eum (Pompeium) ordinem duxerat,(14) and Lucan waxed eloquent on his treachery, referring to the posito..pilio (15). It is possible therefore that he had been a primus pilus. What is not certain is what his military tribunate was, whether a rank attained in the Roman army before his adhesion to Ptolemy or a rank attained in the latter's army. However, what we expect in this period is not so much regular

appointment, but appointments made through expediency. In this category presumably comes the clear case of L. Firmius, who was primus pilus and tribunus militum in a Triumviral legion. (16) That is sufficient to justify us in suggesting that when Augustus appointed primipilares as well as equestrians to legionary tribunates he may have been employing an expedient which had emerged as a temporary practice in the civil wars.

The only other clear connection between Augustan promotion of primipilares and Republican practice is that a cavalry ala is known as the ala Scaev<sup>l</sup>ae. (17) The commander from whom this regiment has taken its name has been identified with the Cassius Scaeva, whose promotion to the primipilate is mentioned in the civil wars (18). The inscription appears to be early, and it is of a cavalry regiment at a time when <sup>Caesar</sup> ~~he~~ was beginning to put these units on a more permanent basis (19). Here again it is clearly possible that Augustus had some precedent for his use of primipilares.

Under the heading of civil activities of primipili we may note that M. Laetorius, a primuspilus, was awarded the dedication of a temple by the people in 495 B.C., the purpose being to slight the consuls (20). Orosius refers to a primipilaris as concerned in the drawing-up of Sulla's proscription list (21). The use of the term primipilaris is not attested under the Republic, and it may well be that this is the word of Orosius rather than his source. Whether this activity of a serving or retired primuspilus had any parallels is unknown to us.

The primus pilius, or centurio primi pili as he was more generally known at this time, was under the Republic a centurion, appointed to the highest centurionate in the legion for a set period of time, probably one year. The post could be held more than once. He in conjunction with the other primi ordines took part in councils of war and spoke for the legions. His age could be below fifty, and quite probably was above forty. Experience, and fighting ability were his characteristics. As far as promotion was concerned, while there are isolated examples of promotions that under Augustus became the regular thing, it seems that the absence of a permanent army structure and social barriers stood in the way of the centurio primi pili. Most significant of all for us are the things unattested under the Republic, despite the wealth of military information that we have. The prefect of the camp and the very word primipilaris are absent from records. The auxilia were not as yet largely officered by regular commanders (22). The Rome tribunates, like the Rome Cohorts, did not yet exist. The special donative of the primuspilus, which placed him in so advantageous a position socially, may not yet have existed. Thus, while in a number of ways expedients of the civil wars period may have suggested to Augustus methods of employing men who had been centuriones primi pili, it was his work in setting up a permanent structure, within which they were given an important part, that gave the primipilares their peculiar importance. In the next chapter we shall study that part.

THE AUGUSTAN PRIMIPILATE

There is a general point that applies to all the work of Augustus, and in particular to his use of the primipilares; that he was experimenting. In the previous chapter I have given the picture of the centurio primi pili as he existed under the Republic. Augustus as far as we can gather changed little as far as the position of this man in the legion was concerned. His innovation was to use these men, after their tenure of the primipilate, in a wide variety of duties, some of which were to become permanently connected with the primipilares, others of which were to lapse or become the property of other corps. To attempt to apply rigid rules concerning order of promotion, etc., to this period, is to obscure the picture, not to clarify it. There is a sense in which all the posts held by primipilares in this period, except the tribunates of the guard, were temporary positions rather than points in a regular career.

The first creation of Augustus was the primipilaris. While, as we have noted, men who had held the primipilate in Republican times continued to serve as centurions, or in the civil wars re-enlisted as evocati, the regular title of rank, primipilaris, and the regular use of these men in superior posts, date from Augustus. He also created the numerus at Rome, the pool from which vacancies could be supplied and from which men for special tasks could be drawn. Almost certainly it was he who instituted the specially large gratuity on completion

of office that made the primipilaris proverbial for his wealth.

From the pool at Rome he supplied certain offices in the army. The careers including these posts appear in their bare bones in the tables of this chapter, and in their entirety in the Prosopography. Let us examine first the constituent posts. The man who had been primuspilus could become primuspilus again. Clearly this is the meaning of the phrase pp. bis which occurs so frequently in these careers. It is to be compared rather with the cases of trib. mil. bis, etc., than with the use of pp. bis to indicate that a man had been both primuspilus and primuspilus iterum, which we shall see coming in later, when the practice of iteration of the ordinary primipilate *had ceased. There are examples of the primipilate* held three times, those of Q. Cruttius and the unknown of IX 1630. From what we have seen of practice under the Republic, when iteration was common also, it seems most likely that the tenure of each primipilate was for one year. Whether the two primipilates followed directly upon one another or were separated by other posts is uncertain, as most of the careers are drawn up as summaries rather than as lists of posts in chronological order.

The primuspilus could also be praefectus castrorum. I have a full chapter on this post, and here we are only concerned with its development as part of the primipilaris career. Therefore it is enough to say that this was the man responsible for the camp, be it of one legion or more. The post at this time was not attached to any particular legion, as far as we can

judge, and it seems best to think of it as one to which primipilares were appointed as and when needed, but not yet as a permanent establishment post in a legion, forming part of a regular career. The article by R. Syme in Germania, 1932, vol. XVI pp. 109-11, though brief, is a very good appreciation of the position of the praefectus castrorum at this time. The fact that it had not yet been restricted to primipilares is shown by the fact that Arrius Salanus held it after a normal equestrian career. Sometimes in this period the expression praef. cast. Imp. appears. It is attested for Sex. Aulienus and the unknown of XI 711. I can only think that it means that the men in question had held the post when the emperor himself was on campaign.

The legionary tribunates at this period, apart from those reserved for laticlavii, were occupied by equestrians or primipilares. Here too, as a glance through the tables will show, iteration was possible. <sup>of the</sup> The auxiliary commands the prefectures of cohorts and alae are both attested <sup>for</sup> primipilares, but it must be remembered that the alae could also be commanded <sup>by</sup> equestrians, and both types of units by their own notables. Thus Domaszewski was wrong to describe the primipilate as the basis of the militia equestris of the period, (1). The primipilares seem to have had the fullest and <sup>most</sup> varied careers, but the evidence does not show that they staffed the majority of the auxiliary commands or of the legionary tribunates. Rather they were used freely whenever the High Command thought

it necessary to put a unit under the command of a regular officer of considerable experience.

The Rome tribunates will be discussed in relation to the problem of order of posts. Here it need only be noted that, with the exception of L. Ovinus Rufus, the primipilares who are attested as holding such tribunates in this period only commanded praetorian cohorts, not necessarily at Rome. Of other posts that of praefectus classis appears in primipilaris careers, presumably because it is still essentially a purely military post.

Three posts seem to call for special consideration. They are those of praefectus cohortium, praefectus civitatum and praefectus fabrum. The first was made equivalent to praefectus castrorum by Domaszewski (2), under the impression that the latter post could be held over a purely auxiliary camp. The fullest definition of the post is given in the case of P. Cornelius Ciciatricula, where the force is defined as consisting of four cohorts. Cn. Manlius appears to have held a similar command. It seems from the scanty evidence to have been a temporary brigading of a number of units under one experienced commander. The praefectus civitatum was a military governor, generally in an area where conditions did not favour the setting-up of a province (3). Again, it is a temporary position, to which a primipilaris or a native chief (V 7231 - M. Iulius Cottius) could be appointed, not an establishment post reserved for men of a particular type of career. The praefectus fabrum

was an officer on a governor's staff, or sometimes on the emperor's. A post with the same name was often held by young equestrians (4), and continued to be after the reign of Claudius, but Mr. Birley has seen the essential difference, namely that the primipilares served on the staffs of governors of Imperial provinces, where their experience was of great value, and the equestrians, holding this post as a starting-point to their career, served on the staffs of governors of senatorial provinces or with consuls or praetors at Rome (5). This distinction is fundamental. It seems probable that Claudius abolished the post in Imperial provinces, as the primipilares who held the post seem all to belong to the period up to and including the reign of Claudius. There is one more post to mention, that of praefectus levis armaturae, which appears to be an appointment in a frontier district to the command of local levies.

In examining these various posts it should have become clear to the reader that each of them was a command which could be held by a primipilaris but in all cases, not even excluding the prefecture of the camp nor the Rome tribunates (Cn. Manlius), men of other antecedents could hold them also. The careers of the primipilares tend to show a greater variety than those of the equestrian officers, but they are not careers as we know them later, comprising posts the majority of which were restricted to primipilares, held in a more or less rigid order of importance. They are rather a collection of miscellaneous posts to which the primipilaris has been appointed, the order depending

on the particular needs of the time. Let us examine the careers themselves for evidence on this last point.

The basic order has been stated by Keyes (6) to be primuspilus, tribunus militum, praefectus equitum, praefectus castrorum, praefectus fabrum. The other posts that we have mentioned above do not appear regularly enough for any generalisation. Here are the tables of careers, drawn up as far as possible according to their idiosyncracies.

(a) "P~~er~~fect"

AE 1954.104

[primo]pilo bis, [tribu]no militum bis, [pr]aefecto [e]quitum bis [pr]aefecto castrorum, [p]raefecto navium...

XI 711

[pp., tr.] mil. IIII, [praef. eq.] III, praef. cast. Imp. Caes., praef. classis...

(b) Careers where praefectus fabrum occurs early.

Cn. Baebius Celsus

prim. pil., praef. fabr..

M. Cestius

primo pilo, praef. fabrum, trib. mil..

C. Purtilius Atinas

prim. pil. leg. -, pr. fab., pr. equi..

(c) Careers where praefectus equitum is omitted.

Sex. Aulienus

primo pilo II, tr. mil., praef. levis armat., - praef. - castr. Imp. Caesaris Aug. et Ti. Caesaris Augusti, praef. classis, praef. fabr..

L. Curiatius

prim. pil., trib. mil. II, praef. castr., praef. fabr..

C. Musanus

primo pilo bis, tr. mil., praefecto stratopedarci.

- C. Norbanus quadratus prim. pil., trib. milit.,  
praef. castr..
- C. Servilius pp., tr. mil., praef. castr..
- IX 367z pp., tr. mil., praef. cast..
- (d) Careers where praefectus castrorum is omitted.
- P. Cornelius Cicatricula prim. pil. bis, praefect.  
equit., praef. clas., praef.  
cohortium civium Romanorum  
quattuor in Hispania, trib.  
mil..
- Curtilius prim. pil. leg. VI, praef.  
cohortis, tr. mil., praef.  
equit., praef. fabr..
- C. Pompullius prim. pil., trib. mil., praef.  
eq..
- XI 71z (a) pp. [II ?], tr. mil., pr. [eq. ?],  
praef. fabr..
- (e) Careers where praefectus equitum precedes tribunus militum.
- L. Ap<sup>o</sup>n<sup>o</sup>ius pp., praefecto equitu.,  
tribuno militum leg. VII et  
leg. XXII, praefect. castrorum
- P. Cornelius Cicatricula prim. pil. bis, praefect.  
equit., praef. clas., praef.  
cohortium civium Romanorum  
quattuor in Hispania, trib.  
mil..
- (f) Careers where praefectus cohortis precedes primuspilus.
- L. Attius Lucanus signifero, centurioni, tribuno  
cohort. V Ingenuorum, [pp. ?]
- M. Tarquiti<sup>o</sup> Saturninus praef. coh. scut., primo pilo  
leg. XXII, trib. milit. leg.  
III, leg. XXII.
- (g) Careers where praefectus equitum precedes primuspilus.
- L. Vibrius Punicus praef. equitum, primopilo,  
trib(und) mil(itum), praef.  
Corsicae.

(h) Careers where praefectus cohortis follows primuspilus.

Curtilius prim. pil. leg. VI, praef. cohortis, tr. mil., praef. equit. praef. fabr..

(i) Careers where praefectus castrorum follows primuspilus.

L. Octavius Balbus prim. pil., praef. castror., praef. fabr..

Q. Paesidius Macedo prim. pil. leg. IX Hispania., praef. castror. leg. IV Scythic. trib, milit. leg. eiusdem.

L. Praecilius Clemens primipilari leg. V Macedonicae, praefecto castrorum leg. eiusdem.

(j) Careers of equestrians holding primipilaris posts.

Arrius Salanus trib. mil. legion III August., leg. X Geminae, praef. equit., praef. castr., praef. fab..

Vespasius Pollio ter tribunum militumque praefectum castrorum.

(k) Careers where there is insufficient evidence to classify them

P. Fannius pp. leg. VI., praef. equit..

Glitius Barbarus primipilaris, p[raef. -], tr. mil., praef. fabr. Ti. C[laudi Caesaris Aug. Germ.].

C. Mucius Scaeva praef. cohort., primopilo leg. VI Ferrat..

M. Oppius centur. leg. VI, pp... trib. leg. II, praef....castr..

AI 712 (a) prim. pil., praef. eq..

XII 4371 pra[ef. -], primipilus, tribunu[s militum].

---

It will be seen that there are only two perfect cases, both subject to their restoration being correct. Even in these cases

there is the complicating factor of iteration of posts, there being no way of telling if the unknown of AE 1954. 104, for instance, meant that his two military tribunates and two cavalry commands were both held at the same point of time in his career, or whether he was conveniently summarising his career. Thus a most complicated series of changes of post, involving perhaps the tenure of a military tribunate, then a prefecture of cavalry, then a second legionary tribunate, may lie behind even the inscriptions that appear to confirm the order of appointment suggested above. The exceptions to that order are arranged in a rough classification above. Not all the anomalies appear in these headings, as a careful study will show. It should be clear from the careers that any attempt to rationalise these examples into a career which involves a regular ladder of promotion is doomed to failure. Consider for a moment the idea that the prefecture of the camp was the top rung of that ladder. I append a list of cases where other posts are held after that prefecture.

Arrius Salanus (j)	praefectus fabrum.
Sex. Aulienus (c)	praefectus classis, praefectus fabrum.
L. Curiatius (c)	praefectus fabrum.
L. Octavius Balbus (i)	praefectus fabrum.
q. Paesidius Macedo(i)	tribunus militum.
XI 711 (a)	praefectus classis.
AE 1954. 104	praefectus fabrum, praefectus navium.

The answer clearly here is that praefectus castrorum, praefectus classis, praefectus fabrum, tend to be the three senior posts, yet even in saying that, you must take into

account section (b), as far as the post of praefectus fabrum is concerned, and the career of P. Cornelius Cicatricula (e) as far as the post of praefectus classis is concerned. To attempt to say more, particularly about the auxiliary posts and the legionary tribunates, is pointless. Clearly the Romans themselves had not given these careers a logical structure. That had to await the reforms of Claudius. The latter, as far as we can judge, made the following changes. He decided the order of tenure of the posts of praefectus cohortis, tribunus militum, and praefectus equitum, curtailed the practice of appointing primipilares to these posts, and made the prefecture of the camp an establishment post in each legion. It is convenient to attach the name of Claudius to these last two changes, as he is other-wise known as a military reformer, and the changes seem to take place about his time, but of course the details are unknown to us.

A word is necessary on dating. The title of this chapter is perhaps slightly misleading. While the system we have been discussing was primarily the work of Augustus, it continued after his death. Some time in the reign of Claudius it was superseded to a large extent, due to the reforms referred to above. The practice of occasionally appointing primipilares to posts held normally after the reign of Claudius by equestrians continued till 69. The cases of this will be referred to in our next chapter, on the developing ~~of~~ primipilate; a number of the cases given in this chapter are undated, and in such

cases there is always the possibility that they belong to as late as the reign of Nero.

Further promotion, beyond the posts already mentioned, is only attested for P. Anicius Maximus, P. Palpellius Clodius Quirinalis, and Catonius Iustus. The first really belongs to the next chapter, as he has none of the irregularities associated with the Augustan primipilate. The promotion from prefect of the camp of a British legion to prefect of the camp in Egypt forms our justification for mentioning him here. Nevertheless the problems of his career are intimately bound up with those of the prefecture of the camp in Egypt, and cannot be explored in a general chapter. P. Palpellius Clodius Quirinalis has an intermediary career, for though he held the prefecture of the Ravenna fleet after the primipilate and the legionary tribunate, that prefecture is described as a procuratorship. This is notable both as evidence for the beginning of change in the status of the Italian fleet prefectures, and for the introduction of a procuratorship into a career which did not contain a praetorian tribunate. Finally Catonius Iustus, a centurio primi ordinis, rose to be praetorian prefect to Claudius. Unfortunately his route is not known.

The Rome tribunates follow.

P. Aemilius	primopilo bis, praefecto equit., tribuno chort. IIII praetor..
C. Baebius Atticus	primopil. leg. V Macedonic., praef. civitatium Moesiae et Treballiae, praef. civit-

- atium in Alpihus Maritumis,  
tr. mil. coh. VIII pr., prim-  
opil. iter., procurator Ti.  
Claudi Caesaris Aug. Germanici  
in Norico.
- L. Ovinus Rufus  
prim. ordo cohortium praet.  
Divi Augusti, prim. pil. leg.  
XIIII Gem., trib. mil. coh.  
XI urb., trib. mil. coh. III  
praet., praef. fab..
- T. Pontinius  
primopil. leg. V Macedonicae,  
praef. [eq.], trib. chor. V  
p [raet..].
- M. Vergilius Gallus Lusius  
prim. pil. leg. XI, praef.  
cohort. Ubiorum peditum et  
equitum, praef. fab. III, trib.  
mil. cohort. primae, idiologo  
ad Aegyptum.
- X 1711  
[7] leg. VII Macedonic.,  
pr [imipilo] leg. IIII Scyth-  
icae, trib. coh...praet.,  
primo pilo iter. leg. XVI  
Ga[ll.], proc. Ti. Claudii  
Caesaris Au[g...]
- Cn. Manlius  
trib. cohortis praet., praef-  
ect. cohortium.
- Maxumus  
[t]rib. [c]oh. II praetoria [e]  
pri[m]o pilo bis, proc [u]r.  
T[i] Claudii Caesaris Augusti  
Germanici, prae[f..]s bis iam

---

They differ from the posts which we have been considering in that, as far as we know, they were from the first reserved for primipilares. Cn. Manlius seems to have been an exception to this rule, as Arrius Salanus and Vespasius Pollio were as far as the post of praefectus castrorum is concerned. Apart

from the case of L. Ovinus Rufus, only the praetorian tribunate is attested for primipilaris careers of this period. There is not regular approach to this post, till the time of Claudius, when as is shown by the cases of C. Baebius Atticus, X 1711, and of Maxumus, a pattern of primuspilus, tribunus cohortis praetoriae, primuspilus iterum, procurator, began to emerge.

The same is true of the posts following the praetorian tribunate. Before the above pattern appeared we find one man becoming praefectus fabrum, another idiologus in Egypt, having been praefectus fabrum before his tribunate. This latter is a case of a praetorian tribune being appointed to a post which was later integrated into a procuratorial career. It is not to be interpreted as evidence of a possible civil career open to primipilares, but as an appointment of an individual to a post that needed to be filled, there being no regular practice as regarding the filling of such vacancies. More is said about this in the chapter on the primipilaris procurators.

There is one further type of post to which reference should be made, the ducenarian commands of the legions in Egypt. The veto on the entry of senators into Egypt meant that from the start the legions there must be commanded by ducenarians, prefects. There is nothing to suggest that these were ever recruited otherwise than from primipilares. The first case known to us is that of L. Cirpinus, pri. pil. iter., praef. leg. XXII, whom we are inclined to date before the reign of Claudius. This is important, because on the inscription, preceding the

prefecture, is the post of primuspilus iterum. The other examples of this post from early times come from inscriptions of men who served under Claudius as procurators, and from that of L. Rufellius Severus, who is dealt with in the next chapter. Therefore we must reckon with the possibility that ~~the~~ post of primuspilus iterum had appeared before the reign of Claudius, though not necessarily much before. It may be, as Mr. Birley has suggested to me, that the idea of the post came from the need for special training for the primipilaris destined for the command of an Egyptian legion.

The evidence for the corps from which primipilares were being recruited at this period is not great. L. Ovinus Rufus and the unknown of IX 2983 were praetorian centurions. Aufidienus Rufus and Helvius Rufus started in the ranks, most probably of the legions. C. Norbanus Quadratus, as a colonist from the East, probably began in the ranks of the legions. P. Anicius Maximus, also a colonist, probably obtained a direct commission as centurion. Ti. Iulius Italicus, Sabidius, Cassius Chaerea, and Catonius Iustus, were legionary centurions. L. Aurelius Rufus may have been centurio stratorum. Cn. Manlius and Arrius Salanus, and probably Vespasius Pollio, were equestrians who held posts otherwise associated with the primipilares.

The Augustan primipilate differed from the Republican chiefly in the use of the ex-primuspilus, who had now the new title primipilaris. These primipilares were used in a wide range of posts, as they were needed, without those posts

constituting a formal career. Significant for the later development of the primipilaris career was the appearance of the prefecture of the camp, not yet attached to a legion, of the Rome tribunates, (like the prefecture almost a primipilaris preserve, and the ducenarian legionary prefectures in Egypt (reserved also for the primipilares.) We have noted the possibility that the post of primuspilus iterum had made its appearance before the reign of Claudius. Thus while the creation of a stereotyped primipilaris career seems to have been largely the work of Claudius, it was Augustus who took the decisive step of using these men freely in new posts for which their training and experience fitted them. Some of his measures may have been suggested by Republican expedients, particularly by developments during the civil wars, but it was his work to exploit fully the potentialities of the primipilares. His system, building on the Republican centurio primi pili, and already in part anticipating the distinct primipilaris careers as they appear from the reign of Claudius onwards, is typical of the genius which took old institutions and turned them to new uses, without rigid definitions of posts tenable and their order of tenure.

THE DEVELOPING PRIMIPILATE

CLAUDIUS AND NERO.

In the previous chapter we have seen how Augustus embarked on an extensive employment of primipilares in a large number of posts, all military in nature, without attempting as far as we can see to create a special primipilaris career in which the order of posts would be carefully laid down. Under Tiberius and Caligula this system seems to have continued, though the possibility cannot be excluded that experiments anticipating later developments were being made. Thus we have already seen that the post of primuspilus iterum may have appeared before the reign of Claudius. Under the next two emperors, Claudius and Nero, two distinct careers appear, both restricted to primipilares. The first is the tenure of the prefecture of the camp immediately after the primipilate, this normally marking the <sup>end</sup> of the career. The second is the tenure of the three Rome tribunates, followed in some cases by primuspilus iterum, held at Rome or in a legion, and a procuratorship. Nevertheless, up to 69 we do find cases where posts as commanders of auxiliaries or as legionary tribunes are held within what we would otherwise describe as an ordinary career. These posts are in the case of the auxiliaries as praefecti, not as praepositi, i.e. they are not regarded as extraordinary commands.

It will be convenient to begin by mentioning these cases. C. Valerius Clemens commanded an ala in the Jewish

war of Vespasian. L. Antonius Naso held the prefecture of a civitas before his primipilate, and a legionary tribunate directly after it. This latter appointment cannot have been before the years 66-67. C. Nymphidius Sabinus held the prefecture of an ala before his Rome tribunate, which latter post he held at an age which argues extraordinary favour. The appointment of Pompeius Longinus to a praetorian tribunate by Galba, without his having fulfilled the normal conditions (e Galbae amicis, non ordine militiae), is explicable by the peculiar circumstances of 69, when clearly Galba did not feel able to rely on normal channels of promotion.

All these are examples drawn from the reign of Nero or slightly later. There are in addition the cases I referred to in my previous chapter, but reserved to this place, where part of the career belongs to the reign of Claudius, and features of the regular career are already present.

C. Baebius Atticus	primopil. leg. V. Macedonica, praef. civitatum Moesiae et Treballiae, praef. civitatum in Alpihus Maritumis, tr. mil. coh. VIII/pr., primopil. iter., procurator Ti. Claudii Caesaris Aug. Germanici in Norico.
X 1711	7] leg. VII Macedonica., pr[imipilo] leg. IIII Scythicae, trib. coh. praet., primopilo iter. leg. XVI 9d[II], proc. Ti. Claudii Caesaris Aug. g..
Maximus	[t]rib. [c]oh. II praetoria[e], pri[m]o pilo bis, proc [u]nt 7[i] Claudii Caesaris Augusti Germanici, prae [f...]s bis iam ...

Clearly already it was normal for a procuratorship to be

preceded by a praetorian tribunate and the post of primuspilus iterum. They do not show the two other Rome tribunates preceding the praetorian one, promotion to the latter post being direct from the primipilate, or in one case after the tenure of two posts as praefectus civitatum.

On this question of the tenure of all three Rome tribunates, apart from the inscription of L. Ovinius Rufus referred to in the previous chapter, the first inscription recording the tenure of two Rome tribunates, the praetorian and the urban, is that of Iulius Pollio, who was praetorian tribune in A.D. 55. Cases where all three were held are as follows, with their dates, C. Gavius Silvanus, praetorian tribune in A.D. 65, M. Vettius Valens, procurator in A.D. 66, and L. Antonius Naso, who passed through the Rome cohorts in the period 67-68. The tenure of all three tribunates was never universally enforced, as far as we can judge, but as this is a question of the individual career, in which the date has no special significance, the discussion of cases after 69 where not all three tribunates were held is confined to the chapter on the Rome tribunates, with one exception.

For the development of the post of praefectus castrorum we must revert to some texts given in the notes to the previous chapter. The chief change brought about by Claudius seems to have been the attaching of the prefects of the camp to the establishments of legions, one in each. Thus we find

L. Praecilius Clemens described as praefectus castrorum leg. eiusdem in an inscription set up by veterans who had completed their service some time in the period 36-43 A.D.. P. Anicius Maximus was prefect of the camp of the legion II Augusta in A.D. 43. Taking the two together one must conclude that the change came into effect in the early years of Claudius, and may have been at least prepared for in the preceding reign. The attempt of Keyes to demonstrate a loss of importance by the prefecture due to its ceasing to be the top rung of the equestrian military ladder (1) is based on the mistaken belief of Domaszewski that it was the top rung, and the inscription he uses, that of Q. Paesidius Macedo, does not prove his case. That inscription shows a military tribunate held after the prefecture of the camp. The fact that a legion is given for the prefecture suggests a date under or after Claudius. We know that the prefecture ranked above the equestrian legionary tribunate in the second century, and the most likely explanation of this inscription is that it comes from a transitional period under Claudius. If there is a difference in rank it may be due to the desire of Claudius to make the legionary tribunate the top of the tree, cf. his original policy with regard to the equestrian militiae (2). In that case the former policy was probably as short-lived as the latter.

Procuratorships become rather more common in this period. I give a complete survey of them from the chronological aspect

in the chapter on that subject, so here I will only point out development. The approach was via the Rome tribunates and pp iterum. The one perfect example of this is the career of M. Vettius Valens. For T. Iulius Ustus the praetorian tribunate and the procuratorship of Thrace are recorded, and for Valerius Paulinus the praetorian tribunate and the procuratorship of Gallia Narbonensis. Iulius Pollio, already referred to, reached the procuratorship of Sardinia.

On the question of the corps from which primipilares were recruited at this time, the facts are these. M. Vettius Valens and Sex. Cetrius Severus were both from the ranks of the praetorian guard. L. Rufellius Severus and Alfenus Varus had been centurions at Rome, which means, as demonstrated in our chapter on the primipilaris and the Rome cohorts, that they were either ex-praetorians or men ex equite Romano. On the other hand there is a group of men who must have been from the legions. L. Lepidius Proculus stated the fact. L. Gerellanus Fronto and his probable brother Gerellanus, L. Antonius Naso, C. Velius Rufus, and the unknown of III 143871, all coming from Helipolis, must have come up through the legions. To them may be added as a probability Antonius Taurus, and probably from the Eastern legions also was A. Instuleius Tenax. All of this group had at least begun their careers under Nero. Thus there was a continuing use of men from Eastern colonies. It is to be noted that on comparison these colonists did not come off

badly as far as further promotion is concerned.

The reign of Claudius thus marked a turning-point in the history of the primipilaris. Instead of a succession of posts governed by the circumstances of the moment he now had a regular career, including a monopoly of the Rome tribunates and the prefectures of the camp, now permanent posts on the staff of the legions. That career still ended for most purposes in a Rome tribunate or the prefecture of the camp. While procuratorships were sometimes held, there was no regular outlet that way, and the lack of any true hierarchy of posts made patronage all-important. Recruiting is attested from the praetorian guard and the legions, particularly those of the East. There is no apparent difference in promotion between these two groups. A centurion by direct commission might reach the primipilate, e.g. P. Anicius Maccimus. Irregularities still occurred, in posts held and in posts omitted. The main structure of the primipilaris career as we know it had been brought into existence, but it had not yet become a rigid system. Claudius and Nero clearly owed much to the work of Augustus and his successors, but their own contribution was by no means negligible.

#### THE EVENTS OF 69

While it is doubtful whether any permanent contribution to the primipilaris career was made by the events of the

civil wars, there were a number of promotions and set-backs in careers which were influenced by those events. L. Antonius Naso, whose career had been progressing steadily, lost his praetorian tribunate. Unlike Antonius Taurus, who appears never to have re-entered the service, he made a partial recovery, and received a procuratorship. This was too late after his tribunate to hold out much promise of further promotion, T. Suedius Clemens also seems to have suffered neglect as not one of Vespasian's own choice. On the other hand, only in the circumstances of civil war could the unknown of XI 57<sup>44</sup> have been promoted from the prefecture of the coast in Mauretania to primuspilus iterum.

More outstanding were the prefects of the period. Nymphidius Sabinus received his earlier, in 65, but is included here as an example like the others of an emergency appointment. He must have been one of the youngest praetorian prefects ever. Alfenus Varus had only been prefect of the camp at the time of his elevation to the prefecture. This brings out a useful point, that from the purely military point of view a man who had been primuspilus was equipped to take charge of the praetorian troops. Hence there are examples throughout the period with which we are mainly concerned of men, particularly primipilares, promoted to the prefecture with little experience other than military. Arrius Varus clearly owed

his praetorian prefecture to his association with Antonius Primus, as he did his prefecture of the annona. The case of Plotius Firmus is more difficult. When he was elected as praetorian prefect by the soldiers after Otho's seizure of power he was prefect of the vigiles. We do not know if he had obtained this latter prefecture by services during the civil war, or attained it under Nero or Galba by normal selection. In any case these prefects, as Catonius Iustus, are not to be taken as evidence for a regular supply of primipilares to the great prefectures. This was a second-century development.

#### THE FLAVIANS

The evidence for this period is scanty, but nevertheless of extreme interest. The first point to be noted is the evidence that the urban tribunates outside Rome were on a different plane from the other tribunates inside Rome. In the career of C. Velius Rufus and of Pompeius Proculus the absence of tribunates in the other two Rome corps and of the post of primuspilus iterum is notable. As this peculiarity was, as far as we can judge, continuous throughout the period it is reserved for discussion in the chapter on the Rome tribunates. On career development we note in the cursus of Cn. Pompeius Homullus, and to a lesser extent in that of C. Velius Rufus the development of a hierarchy. C. Velius Rufus was in fact the first primipilaris of whom

we know to hold two procuratorships. Cn. Pompeius Homullus did even better, rising to a secretariat. He was apparently decorated by Domitian, so that the procuratorial part of his career may belong to the time of Trajan. An equally notable career was that of the unknown of XI 5744. This man was prefect of an ala presumably in 69, <sup>and</sup> from that post, after a primipilate, he proceeded, after a career conforming to a rigid pattern, to the fourth ducenarian procuratorial echelon. Clearly he may antedate C. Velius Rufus, but his exact dating is a matter for conjecture. We thus have evidence for primipilares being admitted into the developing procuratorial system, and a career of sorts emerging as distinct from the single posts previously attested.

On the question of recruiting it will be recalled that C. Velius Rufus was one of the Heliopolis group. There is abundant evidence for equestrians. Marcius Titianus, from Balbura, in Lyan<sup>cia</sup>, after the prefecture of a cohort entered the centurionate and reached the post of primuspilus iterum. L. Decrius Longinus after being praefectus fabrum was commissioned as centurion and died as prefect of the camp. These two belong to this period or possibly in part at least to the one following. Cn. Pompeius Homullus, whom for reasons given in the procuratorial chapter I suspect to have been a Spanish equestrian, began his career under the Flavians. Sex. Vibius Gallus also must have begun his

career under the <sup>l</sup>Flavians. The fact that he came from the East and yet was trecenarius suggests that he too was a centurion ex equite Romano. Q. Raecius Rufus, also a trecenarius, could have been either an evocatus or ex equite Romano. The Italian origin of Q. Petronius Modestus suggests the same two alternatives for him. He reached the first ducenarian procuratorial echelon.

The most important point about the Flavian period then was the growth of a hierarchy within the procuratorships, into which the primipilares were introduced to some extent. In this context the inscription XI 5744 is very important, for it shows a fully-developed primipilaris procuratorial career which is probably earlier than the time of Domitian. Among other points to be noticed is the growth of evidence for the men ex equite Romano, and the even balance of possibilities. Some finished as praefecti castrorum, some reached procuratorships.

#### TRAJAN AND HADRIAN

The notable changes of this period again concern procuratorships. Whether there were more procuratorships going to primipilares at this period is an open question. Elsewhere I have made plain that there are fundamental considerations militating against the arrival at the procuratorships of a large number of primipilares. What is evident, and to some degree foreshadowed in the Flavian

period, is the accession of primipilares to more and more important posts. Two of the most notable men of the period, both praetorian prefects, Marcius Turbo and Sulpicius Similis were primipilares, a third Ti. Claudius Secundinus went to a secretariat, and thence to the post of praefectus annonae. We have already suggested that the procuratorial career of Cn. Pompeius Homullus fell under Trajan.

The question of corps of recruitment now becomes acute. Some of the evidence falls naturally into groups. There is one of ex-praetorians, who have served under one or both emperors. They include four primipilares, a praefectus castrorum, and a man whose inscription is broken at the post of primuspilus. Two points emerge here. To be an evocatus in itself did not ensure further promotion. The man most likely to wax eloquent about his career prior to the primipilate was the man who had not advanced beyond it.

Of the men ex equite Romano the fortunes were mixed. Of the three from Spain, (including M. Calpurnius Seneca but excluding Cn. Pompeius Homullus), only Seneca entered the procuratorial career, and he reached the fourth-echelon post of prefect of the Misenum fleet. T. Pontius Sabinus, who transferred to the centurionate after two equestrian militiae, did not pass the first echelon procuratorship of Narbonensis. L. Gavius Fronto, from Attaleia in Pamphylia,

almost certainly a man ex equite Romano, became prefect of the camp. N. Marcius Plaetorius Celer, who probably had a direct commission as centurion, became a tribune of vigiles. Finally the career of Ti. Claudius Secundinus, suggests the distinct possibility that he was from the equestrian order rather than from the ranks of the praetorian guard.

The corps of origin is unknown in the case of L. Numerius Albanus, prefect of the Ravenna fleet, though his Italian origo virtually rules out initial service in the legions. T. Flavius Priamus became iuridicus in Egypt, in the first procuratorial ducenarian echelon. Most important of the unknowns are the two praetorian prefects. Of Similis we know nothing. Turbo came from Dalmatia, as we now know, which leaves the question wide open. From him we get the incidental information that the tribunates of the equites singulares at Rome were also held by primipilares.

Among the men who were definitely not from the praetorian guard we number Q. Geminus Sabinus and Gargilius Venator, both from Africa. Statilius Solon also was certainly non-Italian.

One person we have not mentioned so far marks a new opening for the primipilaris. Cammius Secundinus, an Italian, held a centenarian procuratorship after being primispilus and prefect of the camp. A second chance was

thus offered to primipilares who had failed to secure selection for the numerus at Rome.

On a question of nomenclature rather than of actual change in the nature of the post we may note that the first cases of praefectus legionis as opposed to praefectus castrorum legionis (in inscriptions relating to the prefects of the camp outside Egypt) belong to this period. Further, we may note that the garrisoning of Egypt by the legion II Traiana (3) made the prefect of this legion henceforth ducenarian, and that inside Egypt he continued to be known by the old title of praefectus castrorum.

Clearly in this period we have a bolder approach to the question of the possible employment of primipilares. Important posts were bestowed upon them. Nevertheless the men who obtained these appointments were the cream, a small proportion of the whole. We have noted particularly cases where praetorians and equestrians, men who could count on heavier backing than the legionary, did not advance beyond the primipilate or the prefecture of the camp. It should be remembered, of course, that the procuratorships played little part in the hopes of the ordinary centurion. The primipilate was enough, and the boast of L. Gavius Fronto that he was the first prefect of the camp from his town reminds us that this post, the highest non-senatorial post in a legion, was no mean prize.

As far as the various corps were concerned, no particular preference emerges, except for a tendency to favour men from Spain and perhaps equestrians generally. The talent of the individual and the strength of his backing probably played the greatest part in determining the career. If the fact that no legionary is positively identified among the procurators seems at first to support the views put forward by Domaszewski and Durry, it should be remembered that the man from the legions was the least likely to state his corps of origin, for there was nothing distinctive about it. This comes out clearly in the study of the recruiting for the centurionate. Domaszewski concluded that it was mainly from Italy in the first two centuries, which of course meant it could not be mainly from the legions. Yet Baehr and Birley (4) were able to demonstrate statistically that the majority of centurions at all times were recruited from the ranks of the legions. This is not discernible from the recorded careers, cf. Forni's lists, (5), because the centurion from the legions did not normally mention his previous career. This applies a fortiore to the primipilate. The only way therefore to demonstrate the presence of this element in the primipilate is by checking the province of origin where the province of origin of praetorian and legionary mainly differ, that is between approximately 69 and 193. Hence in this space

of time in particular great attention should be paid to the lists of known origins in the chapter on geographical origins.

Let us repeat the statement made before the digression above. Under the emperors Trajan and Hadrian there is no discernible difference in their treatment of primipilares which can be related to their corps of origin, apart from some slight indication of special favour for equestrians.

PIUS TO COMMODUS

There is a considerable contrast between this period and the preceding one. Whereas in the previous period the provinces were more than adequately represented, in this period Italy came back into prominence. In fact apart from two Africans, whose dating depends on a turn of phrase and is not secure, we have only two men from Dalmatia, one from Noricum and one from Heraclea, in Caria. The contrast is striking. It is tempting to see in it a reflection of the fact that the last three Antonines came to the throne without military experience, and so must have been more inclined to value the opinions of their praetorian prefects, who would naturally favour men who were their own protégés. In this respect it is interesting to note that M. Pflaum has suggested (6) that Gavius Maximus was a primipilaris, chiefly because of his career. If he were right one can

readily appreciate that his influence for his twenty years' tenure of the prefecture would favour the men from the guard. In fact we know that his successor, Tattius Maximus, was a primipilaris (158- c. 160), and M Bassaeus Rufus was praetorian prefect 169- c. 179<sup>f</sup>. In addition there is the unknown of EE VIII 478, whom (as M. Pflaum suggests) was in Syria 175-6. Clearly even without Gavius, we have here a number of influential men, able to push their fellows. In fact if Gavius Maximus was a primipilaris there would have been a primipilaris as praetorian prefect from Similis in c. 112 to c. 179, the only long gap being between c. 160 and 169. Short of the discovery of another inscription there is no means of demonstrating this, however.

A difficulty arised when we begin to examine the Italian primipilares. Clearly, from the point of view of georgraphical origin, they could equally well be evocati or men ex equite Romano. Of the praetorians who tell us what they were, three have primuspilus as their last recorded post, G. Didius Saturninus, Sextilius Marcianus, and M. Tillius Rufus. L. Petronius Sabinus and L. Cominius Maximus reached the first ducenarian procuratorial echelon, the latter dying without further advancement. Finally, M. Bassaeus Rufus became praetorian prefect. It is a salutary reminder of the imperfection of our knowledge, that

he is the only praetorian prefect who definitely started in the ranks of the praetorian guard. Among equestrians Satrius Crescens was a primuspilus and Cn. Marcius Rustius Rufinus became praetorian prefect. G. Sulpicius Ursulus became prefect of the camp. (His dating to this period is conjectural).

Of the other Italians L. Oranius Iustus became a prefect of the camp, C. Valerius Pansa became procurator of Britain (first echelon) and died as such, T. Desticius Severus procurator of Belgica, <sup>L. Mantennius Sabinus prefect of</sup> ~~and the~~ Egypt, and Tattius Maximus praetorian prefect.

L. Sempronius Ingenuus, whose antecedents are unknown became procurator of Dacia Porolissensis (third ducenarian echelon). T Flavius Genialis became praetorian prefect to Didius Iulianus, the shortness of the time after his praetorian tribunate making one suspect that the appointment was not according to seniority. Of centenarian procurators apart from T. Desticius Severus<sup>y</sup> who began his career thus, and carried it to such a triumphant conclusion, there is the unknown of VI 31871, procurator XL Galliarum, a praetorian, and L. Artorius Castus, already mentioned, who was procurator of Liburnia iure gladi.

A comparison with the appropriate list in the chapter on geographical origins will serve to strengthen the impression gained here, of Italians receiving considerable

preference at this period. But it should be pointed out that it can only be demonstrated for these reigns, and that in the last resort it is difficult to say whether the preference was for men from the praetorian guard or for Italian equestrians. Figures must not be too closely pressed. Clearly the last three Antonines have continued to make free use of the primipilares, <sup>The second century was his day,</sup> as he existed before the changes in his position that made him responsible for the collection of the annona.

Some inscriptions of which the dating is not exact may be considered here. C. Rufius Festus, an Italian, held a procuratorship in the first ducenarian echelon before his death. He belongs to the second half of the second century. Truttedius Clemens is dated to the period Hadr.- Commodus by M. Pflaum. (7) He is also Italian, and reached the first ducenarian echelon of the procuratorships. Valerius and the unknown of XIV 191 both reached the fourth ducenarian echelon, and the unknown of ~~EE~~ VIII 478 the praetorian prefecture. M. Pflaum has classed all three as Italian, (8) but I am unable to accept his reasoning. There are other cases where there is even less dating evidence, but these are most profitably discussed in the chapters which treat of the constituent parts of the primipilaris career.

### THE THIRD CENTURY

While for the first half of the third century there seems to be much continuity, in fact significant changes are taking place under the surface. The most important I have left over to the next chapter, for the change in the character of the post of primipilaris is mirrored in the legal sources long before any hint of it appears on inscriptions. As far as the prefectures of the legions are concerned, three new ducenarian prefectures appear with the creation of the Parthian legions, and mid-way through the century the prefects of the other legions become commanders also, on the disappearance of the senatorial officers who previously ranked above them. Before that occurs there is one interesting development, the tenure of two legionary prefectures in succession, by P. Aelius Marcellus, P. Aurelius Cassianus, and probably by the unknown of X 3342a. Also new posts enter the career. Apart from the new corps of recruitment, to which we shall come in a minute, there is the re-appearance of the legionary tribunate, in the case of Ulpus Filinus, and later of the tribunate of a mobile detachment drawn from two legions, in the case of L. Petronius Taurus Volusianus.

Before turning to the new sources of recruits already mentioned it will be convenient to dispose of the old. It must be remembered that we are once more in a period

when the praetorian guard and the legions were being recruited from very much the same provinces. Thus evidence of geographical origin cannot help out our other evidence here. Of known legionaries Aelius Triccianus after being prefect of the legion II Parthica was made a senator and sent by Macrinus to govern Pannonia. Such promotion for a primipilaris was unprecedented, and presumably called forth by the unusual circumstances of the time. P. Valerius Comazon started either as an auxiliary soldier or as a legionary. Distinctions of this sort were becoming less important in any case.

Of the praetorian soldiers the unknown of VI 32887, one of the transfers of Severus to the guard from the legions, died as a primipilaris. L. Arbustus Valentinus did the same thing. The unknown of VI 1645 reached at least the post of praefectus vehiculorum. Its precise rating is a matter of doubt in this case. (9) Of equestrians L. Petronius Taurus Volusianus received a direct commission, and ended up as praetorian prefect, and P. Aelius Primianus after a peculiar career ended up as tribune of vigiles.

A new source of recruits that loomed very large in this period was the castra peregrinorum. Source is perhaps the wrong word, as men from other corps of recruitment came to it, and perhaps only three of those <sup>posts</sup> connected with  
1

it could be classed as permanent staff<sup>ones.</sup> Nevertheless the passage through this camp seems to have played its part in the careers of the people named below. In itself, like other posts, it did not guarantee advancement. Trebonius Sossianus reached the primipilate from centurio frumentarius. C. Sulg<sup>us</sup> Caecilianus and P. Aelius Marcellus became prefects of legions from the posts of optio peregrinorum and centurio frumentarius respectively. Tib. Cl. Demetrius became procurator of the Maritime Alps, a centenarian post, having been miles and centurio frumentarius. C. Titius Similis, whose early career is lost to us, after a legionary centurionate became centurio frumentarius and then princeps peregrinorum, and after a centenarian procuratorship he reached the first rung of the ducenary ladder. P. Vibius Marianus rose to the second ducenarian echelon from centurio frumentarius, via the Rome centurionates. M. Aquilius Felix found a peculiar road to success. Sent to assassinate Severus he changed sides to such effect that before the end of that emperor's reign he had reached the fourth ducenarian echelon via the centenarian procuratorships.

There are three praetorian prefects. M. Oclatinus Adventus, by origin either a legionary or a praetorian, was centurio frumentarius and princeps peregrinorum. The

further route by which he reached the praetorian prefecture is unknown, though it included a ducenarian procuratorship, in Britain. Ulpianus and Iulianus Nestor were "commanders of the messengers" under Caracalla, which is clearly connected with the castra peregrina. They were made praetorian prefects under Macrinus, and as Iulianus had been a censibus at the time of Caracalla's death the appointments need not have been inappropriate to their standing and ability.

Among the centuriones deputati, also attached to the castra, we note Aur. Flavonius Rufinus, who died as an urban tribune, and L. Petronius Taurus Volusianus. The latter was ex equite Romano, and was commissioned as centurio deputatus. He mentions no other service before his primipilate.

Of the three men who held positions in the fleet T. Flavius Antonius died as a primipilaris, having been navarchus princeps classis, i.e. senior staff officer of a fleet. Sulgius Caecilianus had also been a navarchus, but he had had previous service in the castra peregrina. Finally, though his inscription presents some difficulties of interpretation, the unknown of X 3342a had been trierarchus, i.e. commander of a ship, some time before his primipilate. He became prefect of a legion.

It will be observed that there was a number of posts which could be held by people of different corps of recruitment. This had always been true e.g. the Rome centurionates could be held either by men ex equite Romano or ex-praetorians, and the legionary centurionates by men from all three of the main sources of recruiting. The castra peregrina itself was mainly, as far as we are concerned, a depot to which centurions temporarily at Rome might be posted. In particular it acted as a centre for the information brought in by the Intelligence Corps, the frumentarii. Some of these centurions were from the ranks of the frumentarii, some were transferred from ordinary legionary centurionates, some were equestrians, centurions by direct commission. That it was an advantage however for a man to have served as centurio frumentarius or centurio deputatus, or as commander of the camp, as princeps peregrinorum, cannot be doubted; and it is presumably a reflection of the importance of the intelligence service controlled there and of the camp's proximity to Rome. The old corps continued to provide recruits. There is a general scarcity of evidence for this period, so too much emphasis must not be laid on the fact there are relatively few cases of praetorians. As far as the men ex equite Romano are concerned, it is to be noted that the

otherwise undated inscriptions of C. Iulius Corianus and M. Aelius Caesonianus which have that phrase may well date from this period.

If we compare the career changes and the changes in recruiting I think we shall get the impression of increasing flexibility in a system which, apart from the procuratorships, had varied little since the time of Nero. New key posts, those in the castra peregrina, and the prefecture of the legion II Parthica, replace the old; e.g. the tribunate of the equites singulares seems to decline in importance in this period. Behind this increasing flexibility even more important changes were taking place, which resulted in the primipilaris becoming more or less a civilian in uniform, charged with the conveying of the annona to the troops, while the prefect of the legion became its commander, and ceased to be a primipilaris.

In a survey of the period as a whole, the three important points from the stand-point of the development of the career seem to be, (a) the creation and wide employment by Augustus of the primipilaris and of the prefect of the camp, (b) the military re-organisation of Claudius which furthered the development of a distinctly primipilaris career, and (c) the final phase of increasing flexibility within the system in the first half of the third century

which led to the development referred to above. There are points with regard to the development of the institutions connected with the primipilaris, but these are amplified in the chapters devoted to those institutions. As far as the corps of recruiting are concerned it is significant that the only clear case of preferential treatment of a particular corps occurs under the militarily inexperienced last three Antonines. It is to be noted that the preference there is apparently a general one, i.e. the men from Italy are given more primipilates; they are not merely given the Rome tribunates, while the men from the legions fill the prefectures of the camp after their first primipilate. Thus the conclusion that praetorians received till the end of the second century, the greater share of the primipilates, and all the Rome tribunates, is wrong. The fact is that under the last three Antonines alone there seems to have been a clear preponderance of Italians, drawn from the guard and Italian equestrian families, receiving primipilates. At other times selection seems to have been primarily based on merit and the individual's backing. Clearly the equestrian and the guardsman had the advantage in the latter respect, and they would normally be better educated. This was sufficient to assure them greater representation than their numbers warranted as far as the primipilate was concerned, but the evidence does not support the view that the praetorians exercised a virtual monopoly.

The legionary of merit could in most periods reach the top. The contribution of the centurions ex equite Romano has also tended to be underestimated. A further point needs to be made. Once a man had secured selection for the primipilate, his career depended on his merit. There is no warrant to claim that the Rome tribunates were reserved for a particular class of recruits or for men of a particular geographical origin. Finally, and this is a point which will emerge clearly whatever class of recruit or whatever institution of the career we study, the true goal of the career is the primipilate. It was difficult to obtain, and to obtain it was in itself an achievement. While the career of which we have studied the development aimed at producing men able to act as prefects of the camp, Rome tribunes, ducenarian prefects of legions, and a select few capable of holding procuratorships and even prefectures, its primary aim was to draw men to the centurionate by providing a route to the primipilate. The student of the primipilaris career must see that for many, in fact the vast majority, the post of primuspilus or praefectus castrorum was the end of their career, and see in the fact not a weakness of the system but a mark of the genius of its creators. That genius lay in the fact that this career could produce equally a Marcius Turbo, whose career was so swift that

he was available as a praetorian prefect for nearly twenty years, and a Retonius Lucius, primuspilus after fifty-eight years' service. This dual nature of the career, providing opportunity for the brilliant centurion while offering to the plodder a final blaze of riches and glory, characterised the primipilaris career throughout its history. One last word - though space makes it necessary to restrict this study to the primipilaris career, that career can only be evaluated against the background of the centurion's career. The primipilares in fact represent the cream of the centurionate. For that very reason I deplore the tendency to over-emphasise the brilliant careers. Any career that reaches the primipilate is brilliant from the stand-point of the centurion, and it is from that stand-point that the career we have been discussing must be regarded.

THE LATE PRIMIPILATE

Some reference clearly ought to be made to the later development of the post of primipilaris as it is mirrored in the legal sources, and to a lesser extent in papyri and inscriptions. It will be convenient first to remind ourselves of the latest evidence for the conventional primipilaris career. There is a wealth of evidence up to the end of the reign of Severus Alexander for the continuation of the recruitment of the prefects of the legions, the Rome tribunes, and some procurators, from the primipili of the legions. There is no fundamental change in the character of the post of primuspilus discernible from the epigraphic evidence. That evidence continues in sufficient bulk to demonstrate continuity into the reign of Valerian and Gallienus. A list of the cases is given below.

243	T. Pontius Marcianus	primuspilus
244-9	VI 1645	A relatively normal career
		corn. pr. pr. to praef. vehic..
238-44	Oclatius Sacerdos	primuspilus ex trec..
244	VII 103	primuspilus.
238-49	L. Trebonius Sossianus	7 frum., pp..
253-68	Numisius Natulus	primuspilus.
253	Sattonius Iucundus	primuspilus.
255	P. Aelius Primianus	pp., trib. vig..
253-68	L. Petronius Taurus V.	A full career.
Gallienus ?	Traianus Mucianus	A normal approach to the primipilate
Gallienus ?	Aurelius Sabinianus	trib. prot., praet.
Gallienus ?	III 3126	trib. urb., trib. praet. et prot.
Gallienus ?	AE 1954. 135	dec. alae., 7 prot., pp. prot..

The important careers are those of VI 1645, P. Aelius Primianus, and L. Petronius Taurus Volusianus, for they are firmly dated careers which show the basic career still the same. The four careers that I have marked with a query as of the reign of Gallienus, all have his reign or the years immediately preceding 253 as their terminus post quem as they mention the term protector. Aurelius Sabinianus had a son who was a tribunus laticlavus, which on present evidence ought to make the reign of Gallienus his latest probable dating. The unknown of III 3126 refers to three Augusti, who could be Valerian, Gallienus, and the younger Valerian. On the careers of the other two it is difficult to say a lot except to point out that these careers are still basically the same as those of the preceding two and half centuries. The main difference is the term protector, and I have pointed out in an appendix that this is in an embryonic stage as it is not attached to the same posts in each career.

What happened after Gallienus? The prefects of the legions were now all ducenarian. We have a career inscription of the period of Diocletian relating to one of them,

D(is) M(anibus). Val(erius) Thiumpo qui militavit in leg(ione) XI Cl(audia), lectus in sacro comit(io), lanciarius, deinde protexit annis V, missus pref(ectus) leg(ionis) II Hercul(ianae) (e)git ann(os) II semise et recessit, vixit ann(is) XXXXV, m(ensibus) III d(iebus) XI, Aurel(ius)....

Here clearly is a career completely unrelated to the one we have known. While we cannot say definitely that the old career had disappeared after Gallienus as far as these prefectures were concerned, there is a strong probability that that is true. As far as the Rome tribunates were concerned, the praetorian guard disappeared in 312, and the urban cohorts were under one tribune by the period 317-37 (Flavius Ursacius, ILS 722). The old prefectures of the camp disappeared in my opinion under Gallienus, with their conversion into ducenarian legionary prefectures. Thus every element of the old career had disappeared by the end of the century, and is unrecorded after Gallienus, except the post of primipilaris. But that post itself was undergoing change, as we shall see.

It is evident from the legal references appended to this chapter that two things happened in the course of the third century. First, a tax called the PRIMIPILUM emerged as part of the annona. From reference no. 2 it appears it may have begun under Caracalla, and it was certainly functioning in 270-5 from reference no. 11. (The legal references are given in an appendix to this chapter, most of them being arranged in chronological order. They are all numbered, and will be referred to by their numbers in this chapter.) It had therefore definitely begun shortly after Gallienus, and may

well have been in operation throughout the third century.

The second thing we note is that the PRIMIPILARIS becomes associated with the annona, and specifically with this tax. The decisive text for this is dated to A.D. 358, no. 16, but I think it is fair to say that the general impression from the earlier references is that this relationship dated from earlier times. This is suggested by the mention of the stationarii primipilarium in reference no. 12, dates to A.D. 315, if they are to be identified with the stationarii of the mansiones. This identification was suggested by D. Van Berchem, L' annone militaire, p. 72 and he of course is of the opinion that these mansiones were receiving centres for the annona.

Before we go on to note the various pieces of information about the primipilum and primipilaris afforded by the legal references, it may be well to pause and ask ourselves how this change in the functions of the primipilaris had taken place. Clearly we cannot be dogmatic. When the primipilaris last appears in the reign of Gallienus he still has a conventional career, and we can only say definitely that he could not have such a career after Diocletian, as by then all the constituent posts had disappeared. What we can suggest is with the tendency of the legions, accentuated after Hadrian, to stay in the same place for decades,

even centuries, and with the growing tendency for vexillations rather than legions to move from province to province, and do any fighting in the field, the headquarters staff of the legions, including the primipili, must have become more and more sedentary. In this connection we may remind ourselves how old some of these primipili were. It seems possible then that with the institution of the annona by Septimius Severus a new use might have been made of these men, making them responsible for the collection and distribution of the annona in the province. Nevertheless to the time of Gallienus at least they were still attached to legions. When the primipilaris was divorced from the legionary organisation altogether must remain a matter for speculation, but clearly the sole reign of Gallienus might well be the decisive period. That is as much as I dare say on a subject which really belongs to the Late Empire.

The summary I am now going to give does not pretend to be complete. It is only intended to single out points of interest. I have not attempted to make a systematic study of the late primipilaris. The following points seem however to emerge from the references. The post of primipilaris was hereditary, reference no. 27, and compulsory, i.e. the son must take the post, reference nos. 5 (286), 25, 28. Failure to serve entailed financial loss, ref. no. 29.

References 39, 40, and 41 forbid them to seek other posts, and in the last they are specifically stated to be liable to recall to their duties, even if they had entered the church. One gathers from all this, and the way the future professions of their children are decreed, that the post was an unpopular one. From the passages which concern more particularly their duty, refs. 16, 21, 30, 32, 37, we learn that they conveyed the annona to the troops, sometimes in money and sometimes in kind. They had a lot of trouble with the duces, who insisted on a sportula, and clearly a whole series of regulations had to be passed to deal with this abuse, legalising and regulating it. Primpilares of this type are Aurelius Antinous, in the Prosopography, and those recorded in Pap. Oxy. VIII 1133, Griechische Urkunden d. Pap.-Sammlung, Leipzig, I ed. Mitteis, (1906) no. 41, line 1, Pap. Greco-Eg., publ. D. Comparetti & G. Vitelli, I, Pap. Fior., Milan 1906, 1. 71, lines 60, 697, 713, 515, 554, 612, 622, 625, and 707. On the epigraphic side we note Flavius Zosimus, AE 1927.45, who paid a vow, apparently in connection with the pastus militum.

The primipilum was clearly an unpopular tax, and one to which the emperors attached great importance. Goods could be seized if people were in arrears on it, reference 2, the wife's dowry was liable to it, reference 4, and if it

appeared that people had exhausted their resources steps could be taken by the praeses, even though the tax was not yet due for payment, reference 7. Its peculiar importance emerges in the fact that if it had been paid other debts, private and public, might be temporarily waived, references 10 and 11. In reference 31 it will be noted that release from duties cannot be obtained on any pretext till the claims of the primipilum are fully met. The primipilum is also referred to in Pap. Oxy. XVI, 1905, 2001, Griech. urk. etc., no. 87,2. and in AE 1919. 30 there is a reference to it.

In conclusion let me repeat the main point of this chapter. In the course of the third century a profound change took place in the functions of the primipilaris. He became a quasi-civil official, concerned with the collection and distribution of the annona. He is attested as still having a career of the old type up to the sole reign of Gallienus. It is impossible for him to have such a career after the end of the third century at latest. On the other hand, from the end of the third century at latest he was concerned with the primipilum if we accept Van Berchem's identification, noted above. My own feeling is that the decisive change in the functions of the primipilaris when he was completely divorced from the old

primuspilus, probably took place in the sole reign of Gallienus, but until some scholar really tackles the question of the primipilares and the annona, working backwards from the Late Empire to discover how the change took place, I think we can go no further.

APPENDIX    LEGAL REFERENCESIn chronological order

- Frag. Vat. 141            (1) De donationibus. Primpilaribus, ob id ipsum quod primipilares sunt, vacatio a tutelis a Divo Hadriano dari coepit.
- Cod. Iust. 7.73.1            (2) Bona mariti tui si ob reliqua administrationis primipili a fisco occupata sunt - (the wife can recover what is her own) (Caracalla)
- Cod. Iust. 12.63.1.            (3) Commoda primipilatus post administrationem incipiunt deberi, et si is, qui ea percipere debuit, prius rebus humanis eximiatur, heredibus petitio salva sit (Valerian and Gallienus)
- Cod. Iust. 8.14.4            (4) Satis notum est et idem constitutum, bona eorum in dotem data, quae nuptae sunt his qui primipili sarcinam subeunt, obnoxia necessitati ei teneri (A.D. 283)
- Frag. Vat. 278            (5) Idem Aurelio Zoilo. [Cum] adfirmes patrem tuum donationes perfectas in te contulisse et supre[mis] iudiciis eas non revocasse, poteris iure constituto, praesertim cum honor[i] primipilari sis adstrictus, securo animo ea quae donata sunt possidere (A.D. 286)
- Cod. Iust. 5.16.15            (6) Si non verum contractum pater vester gessit, sed sub specie venditionis donationem possessionis in matrem vestram contulit, nec ex bonis quae in persona patris vestri permansisse videbantur, ob primumpilum indemnitati fiscali satisfieri potuit. (A.D. 291)
- Cod. Iust. 4.9.1.            (7) Licet ante tempus debita exigi non possunt, tamen si te ex primipilo debitorem fisci constitutum ac patrimonium tuum exhaustum praeses

provinciae compererit - (measures to be taken) (A.D. 294)

- Cod. Iust. 4.31.11 (8) Si tutores pupillis officio magistratus urgente nominastis ac pro his propter onus primipili pecuniam solvistis - (You are at fault) (Diocletian and Max)
- Cod. Iust. 12. 62. 2 (9) Obventu nominis primipili civiles actiones ad alios iudices transferendae non sunt (Dioc. et Max.)
- Cod. Iust. 12.62.3 (10) Utilitas publica praeferenda est privatorum contractibus: et ideo si constiterit fisco satisfactum esse ob causam primipili, poteris obligatam tibi possessionem dotis titulo petere, ut satis doti fieri possit (Dioc. and Max.)
- Cod. Iust. 12.62.4 (11) Cum ex sola primipili causa liberos etiam si patribus heredes non existant teneri Divus Aurelianus (270-75) sanxerit, si neque successistis patri vestro nec quicquam <sup>le</sup> ex bonis eius tenetis, consequens est a paternis creditoribus vos non conveniri (Dioc. and Max.)
- Cod.Theod. 8.4.2 (12) Stationariis primipilarium, quorum manifesta sunt loca coram mandatum est, ut si extra modum aliquid extorserint, sciant se capite puniendos. Praeterea ne carcerem habeant. Neve quis personam pro manifesto crimine apud se habeat in custodia. Neve quis amplius quam duos agasones ex provincia secum habeat, vel de Numidia sibi adiungat. Neve ex aliis provinciis agasonem habeat, vel, qui alicui iam stationarii minister fuit. (A.D.315)
- Cod. Theod. 8.4.3. (13) Primipilaribus post emeritam militiam perfectissimatus vel ducenae vel centenae vel egregiatus dari dignitas potest (A.D. 317)

- Cod. Theod. 12.1.11 (14) Quoniam relictis curiis nonnulli ad militiae praesidia confugiunt, omnes, qui nondum primipilo inveniuntur obnoxii, solutos militia ad eandem curiam reverti praecipimus: his solis in militia permansuris, qui pro loco utque ordine cum pars tui [pastui?] adtinentur (A.D. 325)
- Cod. Theod. 8.7.6. (15) De largition<sup>alibus</sup>/comitatensibus et officialibus rationales rerum privatarum custodiari praecipimus ut post viginti et quinque annos ad Curiam minime revocentur. Hoc idem de officialibus praefectorum vicariorum observari sanximus. De primipilaribus vero quia cursum exhibent, anni decem observandi sunt. Officiales enim p.v., propterea quod non exhibent primipili pastionem, post viginti quinque annos minime persequantur. Quod sane ad Logografos pertinet, prius promulgatam legem et firmam esse volumus (A.D. 354)
- Cod. Theod. 8.4.6. (16) Primipilaribus qui ad pascendos milites solemniter ad limitem destinantur gravia sustinentibus detrimenta hoc modo credidimus consulendum, ut duces qui multa eius extorquere firmantur, nomine munerum vel sportulae, nihil amplius percipiunt quam percipiebant a Patre nostrae perennis memoriae regente rempublicam, ita ut species a primipilaribus ipsa praestetur, nec in nummum aurumque dirigatur, ne super immensitas pretiorum necessitas conquerendi exurgat. Hac igitur remota iniuria, idonei mittantur, qui ex more susceptis omnibus alimoniis militaribus easdem pervehere contendant actis apud rectorem provinciae conficiendis,

per quae designabitur quantus specierum modus in usum alimoniae militaris a primipilaribus praebetur, et quid ob munera ducibus mittenda vel sportulam cuius habet notitiam officium praesidiale. Dat epistula praefecto cui haec sacra fuerit antelata. (A.D. 358)

- Cod. Theod. 8.4.7.2. (17) Beneficiarii vel officiales rationales, si exhibitione cursus seu primipili necessitate neglecta, interversa etiam ratione fiscali, ad ecclesias putaverint transeundum, curialium retrahantur exemplo  
(A.D. 361)  
(= Just. 1.3.4. - Officiales rationales, si... fiscali ad clericatus honorem putaverit transeundum, ad priorem condicionem retrahantur.)  
(A.D. 361)

- Cod Theod. 8.4.8.2. (18) Qui in proconsulum, consularium, correctorum, vel praesidum officiis ita stipendia merentur ut reipublicae partes pro virili captu spernui laborum procurent, si cursui veredorum obnoxii vel pastui primipili militiam clariorem aditu obstricti itineris occupaverint, ita infulas adfectati honoris admittent, ut necessitatem vetustae procuratoris agnoscant. Liberi vero eorum, si ab ineunte aevo alterius <sup>ca</sup> gradus sacramenta meruerint paternae necessitatis condicione non alias fatigentur, quam si adhuc eos, loci quamquam altioris, tamen eiusmodi docebitur retinere mensuram ut parva contumelia dignitatis paterni muneris subdantur impensis. Et, quoad huiusmodi homines in his provinciis militabunt, quos aut primipili pastus, aut necessitas veredariae non adigat functionis, XXV eos stipendia a nexu curialis nominationis absolvant. (A.D. 364)

- Cod. Theod. 8.4.10.3 (19) Principes seu comnicularios stationes quae personis suis merito deferuntur non aliis vendere sed ipsos potissimum his administratiunculis perfrui iubemus. Quod si post pastum primipili de his putaverint nundinandum, non alteri quam adiutoribus suis, et tamen his ipsis qui nunquam eiusmodi stationes egisse doceantur, habeant libertatem licentiamque vendendi. (A.D. 365)
- Cod. Theod. 8.4.11.1. (20) Solita cohortalibus Syria privilegia quae a Divo Diocletiano porrecta sunt adque concessa nos quoque porreximus, ac iubemus, eos non ad sollicitudinem vastagae, non ad functionem navicularium devocandos, non invitos curialibus coetibus adferibendos, verum peracto labore militiae, pastus primipili competenti sedulitate functione transacta, praerogativum his recusationis offerimus (A.D. 365)  
(= Iust. 12.57.3... recusationis offeribus?)
- Cod. Theod. 8.4.9 (21) Secundum Divi Iuliani statuta sportula duci in quinquaginta libras argenti non ab uno primipilare sed ab unis pariter inferatur; nihilque amplius duces sportulae sollemnis praetexto conentur exculpere. (A.D. 365)
- Cod. Theod. 13.5.14.4. (22) Et sunt corpora, de quibus navicularii ex indictione quinta decima constituendi sunt iuxta sacram iussionem. Ita: ex administratoribus caeterisque honorariis viris (praeter eos qui intra palatium sacrum versati sunt) de coetibus curialibus et de veteribus idoneis naviculariis et de ordine primipilario et de

senatoria dignitate ut si qui voluerint, freti facultatibus, consortio naviculariorum congregentur. (A.D. 371)

Cod. Theod. 8.7.12

(23) Nullum militem a quolibet numero ad stationes agendas per consulares Byzacenam et Tripolitanam provincias destinari iubemus; sed probati in obsequiis praesidalibus eius officii in quo parent vocabulo censeantur; nec quicquam his fit cum armatae militiae nuncupatione commune. Sed et si quis forte ex his qui in legionibus vel in numeris deputentur gestandis armis idoneus fit qui tamen pastui primipili neutiquam obnoxium detegatur, ei cui adscriptus est militiae indubitanter iungatur. (A.D. 371)

Cod. Theod. 8.7.13

(24) Nunquam officiales iudicum in quolibet militum numero deputentur: probatos enim, eius officii in quo parent appellatione congruit nominari. Si quis sane in quolibet numero ex apparitoribus praesidentium nunc repperientur adscripti, neque pastui primipili deteguntur obnoxii, hique armis gestandis pro statura ac robore corporis idonei sunt, revocentur ad numeros quibus de more hactenus deputati sunt. (A.D. 372)

Cod. Just. 12.57.5

(25) Quicumque per Osdroenam primipilium maiore laetatur numero filiorum, unum loco suo veluti hereditario iure substituat, alterum pro amore patriae Edessenae curiae tradat obsequiis.  
(A.D. 375)

Cod. Theod. 12 79

(26) Quicumque... obsequiis, ceterisque quam voluerit militiam profuturus: sin autem duos tantum procreaverit, eundem ordini patriae restituat,

nullo contra hanc formam beneficio/  
valituro. Damus sane licentiam,  
tam patribus eorum quam ipsis qui  
huius legis auctoritate civitatum  
obsequio adgregantur, ut si quos  
curiales patrocinio principalium  
invenerint excusari in medium  
proferant, ut et ipsi similibus  
officiis deputati pareant  
impetratis. (A.D. 375)

Cod. Just. 12.47.2. (27) Filios primipilariū paternam  
sequi condicionem oportet.  
(A.D. 380?)

Cod. Theod. 7.22.11 (28) Si filii primipilariū reperti  
fuerint qui ingressi legitimos  
annos nullis stipendiis fulciuntur,  
sed anno proximo quo ad Curiam  
fuerint laccessiti semet militariis  
manciparint, ad Curiam teneantur,  
ita ut ne officii quidem cum  
transacto anno esse ceperint,  
curialis praepostera audiatur  
circa eius personam ac sera petitio.  
Quod si in eadem domo duo filii  
erunt, et latum, adeo felixque  
patrimonium quod possit duplicem  
L3 necessitatem suscipere functiones,  
unum oportebit militiae, unum  
centuriae vindicari. Quod servand-  
um pari norma erit si tres aut  
quattuor liberi, vel et iam plures  
numero familiam eiusdem stirpis  
ornaverint, ut etiam ex numerosis  
fratribus unus ad Curiam devocetur.  
(A.D. 380?)

Cod. Theod. 8.4.13 (29) Primipilariū liberos sacramentis  
atque militiae quae eorum maiori-  
bus fuerat, glabros ad ultima  
quidem apparitionis et eandem  
necessitatem minime devocamus,  
auris tamen quas tempus efflagitat  
iuvare rempublicam statuimus  
expensis. (A.D. 382)

- Cod. Theod. 8.4.17 (30) Cum ante placuisset ut a primipilaribus secundum dispositionem Divi Gratiani species horreis erogandae comitatensibus militibus ex more deferrentur, limitaneis vero pretia darentur, nunc placuit, ut aurum ad officium illustris per Illyricum praefecturae cum certe taxatione, id est, pro octoginta libris laridae carnis, pro octogenis etiam libris olei, et pro duodenis modis salis, singuli solidi perferantur.  
(A.D. 389)
- Cod. Iust. 12.57.7. (31) Ordinariorum iudicum apparitores, qui vel speculatorum vel ordinariorum attigerint gradum, nullo annorum numero, nullo stipendiorum contemplatione laxentur priusquam primipili pastum digesta ratione compleverint... Non prius otio condonetur  
L<sup>s</sup> (for illness, old age, etc.) quam omne quod primopilo debetur expendent. (A.D. 386)  
(=Cod.Theod. 8. 4.16.1 - Ordinariorum... laxentur)
- Cod. Iust. 12.57.8 (32) Speciebus primipilaribus adaerandis eadem pretiorum taxatio servetur, quae in venalibus publicis poterit reperiri. (A.D. 396)
- Cod. Theod. 8.4.19 (33) In speciebus...reperiri: is enim qui excedere praecepta nostra temptaverit, severa iudicis sententia cohercebitur.  
(A.D. 396)
- Cod. Theod. 11.23.4 (33a) Qui ex primipilaribus sunt, protostasiae necessitatibus obedire cogantur, nec aliqua se obreptione subtrahere.  
(A.D. 396)
- Cod. Theod. 7.20.12.17(34) (About people getting out of the army when still fit and of age.)

Illius quoque sanctionis oportet admoneri, ut si quis decurionum, primipilariorum, collegiatorum, civilium apparitorum vel aliorum necessitatibus inretitus militiae sacramenta durasset, defendi castrensiu[m] stipendioru[m] excusatione non possit. (A.D. 400)

- Cod. Theod. 8.4.21 (35) Polychronio, qui ex primipilaribus in memoraliu[m] scrinia inrepsit, condicioni propriae restituto, generali lege decernimus, omnes qui ex huius modi condicione palatinis semet indecenter inserverunt obsequiis, omissis adsignari natalibus, adque omnes quorum interest huius rei sollicitudo observare ne quis desertis aduetis officiis ad palatina unquam sacramenta adspiret. (A.D. 410)
- Cod. Theod. 11.28.11 (36) Primipili reliqua tanquam ad nuper emissam generalem indulgentiam minime pertineant, flagitari cognovimus. Ideo sancimus, primipili quoque reliqua eiusdem temporis relaxari, nec quemquam debere pro eo tempore quod indulgentia definuit, primipili vel cuiuslibet tituli gratia conveniri; praeter Docimeni, Proconensis, et Troadensis metallorum debitores, quos et dudum latae indulgentiae series comprehendit. (A.D. 416)
- Cod. Theod. 8.4.27 (37) Pro singulis libris argenti quas primipilares viris spectabilibus ducibus sportulae gratia praestant quaterni solidi praebentur, si non ipsi argentum offerre sua sponte maluerint. (A.D. 422)
- Cod. Theod. 16.5.61 (38) Omnis dubiae interpretationis ambages hac sententia resolventes, publicari praecipimus, quod lex quae super Eunomianis militare prohibitis, ceterisque execrabilium

religionum et professionum  
 ritibus promulgata cognoscitur,  
 nihil ad eos qui cohortalini sunt  
 pertinet. His enim sunt  
 apparitionibus obligati, in quibus,  
 emensis militiae stipendiis,  
 veterani primipili munus sustinere  
 coguntur (A.D. 423)

Cod. Theod. 8.4.29.2 (39) Hii quorum nomine excellentiae  
 tuae suggestio comprehendit,  
 omnesque qui ex primipularis ex  
 quacunque provincia quamlibet  
 militiam contra licitum praesump-  
 serunt, etiamsi obtinuisse eam  
 speciali adnotatione nostrae  
 indulgentiae videantur, spoliati  
 cingulo ad priorem statum et  
 condicionem pristinam revocentur,  
 omni aditu cuiuslibet dignitatis,  
 ita huiusmodi conditioni praecluso,  
 ut non solum impetratis iam  
 beneficiis careant, verumetiam si  
 quid postmodum elicere temptaverint  
 id omne in inritum devocetur.  
 Praeceptis enim vestris et publicis  
 utilitatibus in perpetuum debent  
 esse subiecti, nec exsequendarum  
 necessitatum munia declinare  
 (A.D. 428)

Cod. Iust. 12.57.13 (40) Nullum ex primipularibus, nullum  
 ex principe cohortalis officii  
 vel ad aliam posse militiam  
 adspirare vel ministeriis sibi  
 contra publicam utilitatem  
 blandiri vel ad quamlibet aliam  
 dignitatem ad praeiudicium  
 praeteriti status accedere con-  
 cedimus (A.D. 422?)

Cod. Iust. 1.3.27 (41) exceptis primipularibus quos  
 praeceptis tui culminis et publicis  
 utilitatibus in perpetuum esse  
 subiectos sacratissimae constitu-  
 tionis statuta sanxerunt (They  
 could be recalled even if they

entered the church) (A.D. 466)

Cod. Iust. 12.57.14 (42)

Quisquis cohortalibus adhuc obsequiis obligatus vel regimen provinciae vel cingulum cuiuslibet militiae dignitatisve quoquo modo meruit, ante omnia contra licitum usurpatis impetratisve careat, etiamsi ultronea nostra liberalitate ius gerendae provinciae vel militiae seu dignitatis cuiuspiam sibi iactaverit fuisse delatum. Dehinc universis solaciis conditionis quam spreverat, defraudatus, ne quid eorum omnino per se vel interpositam personam possit adquirere, primipili tantum munus implere cogatur; mox curialibus civitatis, in qua natus est, in diem vitae suae functionibus inhaesurus, ita scilicet, ut etiam ii, qui post impletam talem militiam quodlibet militiae dignitatisve genus adfectaverint, curiae patriae suae, restituantur. (A.D. 471)

## II. Undated references

Cod. Iust. 12.57 (43)

De cohortalibus, principibus, et primipilaribus (title = Cod. Theod. 8.4)

Cod. Iust. 12.52 (44)

De primipilo (title).

Digest 27.1.8.12 (45)

(The cases quoted from book 27 are in Greek—I give the Latin of the commentator)

Primipilares ex constitutionibus imperialibus excusationem habent a reliquis tutelis;—primipilaris vero filiorum tutores erunt. Primipilares autem hi existimantur perfuncti primipilo; quod si non perfunctus mortuus fuerit huius primipilaris tutor non erit.

- Digest 27.1.10.1. (46) Non solum autem caligati milites, et ceteri (primipilares) qui militaverunt: sed et qui quocumque modo necessitatis publicae populi Romani gratia absentes sunt, anni habent vacationem post reditum
- Digest 27.1.10.5 (47) Qui primipilum explevit si tutela recepta unius pueri rursus ad militaria negotia revocatus erit, deponet officium tutelae.
- Digest 50.4.18.24 (48) Ab huius modi muneribus neque primipilaris neque veteranus aut miles aliusve, qui privilegio aliquo subnixus nec pontifex excusatur - (re patrimonial civil duties)
- Frag. Vat. 143 (49) Item. Neque autem primipilarium filii neque veteranorum a tutelis excusatur.
- Frag. Vat. 178 (50) Item. Sed primipilares a reliquis tutelis universis excusantur, tamen ipsi filiis suis recte tutorem primipila rem dabunt... legare quoque. Ipse quoque in locum...
- Frag. Vat. 180 (51) [Item...qui] sunt in primipilaribus...ex]emplo veteranorum excusantur.
- Frag. Vat. 213 (52) Item. Licet autem patris appellatio in oratione [sit, puto de avo quoque] accipiendam, quamquam circa primipilares hoc iure u[timur, ut filio primi]pilaris dentur soli non etiam nepoti.

THE ORIGINES OF PRIMIPILARES

Before proceeding to survey the evidence for the origines of primipilares it is necessary to state the types of evidence admitted, and the reasons for the period-divisions. The former are as follows, stated origines, correspondence of the personal tribe with that of the find-spot or of an associated place, context, and rare nomina and cognomina. The first needs no elucidation, nor the second, except to note that sometimes, though the exact origo is uncertain, the fact that the tribe is not known to have been given outside Italy is helpful. Context is not readily definable, and such evidence is best evaluated by study of the inscriptions themselves. An obvious example is the phrase, amantissimus patriae. Finally, there are a number of nomina and a very few cognomina, whose distribution in the Corpus indicates that they were confined to small areas of the Empire. As an Italian nomen may be cited RUFELLIUS, found ten times in volume V, four times in volume XI, and three times in volumes VI and X, i.e. never outside Italy. As a "manufactured" nomen of a Celtic type may be cited LIBERALINIUS, found eleven times in volume XIII, and twice in volume XII. Many cases are made out from a combination of various types of evidence, and these may be checked in the prosopography, where the origo with reasons is given where possible. A full discussion of methods of determining origo will be found in E. Birley, Roman Britain

and the Roman Army, pp. 154-71.

The first two centuries have been divided into four periods of unequal length. The first is till 69, and I have further roughly divided it at 41, about the time of the important changes in military organisation brought about by Claudius, which also corresponds to the division by G. Forni in Il Reclutamento delle Legioni da Augusto a Diocleziano. Though we no longer speak of Vespasian as "excluding" Italians from the legions, the drop in proportion of Italians in the legions after 69 is marked enough to warrant a division at that date. More controversial may seem the putting together of Trajan and Hadrian, but it seems clear to me that as far as the primipilares are concerned their reigns are a unity. Again, the period Pius-Commodus is clearly a division. I have made no divisions within the third century material, the bulk of closely dated material being small.

The evidence is given in the form of tables, in which are included all cases where a prima facie case for origo can be made out. Other cases where origo is suggested will be found in Part II, but they are not included here. The figures should be seen against the background of legionary recruiting, for which G. Forni's figures are the latest, and of praetorian recruiting, for which M. Durry and A. Passerini are the authorities. The primipilaris is placed in the period when his primipilate was given, that being the decisive act which indicates the emperor's policy.

## AUGUSTUS TO CALIGULA

## ITALY

Regio I

Venafrum

L. Ovinus Rufus  
M. Vergilius Gallus LusiusRegio IVAmiternum  
Superaequum  
Tibur  
NursiaC. Apidius Bassus  
T. Staius Marrax  
M. Helvius Rufus Civica  
Vespasius rollioRegio V

Ricina

L. Cirpinus T.f.

Regio VII

Veii

M. Tarquinius Saturninus

Regio VIII

Bononia

XI 711

Regio IX

Pollentia

Q. Carrinas

ItalianPaullus Aemilius D.f.  
Aesius  
Q. Crittius C.f.  
Curtilius C.f.  
L. Eggius  
Sex. Pedius Lusianus Hirrutus  
C. Pompullius P.f.  
Sabidius C.f.  
C. Sornatius C.f.  
Staius  
Olennius

## PROVINCES

Gallia Narbonensis

Baeterrae (colony)

L. Aponius

Forum Iulii (colony)  
Arelate (colony)

Sex. Aulienus Sex.f..  
AE 1954. 104

Baetica

Astigi (colony)

Cn. Manlius Cn.f.

Macedonia

Philippi (colony)

C. Mucius Scaeva

Pisidia

Antioch (colony)

P. Anicius Maximus

Asia

Alexandria Troas (colony)

C. Norbanus Quadratus

7

Helvius Rufus is the only certain soldier, probably a legionary. Vespasius Pollio and Cn. Manlius were probably equestrians holding posts otherwise associated with primipilares. P. Anicius Maximus I suspect to have been directly commissioned as centurion after a municipal career. L. Ovinus Rufus had been a praetorian centurion, which on present evidence rules out the possibility of his having been a legionary. Notice that outside Italy the recruiting is from colonists, some of whom probably were ex-legionaries.

CLAUDIUS TO NERO

--- ITALY ---

Regio I

Ager Falernus

Ti. Iulius Italicus

Regio IV

Cluviae

Helvidius

Regio VII

Volaterra

A. Resius Maximus

Regio VIII

Ariminum

L. Lepidius Proculus  
M. Vettius Valens

Regio X

Iulium Carnicum

C. Baebius Atticus

Regio XI

Fanum Fortunae  
Taurini

L. Rufellius Severus  
C. Gavius Silvanus  
Glitius Barbarus  
C. Valerius Clemens  
P. Palpellius Clodius  
Quirinalis

Italian

Alledius Severus  
Caetronius Pisanus  
Casperius Niger  
Sex. Cetrius Severus  
C. Nymphidius Sabinus  
Sex. Subrius Dexter  
Subrius Flavius  
T. Suedius Clemens  
Turullius Cerialis  
Veianius Niger  
Poenius Postumus ?

PROVINCES

Gallia Narbonensis

Forum Iulii (colony)

Valerius Paulinus

Macedonia

Dyrrhachium (colony)

Q. Paesidius Macedo

Syria

Heliopolis (colony)

L. Antonius Naso

Ti. Antonius Taurus  
Gerellanus - ?  
Gerellanus Fronto 6

The figures differ very little from the previous ones.

G. Forni's figures, Appendix B, Tables I and II, show a <sup>e</sup> decline in Italian and increase in provincial recruiting for legionaries, but our figures are too small to be sensitive to this. L. Lepidius Proculus was a legionary, as were probably most of the men from the colonies. M. Vettius Valens and Sex. Cetrius Severus were praetorians. L. Rufellius Severus and C. Gavius Silvanus were praetorian centurions, which on present evidence rules out any possibility of their having been legionaries. C. Nymphidius Sabinus is in all probability another case of an equestrian holding a post normally held by primipilares. Again, the men from outside Italy were from colonies.

A further number of cases to be taken into consideration are those whose careers show the characteristics of the career introduced by Augustus, the tenure of the tribunate of a legion, of the prefecture of a cohort or ala, or of the post of praefectus fabrum. They cannot be included en masse in the pre-Claudian table, as isolated examples of these posts in primipilaris careers occur up to 69.

BEFORE 69

ITALY

Regio I

Formiae

-urius Gallus (1)

Regio IV

Marruvium

Q. Lucilius Gallus

Supinum

L. Octavius Balbus  
Titecius -Regio VIII

Forum Livi

C. Purtilius Atinas

Regio X

-

C. Meffius Saxo

Italian

P. Cornelius Cicatricula

T. Pontinius ?

8

## PROVINCES

Gallia Narbonensis

Nemausus (colony)

L. Attius Lucanus

L. Vibrius Punicus

2

L. Attius Lucanus may have been a legionary. As was to be expected, these three tables cannot tell us a great deal, for so long as Italians are being recruited for the guard and for the legions a table of origines can tell us little about the corps from which the men listed in it came. We can draw the negative conclusions that no generalisation can be made about the proportion of primipilares from the guard to that from the legions before 69. We also note that it is Italy and the old colonies outside Italy that are supplying primipilares, which suggests it was the best type of man that was getting the primipilate.

## VESPASIAN TO NERVA

## ITALY

Regio IV

-

A. - Pudens

Regio IX

Alba Pompeia

Q. Mantius †

Regio X

Tergeste

Q. Petronius Modestus 3

## PROVINCES:

Spain

-

Cn. Pompeius Homullus ?

Pontus et Bithynia

Amastris

Sex. Vibius Gallus

Lycia and Pamphylia

Balbura

Marcius Titianus

Syria

Heliopolis (colony)

C. Velius Rufus

III 143871

5

The numbers are very small, as was to be expected for so short a period. They afford evidence not for proportion but for representation. The Italians ought to be either praetorians or ex equite Romano, i.e. equestrians who have sought and obtained direct commissions as centurions. Of the others I suspect Cn. Pompeius Homullus and Sex. Vibius Gallus to have been ex equite Romano, and Marcius Titianus definitely was.

it should be noted that Titianus and Gallus may belong to the period Trajan-Hadrian. The two colonists were probably legionaries. Note that the people ex equite Romano don't necessarily come from colonies, as probably at this period a legionary primipilaris would do.

Further to be taken into account are the following, who are all dated to the first century.

## FIRST CENTURY

### ITALY

#### Regio III

Grumentum

X 218

#### Regio X

Aquileia  
Varvaria

P. Bruttius Gratus  
L. Oppius Secundus

#### Italian

L. Aufellius Rufus 4

P. Bruttius Gratus had been a praetorian centurion.

## TRAJAN AND HADRIAN

### ITALY

#### Regio I

Atella

C. Nummius Constans  
N. Marcius Plaetorius  
Celer

#### Regio IV

Cures  
Paeligni

Octavius Secundus  
L. Decrius Longinus

Regio V

Auximum

C. Oppius Bassus

Regio VI

Attidium

C. Caesius Silvester

Matilica

C. Arrius Clemens

Regio IX

Alba Pompeia

- Memor

Regio X

Aquileia

M. Oscius Drusus

PROVINCESBaetica

Hispalis (colony)

M. Calpurnius Seneca

Tarraconensis

Aeso

L. Aemilius Paternus

Bracara Augusta

L. Terentius Rufus

Lycia and Pamphylia

Attaleia (semi-colony)

L. Gavius Fronto

Dalmatia

Epidaurus (colony)

Q. Marcius Turbo

Africa Procons..

Bulla Regia

Gargilius Venator

Vicus Annaeus

Q. Geminius Sabinus ? 7

This is a very important table, showing clearly the provinces still well represented under Trajan and Hadrian. L. Aemilius Paternus, L. Decrius Longinus and L. Aemilius Paternus were ex equite Romano. I suspect that L. Cammius Secundinus, Ti. Claudius Secundinus, M. Calpurnius Seneca, and

L. Gavius Fronto were also, and that N. Marcius Plaetorius Celer obtained a direct commission as centurion after a municipal career. Praetorians were C. Arrius Clemens, C. Caesius Silvester C. Nummius Constans, Octavius Secundus, and C. Oppius Bassus. The last-named may have only received his primipilate under Pius.

We may note in passing the case of T. Servaeus Sabinus, whose probable origo was the colony of Iconium, in the province of Galatia. His son served as a centurion in IX Hispana which gives a terminus ante quem of c. 140 (1).

The next list embraces the last three Antonines, and affords a strong contrast to the previous one.

## PIUS TO COMMODUS

### ITALY

#### Rome

C. Satrius Crescens  
F. Timinius Tertullus

#### Regio I

Beneventum

Cn. Marcius Rustius  
Rufinus

Teianum

P. Prosius Celer

#### Regio IV

Cures

Sex. Baius Pudens

Reate

L. Oranius Iustus

#### Regio V

Falerio

L. Calvisius Secundus

Firmum

M. Gavius Firmus

#### Regio VI

Urvinum Mataurense

C. Cestius Sabinus

L. Petronius Sabinus

Regio VII

Colonia Saturnina

C. Didius Saturninus

Regio VIII

Bononia

M. Maesius Geminus

Regio X

Mantua

L. Cominius Maximus

Regio XI

Concordia

T. Desticius Severus

Novaria

C. Valerius Pansa

Vercellae

Sextilius Marcianus

Italian

M. Bassaeus Rufus

L. Mantennius Sabinus ?

Gigennaus Valens

Q. Plotienus Sabinus

Pontienus Magnus

Tattius Maximus

Tuscenius Felix

23

## PROVINCES

Asturia and Galicia

-

G. Sulpicius Ursulus

Noricum

Solva (colony)

P. Aelius Crispinus

Dalmatia

Salona (colony)

T. Flavius Firmus

Asia

Heraclea

T. Statilius Solon

Numidia

Thamugadi (colony)

C. Vibius Marinus

5

While colonists are not completely swept from the field, they are clearly well outnumbered; known corps are as follows. Cn. Marcius Rustius Rufinus, G. Sulpicius Ursulus and T. Statilius Solon were ex equite Romano, and I suspect that C. Satrius Crescens was too. C. Valerius Pansa I suspect to have gained a direct commission after a municipal career. Praetorians were M. Gavius Firmus, L. Petronius Sabinus, C. Didius Saturninus, L. Cominius Maximus, Sextilius Marcianus, and M. Bassaeus Rufus. For this period, and this period alone, there is evidence for preference of Italians to provincials out of proportion to the respective numbers of each serving in the guard and legions, and it should be noted that this is not in itself evidence for unusual preference for praetorians. Italians could be either praetorians or ex equite Romano. This preference for Italians may be due to the fact that none of the three emperors had had prior military experience, which would have drawn their attention to the solid worth of many men from the ranks of the legion.

Before passing to the third century, two groups may be considered of less definite date. They are formed mainly of inscriptions where filiation, tribe, and the phrasing of the inscription indicate a date earlier than the third century to be probable. They are further subdivided into those which are second-century, and those which could also be first-century.

## FIRST AND SECOND CENTURIES

## ITALY

Regio I

Ostia	Fabius Longus (i)
	Fabius Longus (ii)
Fanum Fortunae	L. Ancharius Proculus

Regio II

Beneventum	L. Fullonius Severus
Compsa	M. Paccius Marcellus

Regio IV

Teate	P. Seius Rufus
-------	----------------

Regio V

Asculum	L. Saturnus Picens
---------	--------------------

Regio VI

Sassina	C. Disidenus Secundus
Tuficum	C. Sibidienus Maximus
Carsulae	C. Tifanus Cilo
Ostra	Q. Precius Proculus

Regio VII

Arretium	L. Umbricius Clemens
Clusium	A. Luc-

Regio X

Concordia	P. Minnius Salvius
-----------	--------------------

Regio XI

Mediolanum	P. Lucilius Successor
------------	-----------------------

Italian

Q. Anatus Paulus
C. Asinius Severus
A. Numisienus Gallus
C. Quintilius Priscus

PROVINCES

Germ. Sup.

Cologne (colony)

L. Mellonius Blandus

Syria

Berytus (colony,  
Berytus or Heliopolis (colonies)

C. Iulius Tiberinus  
Cn. Iulius Rufus

Maur. Caes.

Caesarea (colony)

Sex. Iulius Severus 4

The figures are irrelevant to the question of proportion of legionaries to praetorians, as till 69 there were considerable numbers of Italians in the legions, and from 138-69 Italians, which includes men ex equite Romano as well as praetorians, received preferential treatment. Of the colonists Sex. Iulius Severus was probably ex equite Romano, and the others probably legionaries.

SECOND CENTURY

ITALY

Regio I

Fundi

Ti. Veturius Mauretanus

Regio VI

Saena

Q. Terentius Firmus

Regio VII

Volsinii

C. Rufius Festus

Regio VIII

Ravenna  
Ariminum

M. Apicius Tiro  
L. Betutius Furianus  
III 14360.1

Regio x

Aquileia  
Altinum  
Verona  
Sassina

A. Caesilius Acastinus  
C. Valerius Secundus  
F. Cleusius Proculus  
L. Appaeus rudens

Italian

Amblasius Secundus ?  
Truttedius Clemens 13

PROVINCES

Britain

Lincōn (colony)

M. Minicius Marcellinus

Tarraconensis

-

C. Iulius Lepidus 2

As Britain is not known to have supplied the guard M. Minicius Marcellinus was almost certainly an ex-legionary. M. Apicius Tiro, P. Cleusius Proculus, and Amblasius Secundus, were all praetorians. Before going on to the third century there are two men from the colony of Carthage to consider, Sex. Atilius Rogatianus and P. Nonius Felix. The only clue to their dating is the fact that they use e.v. instead of the normal v.e. which is an earlier form, and suggests the late second century rather than the third. I did not wish to include them in the Pius-Commodus table on such slight evidence, as they would tend to change the picture a little, but held it necessary to mention them specifically so that the reader should have a chance to consider that possibility and its implication.

## THE THIRD CENTURY

## ITALY

Rome

M. Aquilius Felix

Regio I

Atina

M. Tillius Rufus

Regio V

Hadria

P. Sallienus Thalamus

Regio VII

Volsinii

Laberius Gallus  
C. Manilius O-Regio VIII

Ravenna

C. Publicius Proculeianus

Regio IX

Dertona

P. Vibius Marianus

Regio X

Cremona

L. Arbustius Valentinus

ItalianAnsius Proculus  
L. Petronius Taurus  
Volusianus 10

## PROVINCES

Germ. Inf..

Cologne (colony)

C. Titius Similis

Gallia Belgica

C. Suiccius La-

Area of XIII

Acceptus Faustinus

Liberalinius Probinus  
 M. Plavonius Victorinus  
 Sattonium Iucundus

Pann. Sup.

Emona (colony) M. Aurelius Germanus  
 Septimia Siscia (colony) C. Publilius Priscillianus  
 Carnuntum (colony) T. Pontius Marcianus

Pann. Inf..

Aquincum (colony) Aelius Aelianus

Moes. Sup.

Horrea Margi M. Aurelius Iustus (i)

Moes. Inf..

Oescus (colony) Aurelius Marcellinus  
 Traiana Augusta T. Aurelius Flavinus  
 Traianus Mucianus

Noricum

-

Valerius Claudius Quintus

Dacia

Apulum (colony) P. Aelius Marcellus  
 M. Ulpius Caius

Macedonia

Thessalonica Flavius Basilides

Asia

Cadi Aurelius Antiochus  
 Ephesus P. Marcus Sextianus  
 Pitani Flavius Herculanus  
 Aphrodisias P. Aelius Apollonianus

Bithynia

Apamea Aurel Flav. Rufinus ?  
 Nicomedia Tib. Cl. Demetrius  
 Prusias M. Aurelius Antoninus

Cappadocia

Isauria

Trocundus

Lycia and Pamphylia

Side

Bryonianus Lollianus

Syria

Heliopolis (colony)

L. Trebonius Sossianus

Syria Commagene

7

M. Aurelius Alexander

Arabia

Philippopolis (colony) Cl. Tiberius Demetrius

Africa Procons.

Tuccabor

C. Sulgius Caecilianus

Maur. Caes.

Auzia (colony)

P. Aelius Primianus

Numidia

Theveste (colony)

C. Cornelius Egrilianus

32

We are now in the same position as before 69, in that there is no clear geographical distinction between praetorian and legionary recruits. Perhaps the most remarkable feature of the table is that despite the apparent change from the policy of the last three Antonines the system is not completely cast aside. There are still a number of Italians, and many of the recruits from the West come from colonies. For the first time there are numerous representatives from the Danube provinces, but Africa is not well represented, and Thrace, source of so many legionar-

ies in this period, is unrepresented. As far as corps are concerned, L. Petronius Taurus Volusianus and P. Aelius Apollonianus were ex equite Romano, I suspect P. Aelius Marcellus was too, and P. Aelius Primianus appears to have begun his military career with a commission as decurion. Praetorians were M. Tillius Rufus and L. Arbustius Valentinus, while M. Aurelius Iustus (i) was a trecenarius, so presumably either from the guard or ex equite Romano. Centurions in the frumentarii were M. Aquilius Felix, P. Vibius Marianus, C. Titius Similis, P. Aelius Marcellus, Tib. Cl. Demetrius, L. Trebonius Sossianus, and C. Sulgius Caecilianus. Centuriones deputati were L. Petronius Taurus Volusianus and Aur. Flav. Rufinus. People who perhaps should not be considered as primipilares are C. Suiccius La-, whose career is baffling, Aelius Aelianus and TROCUNDUS, late ducenarian legionary prefects, and Liberalinius Probinus and Flavonius Victorinus, probably praetorian tribunes of the Gallic emperors. Note the group of men with Celtic or "manufactured" nomina, whose origines are to be found somewhere in the region covered by the thirteenth volume of the Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum.

There remain three short tables of men whose dating is very approximate, which may serve to increase the quantity if not the quality of the evidence available. The first are all later than 150.

AFTER 150

## ITALY

Regio VII

Capena

T. Gnorius Atilianus

## PROVINCES

Gallia Narbonensis

Arelate (colony)

M. Aurelius Priscus

Pannonia

-

Cornelius Saturninus

Mauretania Caesariensis

Tipasa (colony)

M. Cocceius Romanus

M. Aurelius Priscus was a praetorian, who became a centurio frumentarius. I suspect that M. Cocceius Romanus was ex equite Romano.

UNDATED

## ITALY

Regio II

Canusium

A. Busidius

Regio V

- Interamnia

Ti. Clāudius Vitalis

Regio XI

Ticinum

Q. Mattius Quartus

italian

Caetronius Cuspianus  
L. Pescennius Iustus

A. Numisienus Gallus  
P. Pacilius Zenon Laetus

PROVINCES

Spain

L. Septimius Sempronianus ?

Germ. Sup..

Dibio

Rebricus

Epirus

Byllis (colony)

C. Marius Secundus

Asia

Philadelphia

Heridophoros qui et  
Eutoneios

Temenothyrae

Arruntius -

Bithynia

Amastris

M. Aelius Caesonianus  
Dionysius

Galatia

Ancyra

-gus

Africa

Carthage (colony)

Flavius -  
L. Sallustius Processus

M. Aelius Caesonianus Dionysius was ex equite Romano.

The conclusions to be reached from these tables are as follows. From the first the primipilate was not restricted to Italians from Italy, but men received it from colonies in the older provinces of the Empire. The fall in recruitment of Italian<sup>s</sup> for the legions after 69 is not reflected in the figures, admittedly small, which we have for the period up to the end of Hadrian.

In this period, particularly in the Trajan-Hadrian period, the man ex equite Romano becomes prominent. The next period shows a virtual monopoly for Italians, though again I must emphasise the fact that there is no way of demonstrating that all these, or even a majority, were praetorians rather than men ex equite Romano. In connection with this favour for Italians, it should be noted that H.G. Pflaum in his Procurators, p. 185, drew attention to the disfavour shown by the last three Antonines to the Greek East. The third century did not see a complete revolution as far as the West was concerned, primipilares there being still largely drawn from Italy and the colonies; including those on the Danube. What is noticeable is the large number from the East, particularly from Asia Minor. I wish I knew what it meant. The general picture then reflects the fact that the primipilares were an elite body. They were drawn from the best, and therefore Italians and colonists were always prominent among them, whether those Italians were legionaries, before 69, praetorians, or men ex equite Romano. But, on the evidence given, the only period when there is definite evidence that Italians were favoured out of proportion to their numbers and normal advantages, i.e. superior education, better patronage, etc., was the period 138-93, and that favour is not necessarily the monopoly of the men from the guard.

THE PRIMIPILARIS AND THE LEGIONS - AS SOLDIER AND CENTURION

(a) As Soldier

The number of cases where it is definitely recorded that a primipilaris came from the ranks of the legions is not great.

---

Aelius Triccianus	- consular governor of <u>Pann. Inf.</u>
L. Attius Lucanus	- <u>primipilaris</u> (There is an element of doubt)
Aufidienus Rufus	- prefect of the camp
Ti. Claudius Demetrius	- centenarian procurator
M. Helvius Rufus	- <u>primipilaris</u>
L. Lepidius Proculus	- <u>primuspilus</u>
Plotius Firmus	- praetorian prefect
VL 32887	- <u>primuspilus</u>

---

To these might be added M. Oclatinus Adventus, as it is uncertain whether he served as speculator at Rome or on a governor's staff. The fact that the number of definite cases is so small is not of decisive importance in assessing the legionary contribution to the primipilate, for we may draw a parallel with the position as regarding centurions from the ranks of the legions. The cases where it can be shown that centurions came from the ranks are very small in number, as is apparent from the list given by G. Forni (1). Nevertheless the studies of W. Baehr and E. Birley (2) have shown clearly that the majority of legionary centurions came from that source. The reason for their failure to give their corps of origin in inscriptions is understandable. Why state a fact common to the majority ?

This applies with particular force where the man has risen to the primipilate and beyond. The cases we have do not go into considerable detail concerning their passage through the grades below centurion. Putting on one side the career of Valerius Thiumpo, who is part of a new system, we note only VI 32887, who was tesserarius at the time of his transfer to the guard, Aelius Triccianus, who became ostiarius to the governor of Pannonia, and the strange career of L. Attius Lucanus, if indeed the man who was signifer and then centurion was the same as the primipilaris. Ti. Claudius Demetrius was a frumentarius, and went to the castra peregrina at Rome to be centurio frumentarius. The distribution in period of our examples is most significant. L. Attius Lucanus, Aufidienus Rufus, M. Helvius Rufus, L. Lepsius Proculus, and Plotius Firmus, all belong to the first century. The rest are of the third. This points to our conclusions as to the policy of the second-century emperors being correct, though I would emphasise these figures are not safe ground for sweeping conclusions. Some attempt to give a more correct picture by using the evidence for origo is made in the chapter on the developing primipilate.

Their achievements vary. Of the first century group only Plotius Firmus achieved anything, and he probably owed much to the circumstances of civil war. Of the third century group, Aelius Triccianus had risen to the important prefecture of II Parthica when Macrinus took the extraordinary step of

making him a consular governor, Ti. Claudius Demetrius had the assistance of experience in the castra peregrina in rising to a centenarian procuratorship, and VI 32887 died as a primuspilus. These results reflect the general picture for the primipilate as much as they do that for the men from the ranks of the legions.

(b) As Centurion

We begin with an analysis of the men who held the legionary centurionate.

(a) Equestrians who held legionary and Rome centurionates.

L. Aemilius Paternus	<u>primuspilus</u>
Cn. Marcius Rustius Rufinus	praetorian prefect
C. Satrius Crecens	<u>primuspilus</u>
G. Sulpicius Ursulus	prefect of a legion.

(b) Equestrians who held only legionary centurionates.

L. Decrius Longinus	prefect of the camp
N. Marcius Plaetorius Celer	tribune of the <u>vigiles</u>
T. Pontius Sabinus	procurator, first ducenar- ian echelon.
L. Terentius Rufus	tribune of the <u>vigiles</u> .

(c) Praetorians who held Rome and legionary centurionates.

Amblasius Secundus	<u>primuspilus</u>
L. Arbustius Valentinus	<u>primuspilus</u> -
C. Arrius Clemens	<u>primipilaris</u>
M. Tillius Rufus	<u>primuspilus</u>
M. Vettius Valens	procurator, first ducenarian echelon.

(d) Praetorians who held only legionary centurionates.

M. Apicius Tiro	prefect of a legion.
C. Caesius Silvester	prefect of the camp.
C. Nummius Constans	<u>primuspilus</u>

Octavius Secundus	<u>primuspilus</u>
C. Oppius Bassus	<u>primuspilus</u>
L. Petronius Sabinus	procurator, second ducenarian echelon.
Sextilius Marcianus	<u>primuspilus</u>

(e) Men who held legionary centurionates and post in the castra peregrina.

P. Aelius Marcellus	prefect of a legion.
C. Sulgius Caecilianus	prefect of a legion.
C. Titius Similis	procurator, first ducenarian echelon.

(f) Men of uncertain origin who held legionary and Rome centurionates.

M. Pompeius Asper	prefect of the camp.
Q. Raecius Rufus	<u>primipilaris</u>

(g) Men, mainly of uncertain origin, who held only legionary centurionates.

L. Antonius Naso	procurator, first ducenarian echelon.
L. Artorius Castus	centenarian procurator.
Q. Geminus Sabinus	<u>primuspilus</u>
Ti. Iulius Italicus	<u>primuspilus</u>
C. Iulius Lepidus	<u>primuspilus</u>
M. Oppius	prefect of the camp
Sabidius C.f.	<u>primuspilus</u>
M. Septimius -lis	<u>primipilaris</u>
III 14360. 1	prefect of the camp.
XI 1059	prefect of a legion.

(h) Men, mainly of uncertain origin, whose fragmentary careers include legionary centurionates.

Atilius Verus	<u>primuspilus</u>
M. Aurelius Crescens	<u>primuspilus</u>
Catonius Iustus	praetorian prefect
C. Cornélius Egrilianus	prefect of a legion.
A. Instuleius Tenax	<u>primipilaris</u>
D. Iunius Verecundus	praetorian tribune
Q. Marcius Turbo etc..	praetorian prefect
Q. Mattius Quartus	<u>primuspilus</u>
A. Resius Maximus	<u>primuspilus</u>
Q. Stadius Proxumus	praetorian tribune
T. Suedius Clemens	ducenarian prefect of a legion.
C. Velius Rufus	procurator of Raetia.

C. Vibius Marinus	<u>primuspilus</u>
X 1711	ducenarian procurator.

(i) Men who hold centurionates of an unknown corps.

A. Busidius	<u>primipilaris</u>
P. Lucius Successor	<u>primuspilus</u>
M. Oclatinus Adventus	praetorian prefect
S. Sulpicius Similis	praetorian prefect
VI 1645	procurator, second ducenarian echelon.

Group (a) is composed of men of the second century. Group (b) consists of men from the period Trajan-Hadrian, though L. Decrius Longinus may have been a little earlier. Group (c) are second century, with the exception of M. Vettius Valens, from the first, and L. Arbustus Valentinus, from the third. It is noteworthy that the former is the only one to make progress. Of (d), a second-century group, only L. Petronius Sabinus, from the Pius-Commodus period, is really notable. All of (a) are third century. C. Titius Similis went to the castra peregrina and stayed there till the primipilate. In (g) note that L. Antonius Naso, the most distinguished, was probably from the ranks of the legions. I have made no attempt in the last four sections to distinguish them in date, as this does not help where the career is not known.

Upon these groups I base the following conclusions. First and foremost, the normal primipilaris career does not progress beyond the primipilate or the prefecture of the camp.

This lack of distinction in the careers whose highest point is given above is not to be laid at the door of the men from the ranks of the legions alone, for many praetorians and men ex equite Romano are included above. The second point is that there is no obvious difference in distinction between the praetorians and men ex equite Romano who held Rome and legionary centurionates, and those who held legionary centurionates alone. A further point arises from this, and the fact that I have only one certain case of a man who reached the primipilate without holding a legionary centurionate, L. Cominius Maximus, though there may have been others. It often has been said that the primipili brought the methods and discipline of the praetorian guard to the legions (3). It must be observed, however, that while on the evidence the vast majority, if not all, primipilares, held legionary centurionates, only a proportion held centurionates at Rome. Thus those of the men ex equite Romano who did not go to Rome centurionates, and all the men from the ranks of the legions, who as far as we can tell never went to them, could not act as instructors in the discipline of Rome. The training-ground for the primuspilus is the centurionate, and more especially the legionary centurionate.

There are several further questions to be considered in connection with the legionary centurionate. The first is that of the ladder of promotion. On this a great deal has been written in the past. I have accepted the views of Wegeleben(4),

according to which the steps are (a) a centurionate in cohorts 2-10, (b) one of the three junior centurionates of the first cohort, and then (c) tenure of the three posts of hastatus, princeps, and primuspilus in turn (cf. P. Aelius Marcellus). An important corollary of this is, as in a later chapter it is laid down that the primipilate is held for one year, that the posts of princeps and hastatus must have been held for a similar period, or slightly longer, as when the primuspilus completed his year of office the senior centurions of the first cohort would tend all to move up one, unless a senior praetorian centurion was given one of the vacancies created. This would also mean that when once a centurion had succeeded in reaching the primi ordines he could expect in about five years to become primuspilus. Also here should be mentioned the views of G. -Ch. Picard and H. Le Bonniec on the princeps and princeps praetorii<sup>n</sup>(5). I have felt able to leave the refutation of these to an Appendix.

The acceptance of the Wegeleben hypothesis clearly simplifies the picture enormously, but how are we to account for the variation in the number of centurionates held? According to Domaszewski movement from one legion to another denoted - promotion (6). In that case a definite relationship should appear between the number of centurionates held and the speed of promotion. Let us consider a table drawn up on these lines.

---

One centurionate

- M. Apicius Tiro evocatus, prefect of a legion.
- M. Oppius ? prefect of the camp.
- L. Terentius Rufus equestrian, tribune of vigiles.
- III 14360.] ? prefect of the camp.
- VI 32887 legionary, primuspilus.

Two centurionates

- L. Antonius Naso legionary?, procurator, first ducenar-  
ian echelon
- Octavius Secundus evocatus, primuspilus.
- C. Oppius Bassus evocatus, primuspilus.
- M. Pompeius Asper ? prefect of the camp.
- T. Pontius Sabinus equestrian procurator, first ducenar-  
ian echelon.
- Sabidius C.f. ? primuspilus.

Three centurionates

- Ti. Iulius Italicus ? primuspilus.
- C. Nummius Constans evocatus, primuspilus.
- G. Sulpicius Ursulus equestrian, prefect of a legion.
- C. Titius Similis ? ,procurator, first ducenarian  
echelon.

Four centurionates

- L. Artorius Castus ? centenarian procurator.
- L. Decrius Longinus equestrian, prefect of the camp.
- C. Iulius Lepidus ? primuspilus
- L. Lepidius Proculus legionary, primuspilus
- Cn. Marcius Rustius Rufinus equestrian, praetorian prefect.
- P. Aelius Marcellus castra per., prefect of a legion.

Five centurionates

- Amblasius Secundus ? , evocatus; primuspilus.
- L. Arbustius Valentinus evocatus, primuspilus
- C. Caesius Silvester evocatus, prefect of the camp.
- C. Sulgius Caecilianus castra per., prefect of a legion.
- M. Tillius Rufus evocatus, primuspilus.

Six centurionates

- C. Arrius Clemens evocatus, primipilaris.
- N. Marcius Plaetorius equestrian, tribune of vigiles.
- Celer
- Sextilius Marcianus evocatus, primuspilus.
- M. Vettius Valens evocatus, procurator, first ducenarian  
echelon.

Seven centurionates

L. Aemilius Paternus	equestrian,	<u>primuspilus</u> .
Q. Geminius Sabinus	?	<u>primuspilus</u> .

Nine centurionates

M. Septimius -lis	?	, <u>primuspilus</u> .
-------------------	---	------------------------

---

The figures show that the distinguished career tends to include two to four centurionates. They are not, however, to be taken merely at their face-value. T. Pontius Sabinus spent about fifteen years, it would appear, over his two centurionates. M. Vettius Valens and the long-serving Sextilius Marcianus had the same number of centurionates. What in fact is indicated by the number of centurionates is the number of changes of legion, in most cases. This may be accompanied by promotion, but does not need to be. In many cases it is probable that the transfer of the centurion is due to the movement of a vexillation from one legion to another. The whole subject of multiple centurionates deserves an exhaustive study. There is thus no justification in equating length of service with the number of centurionates mentioned. Therefore when I am considering the length of service in the centurionate I shall not base any conclusions on the number of centurionates held. From all this two corollaries may be drawn: (a) the length of service in the majority of legionary centurionates was not fixed; (b) normally it would not be worth-while to note a change of century inside a legion, as it was in most cases a

re-shuffle, not a promotion, but transfer to another legion was worth mentioning, even if it did not involve promotion, as something out of the ordinary. The centurial sign, followed by a legion, could cover a long period. The expression centurio et primuspilus, for example, could cover a very long period, and not just mean that a man had been princeps and primuspilus.

The question of the length of service of a particular man in the primipilate can thus only be decided on a consideration of fixed dates between which his years in the centurionate fell, or through the years of service being specified. There are a number of such cases. The classic ones for long service specifically in the centurionate are both praetorians, probably because the praetorian is the more informative. Sextilius Marcianus entered the guard in 140. He was evocatus in 157, and in 192 he reached the primipilate. M. Tillius Rufus was evocatus between 176 and 180, had not yet reached the primipilate in 208, and probably did so in 213. C. Arrius Clemens was decorated for Trajan's Dacian war some time between 101 and 107 as an eques in a praetorian cohort. M. Durry gave five years as the normal minimum time of service before the post was reached. He was decorated by Hadrian, presumably in his Jewish war (about 133-34) as trecenarius, so that if he was only just an eques when first decorated, and had eleven years as a soldier yet to run, at his second decoration he had been fifteen years in the centurionate. After that he held a

legionary centurionate and became primuspilus. The case of T. Pontius Sabinus has been referred to already. This is not the only evidence for long service as centurion and soldier, but it is the only evidence where the length of service in the centurionate will come under discussion when the age at which the primipilate was held is discussed in the next chapter, for differences in ages are largely to be accounted for by length of service as centurion rather than as soldier.

From our discussion we have learnt the following. The primuspilus who comes from the ranks of the legions is on the whole the least likely to give his corps of origin. The result is that the legionary contribution is the most difficult to estimate, for except in the period when the legionary recruitment was other than the praetorian there is no sure way of distinguishing them, and there is always the complicating factor of the men ex equite Romano, who have many origins. The centurionate of the legions is in its own way as important, if not more so, than the Rome tribunates, for as we have seen there are few who do not hold it at some time. It was the natural training-ground for the primipilate, and even the man who had learnt his trade as an equestrian officer before transferring to the centurionate, or the evocatus who had been a centurion at Rome, was rarely excused the tenure of it. That the majority of men who had been legionary centurions did not have distinguished careers only illustrates the general truth that the distinguished career is rare, and the man who

had such a career rarely bothered to detail his early career. The speed of promotion through the centurionate, has no close connection with the number of centurionates held, and can only be calculated in the few cases where points in the career are dated. It was most probably the most important part of the training of the primipilate, particularly in its closing stages, and was long or short according to the ability and support by patronage of the individual prospective primipilaris. Its importance should never be under-estimated.

THE PRIMIPILARIS AND THE ROME COHORTS AS SOLDIER AND CENTURION

(a) As soldier

The question as to whether the vast majority of primipilares were ex-members of the praetorian guard, as suggested by M. Durry, following Domaszewski,<sup>1</sup> has been dealt with in the chapter on the developing primipilate. The contribution of the present chapter to the examination of the Durry thesis will be a survey of the known contribution of the praetorian soldiers to the primipilaris corps. In this I will be guided by the following principles, which I have attempted to establish elsewhere in this work. I will only accept as evidence of service in the ranks of the guard a clear statement of the fact. It is not enough that the man was a centurion in the Rome cohorts, for these posts were also open to centurions ex equite Romano. Italian primipilares, even in the period when there were few Italians being recruited to the legions, cannot be accepted as ipso facto praetorians, for again the men ex equite Romano came also on occasions from Italy. It is equally wrong to say that a Rome tribune must be Italian and an ex-guardsmen,<sup>2</sup> for exceptions can be quoted in each case.<sup>3</sup> It will be seen that I have been strict, but also it will be seen that these limitations are fundamental.

The praetorian, entering the guard about the age of twenty, would become an evocatus, with hopes of the centurionate, after serving his sixteen years. He might receive the centurionate

earlier if he was promoted directly to it from the post of cornicularius praefectorum. Though details vary, they would in general all have held the three "taktische Chargen" of Domaszewski, and have been on the praetorian prefects' staff.

(a) Detailed Careers

Amblasius Secundus

mil. coh. [.. urb. bf]r, mil. coh. I, tesserari [i, op] tionis, sign. coh. eiusdem, [be] nef. praef. praet., [ev] oc. Aug.,

C. Arrius Clemens

militi coh. IX pr., equiti coh. eiusdem, donis donato ab Imp. Traiano, torquibus, armillis, phaleris ob bellum Dacicum, singulari praefectorum, tesserario, optioni, fisci curatori, connicul. tribuni., evocato, Aug..

Octavius Secundus

mil. coh. X urb., translat. in coh. VI pr., sing. trib., benef. trib., sing. pr. praet., optio in centur. sign., [f] is [c] o curat., cornicu [t.] trib., ev. Aug..

C. Oppius Bassus

mil. coh. II pr. et coh. XIII urb. et XIII urb., omnibus officiis in caliga functo, bf. pr. pr., evoc. Aug., ab act. fori. mil. coh. XIII et XIII urbanarum, tesse., option., signif. coh. II pr., evoc. Aug., ab actis fori..

Sextilius Marcianus

[qui est f] actus m [lles in cohorte V] - II pr., p [robatus... factus principali] s... [militavit exactus, t [esserarius, optio, sig] nif., bf. [pr. pr., factus in leg. XX] II Pr. p. [f. evocatus], ...VI a [nno? ab Imp.] ordinibus [adscriptus].

VI 32887

..qui] coe [pit] mil [itare probatus in leg.] ... [fac] tus tes [se] rarius in [leg. eadem, tra] nslatus [in prae] to [rium] .. [mil. coh. praetoriae f] actus.. factus bf. [pr. pr.], ....oleus evo [c..

(b) Careers mentioning evocatus, but with little detail

N L. Arbustius Valentinus	evoc. Aug. ex coh. IIIII pr..
Aurelius Marcianus	pp. ex coh. III pret..
C. Caesius Silvester	benef. pr. pr., evoc. Aug..
L. Cominius Maximus	beneficiar. praef. praetori, evocat Augustorum.
C. Nummius Constans	milit. coh. III praet. et X urb., evocato in foro ab actis..
M. Tillius Rufus	evoc. Augg..
M. Vettius Valens	mil. coh. VIII pr., benef. praef. pr., evoc. Aug..
XI 2112	evoc. Aug..

(c) Careers mentioning the post a comm. cust..

M. Apicius Tiro	ab indicib, curat. salar. evoc., optioni, a comment. cust., evoc. (S)
Sex. Cetrius Severus	spec., beneficiari Getae (the praetorian prefect), ab comentaris custodiaru[m].
VI 31871	evoc., [a commentar. cus] tod..

(d) Careers involving promotion to the centurionate direct  
From corn. pr. pr..

M. Aurelius Priscus	primiscripio castrorum praett., ostiaro praef. praett., canal- iculario.
Ti. Claudius Firmus	pp. ex cornicular. ipsius.
P. Cleusius Proculus	pp...ex corniculario pr. pr...
L. Petronius Sabinus	corn. pr. pr..
VI 1645	corn. praef. pr..

The details of this career will not be gone into here.  
They are given to afford an opportunity to the student to

pursue the matter further, if he so wishes. The immediate question that confronts us is what rank did these men reach. Lists follow, drawn up in the periods we have distinguished in the chapter on the geographical origins of the primipilares.

### 1. Claudius-Nero

Sex. Cetrus Severus	praetorian tribune
M. Vettius Valens	proc. Lusitaniae.

### 2. Flavians

No examples

### 3. Trajan-Hadrian

C. Arrius Clemens	served thirty-nine years at least, <u>primuspilus</u> .
C. Caesius Silvester	retired prefect of the camp.
C. Nummius Constans	dead as <u>primuspilus</u> .
Octavius Secundus	<u>primuspilus</u> , probably retired.
C. Oppius Bassus	<u>primuspilus</u> , may have gone further.

XI 2112

served thirty years at least, primuspilus.

### 4. Pius-Commodus

M. Bassaeus Rufus	praetorian prefect.
Ti. Claudius Firmus	<u>primuspilus</u> , <sup>may</sup> have gone further.
L. Cominius Maximus	<u>procurator Aug. i. (patrimonii ?)</u>
L. Petronius Sabinus	<u>procurator stationis hered.</u>
Sextilius Marcianus	served fifty-two years, <u>primuspilus</u> .

VI 31871

procurator XL Galliarum.

### 5. Second-century, not closely datable.

Amblasius Secundus	dead as <u>primuspilus</u> .
M. Apicius Tiro	prefect of the camp.

P. Cleusius Proculus                    dead as primuspilus.

6. Third Century

L. Arbustius Valentinus                dead as primuspilus

M. Aurelius Priscus                    primuspilus, probably retired.

M. Oclatinus Adventus                praetorian prefect (not  
definitely from praetorian  
ranks).

M. Tillius Rufus                        served forty-nine years at  
least, primuspilus.

VI 1645                                    praefectus vehiculorum.

VI 32887                                  dead as primuspilus.



These lists indicate the furthest recorded point in the careers of primipilares known to have started their careers in the ranks of the praetorian guard. This must be emphasised, for on this evidence must be judged the Durry thesis, not on isolated examples. The examples for the early period are few, and nothing definite can be said about the first century. Under Trajan and Hadrian, on the other hand, it is notable how many careers we know of which ended with the primipilate. This is not of course true for all primipilares, for as we shall see in the chapter on the procurators, this very period saw a significant increase in the number of cases of primipilaris procurators and prefects. Two points are illustrated here, the fact that the majority of primipilares did not go on to further posts, and that those who did quite frequently did not indicate their corps of origin.

With the period of the last three Antonines we have a

number of examples of primipilares who began in the ranks of the guard, and went on to procuratorships. One reached the prefecture. As is apparent from the evidence on geographical origin, that given in the second part of the chapter on the Rome centurions and that on the men ex equite Romano, this period was marked by the favour shown to Italians. Of the careers, that of M. Bassaeus Rufus is the only outstanding one, though it is to be noted that both L. Cominius Maximus and L. Petronius Sabinus began their careers with swift promotion, but circumstances unknown to us brought an end to their progress. The unknown of VI 31871 received a centenarian procuratorship, that of XL Galliarum, after a legionary prefecture, and one would expect his further progress, if he made any, to be slow.

In the third century there are two careers of note, that of M. Oclatinus Adventus unfortunately being possibly of a legionary. We know that he was a speculator, but not whether he was such at Rome or on a provincial governor's staff. The unknown of VI 1645 won the favour of the Philips, but it is probable that their fall brought his career to an end.

It is clear so far that the thesis of M. Durry must be modified in two important aspects. It must be recognised that it cannot be assumed that the vast majority of primipilares known to reach the top were praetorians. E. Birley in fact in an article examined this problem of the corps of recruitment (6) and I give his results, with my own figures, in the final

summary after the survey of the Rome centurionates. His main point was that over fifty per cent of the primipilares known to us as receiving further promotion give no details of their career before the primipilate. The second modification is in the matter of proportion also. M. Durry twice took M. Vettius Valens as a typical case (7). It has appeared here, and it appears from whatever aspect the primipilares<sup>are</sup> considered, that in fact the true typical case is that of the man who does not go beyond the primipilate or, if he does, becomes the prefect of the camp. M. Durry was completely justified in declaring the possibility of a brilliant career for the primipilaris; it is on the question of the proportion of primipilares for which such a career was possible that I wish to take issue with him.

(b) As centurion

The centurions of the Rome cohorts, as M. Durry observed (78), were recruited from the men ex equite Romano, and the evocati. A considerable amount of success among these centurions would be highly significant. Among the lists that will appear as we study various aspects of the Rome centurionates, will be found the names of those who held such centurionates with whom we have already dealt as praetorian soldiers. In nine cases, namely those of M. Apicius Tiro, M. Aurelius Priscus, C. Caesius Silvester, C. Nummius Constans, Octavius Secundus, C. Oppius Bassus, L. Petronius Sabinus, Sextilius

Marcianus, and unknown of VI 32887, Rome centurionates were not held by ex-praetorians. They held only legionary centurionates, with the exception of M. Aurelius Friscus, who only held a centurionate in the frumentarii. One of the questions we shall have to ask ourselves is whether the passage of the years in the centurionate at Rome or elsewhere was significant.

One of the first things that we notice about the Rome centurionates is that they are all graded according to their corps and it is uncommon to hold two posts in the same grade. This is in direct contrast to the centurions in the legions, of whom in Wegeleben's view (Q), which I share, fifty out of sixty were on a par. This means that the centurion at Rome must move from corps to corps if ~~he~~<sup>he is</sup> to be promoted. A legionary centurion, on the other hand, can pass into the primi ordines of the first cohort and through them into the first primipilate without leaving the legion. Also he can change his legion for reasons unconnected with promotion. These matters are dealt with in the chapter on the legionary centurionate, so I will not pursue them further now. The centurionates usually held at Rome were as follows:

centurio vigilum

centurio statorum

centurio urbanus

centurio praetorianus

primus ordo - princeps castrorum

(trecenarius)

I have placed the post of trecenarius in brackets because very little that is certain is known about it. Lip-service has been paid for a long time to the Domaszewski dictum that the trecenarius was commander of the three hundred speculatores,<sup>10</sup> but it has been clearly recognised that the solution to fit all the contexts in which we find this post has not yet been found. A very useful study, which sees clearly that there is a problem, is that of Passerini.<sup>11</sup> My own discussion will be found in an appendix. In the same appendix will be found a discussion of the three people whose relations are not altogether clear, the primus ordo, the princeps castrorum, and the princeps praetorii. It need only be noted here that I have not included the latter here, for that office has yet to be proved to be praetorian, as an examination of Domaszewski's argument with the texts will soon demonstrate.<sup>12</sup> While it would be unwise to try to state definite equivalents of centurionates at Rome and in the legions, it may be noted here that L. Aemilius Paternus, C. Cestius Sabinus and Sulpicius Ursulus began in Rome with the urban centurionate after holding legionary centurionates, and M. Pompeius Asper with the praetorian.

The next question that arises is that of Domaszewski's contention that, except for certain praetorian centurionates, the primipilate is always preceded by a legionary centurionate, in the grade of princeps.<sup>13</sup> The exception he gives is that of the primus ordo, one of which he gives to every cohort on uncertain evidence (see IX 2983 in the Prosopography). In fact

there are a number of cases of direct promotion to the primipilate from the praetorian centurionate, in which there is no need to suppose that the centurionate in question was "primus ordo," namely those of P. Bruttius Gratus, L. Cominius Maximus, G. Sulpicius Ursulus, M. Pompeius Asper, and of Cn. Marcius Rustius Rufinus.

We come now to the analysis of the careers of these men who passed through the Rome centurionates. Two methods of analysis are possible, by chronological period, and by type of career.

### 1. Before Claudius

L. Ovinus Rufus

prim. ordo cohortium praet. Divi Augusti, prim. pil. leg. XIII Gem., trib. mil. cohort. XI urb., trib. mil. coh. III praet., praef. fabr..

IX 2985

[7 coh.] h. VII pr., primus ordo praef. a [fa] br. Ti. Caesaris Augusti.

### 2. Claudius-Nero

P. Alfenus Valens

trecenarius Augusti., - pp. - praef. cast., praef. praet..

L. Rufellius Severus

[7 coh. .. vig.] et stator. et coh. VI [praet.], primi pili II leg. .. et leg. .. , trib. coh. VII pr., probably retired.

M. Vettius Valens

evoc. Aug., 7 coh. VI vig., 7 stat., 7 coh. XVI urb., 7 coh. II pr., exercitatori equit. speculatorum, princip. praetori leg. XIII Gem., ex trec. [pp.] leg. VI Victr., trib. coh. V vig., trib. coh. XII urb., coh. III pr., [pp. II] leg. XIII [I] Gem. Mart. Victr., proc. Imp. [Neronis] Caes. Aug. prov. Lusitan..

### 3. Flavians

Q. Raecius Rufus

trecenario, princ. praet., pp. leg.

XII Fulm., dead.

4. First Century

P. Bruttius Gratus

7 chort. I praet., [prim]  
pil. leg. XIII... 5. Trajan-Hadrian

L. Aemilius Paternus

praef. fabr., 7 leg. VII G.,  
7 leg. I M., 7 leg. VII Cl.,  
7 leg. XIII G., 7 coh. V [urb],  
7 coh. III pr., CCC leg. II  
Aug. et pp..

C. Arrius Clemens

evocato Aug., 7 coh. I vigil.  
7 statorum, 7 coh. XIII urb.  
7 coh. VII pr., trecenario,  
7 leg. III Aug., primipilari.

M. Pompeius Asper

7 leg. XV Apollinar., 7 coh.  
III pr., primop. leg. III  
Cyren., praef. castr. leg.  
XX Victr..

Sex. Vibius Gallus

trecenarius, primipilaris,  
praef. kastor. leg. XIII G..

XI 211z

[prim. pi] l. leg. VI Ferr.,  
7 leg...ex CCC et coh. X pra-  
[et. et]urb. et statorum et  
[...vig., e]voc. Aug..6. Pius-Commodus

C. Cestius Sabinus

7 leg. II Adiutric. pia. fid.  
et leg. VII Claud. p. f.,  
7 coh. VIII pr., 7 leg. VIII  
Aug. ex trecenario, pp. leg  
I Adiutricis p.f., trib. coh.  
XIII urb..

L. Cominius Maximus

pp. bis, procuratori M. Anton-  
ini Aug., praef. leg. II  
Traianae fortis, CC, trib.  
chor. VII praetoriae, XIII  
urbanae, III vigul., centurio  
chortis I pr., X urbanae, V  
vig., evocato Augustorum..

Cn. Marcius Rustius Rufinus

*praef.*  
 [praef. praet.] - cohort-  
 lum vigilum, p[r]aesepito  
 an[nonae Imp. etc., praef  
 classium praetoria [ru]m  
 Misenatum [et Ravennat,  
 trib. co]hortium primae  
 prae[to]riae, XI urban.,  
 VI vigil., prim. pil.  
 legi]onum III Cyrenaicae,  
 III Gall[icae], 7 coh. I  
 [pr.? [exercitato]ri equit  
 [um speculator.], [urb. ...  
 vig., XV Ap]oll., [ab Imp.  
 Augusto ordinibu[s  
 adscripto ex]equite  
 Roman[o].

C. Satrius Crescens

eq. publ., (7 praet.),  
 ex CCC, (7 III Aug.), pp.  
 leg. III Aug..

G. Sulpicius Ursulus

praef. symmachiatorum  
 Asturum belli Dacici,  
 7 leg. I Minerviae p. f.,  
 7 coh. XII urbanae, 7  
 coh. IIII praetoriae, pp.  
 leg. XIIX, praef. leg.  
 III Aug.

VI 31871

~~proc.~~ proc. XL] Galliar.,  
 praeposit. v [exillationum  
 per Ital.] et Raet. et  
 Noric. [bello Germanico,  
 pra]ef kastr. leg. II  
 Tra[lanae fortis, pp.  
 leg. .., 7 coh. ..  
 p]raet., XII urb., [c.  
 vig., evoc. a comm,  
 cus]tod..

## 7. Second Century

Amblasius Secundus

mcc Aug., [... 7 coh.]  
 I vig, 7 coh. XIII urb.  
 [7] leg. V Ma. ex tr.,  
 m a c f stre ...hic I  
 Adiutricis p.f..

## 8. Third Century

L. Arbustius Valentinus

evoc. Aug. ex coh. IIII  
 pr., 7 coh. II vig.,

	7 coh. XI urb., 7 coh. VII pr., 7 leg. VII Ge., 7 leg. VII Gemin. p.f., pp. leg. IIII Fl. Fel..
M. Aurelius Iustus (1)	ex CCC p.p..
C. Didius Saturninus	mil. praet. - 7 praet. - pp. (At least thirty-eight years before primipilate reached).
T. Flavius Caralitanus	7 praet. - pp..
T. Flavius Maximus	ex 7 praet. pp. praef. leg. III Aug. Severi..
G. Iulius Caninus	pref. leg. II Ad. p. f. Se[verianae], ex trec [ena]no
Oclatius Sacerdos	[ex CC]C pp. le[g..
M. Tillius Rufus	(pp. leg. XXII Pr.), 7 leg. XX Val. Vict., ex CCC coh. III pr. p.v., prin, castror, eq. p. exor. et donis donato ab Imp. Severo et Antonino Aug., 7 coh. XII urb. et I vig., evoc. Augg.. (49½53 years' service.)

### 8. Undated

A. Numisiunus Gallus	trecenario, primop. leg. XIV Gem..
V. 795a	...7 coh. .. ur]banae, 7 coh V [praet., ... pp. le]g. XI Cl. p.f., pra[ef. leg....

---

In the first period of all, we note the senior post of praefectus fabrum closing the career, and the cases of the primus ordo of the praetorian cohorts. The evidence for the first century in general is scanty. Again, the period Trajan-Hadrian is notable for the lack of progress beyond the

primipilate, and the period Pius- Commodus is a marked contrast, especially when we remind ourselves that M. Bassaeus Rufus also belongs to this period. The third century has no outstanding careers, the two people from the ranks of the guard who rose to the heights, M. Oclatinus Adventus (not certainly a praetorian) and the unknown of VI 1645, not having Rome centurionates attested; though we know so little of their careers that we cannot assert that they did not hold such posts. The picture thus agrees with the general one we have of the variation in favour shown towards the praetorian, and to some extent, to the men ex equite Romano. It is of course to be borne in mind in assessing these figures that the Rome centurions could be from either of these two sources. We come now to types of career. As full texts appear above, these are given in abbreviated form.

(a) Careers where legionary centurionates precede the Rome posts.

L. Aemilius Paternus	<u>praef. fabr.</u> , 7 4 legions, 7 <u>urb.</u> , 7 <u>pr.</u> , <u>trec. leg.</u> , <u>pp.</u> . Dead.
C. Cestius Sabinus	- 7 2 legions, 7 <u>urb.</u> , 7 <u>pr.</u> , <u>trec.</u> , 7 <u>leg.</u> , <u>pp.</u> , <u>trib. coh.</u> . <u>XIII urb.</u> .
Cn. Marcius Rustius Rufinus	<u>ex equite Romano</u> , 7 <u>leg.</u> , 7 <u>vig.</u> . 7 <u>urb.</u> , 7 <u>praet.</u> , <u>pp</u> - <u>praetorian</u> prefect.
M. Pompeius Asper	7 <u>leg.</u> , 7 <u>pr.</u> , <u>pp.</u> , <u>praef. castr.</u>
G. Sulpicius Ursulus	<u>praef. coh.</u> , 7 <u>leg.</u> , 7 <u>urb.</u> , 7 <u>praet.</u> , <u>pp.</u> , <u>praef. leg.</u> .

(b) Careers where legionary centurionates follow the Rome posts.

Amblasius Secundus	<u>evoc.</u> , 7 <u>vig.</u> , 7 <u>urb.</u> , <u>trec.</u> , 7 <u>leg.</u> , <u>pp.</u> Dead.
L. Arbustius Valentinus	<u>evoc.</u> , 7 <u>vig.</u> , 7 <u>urb.</u> , 7 <u>pr.</u> , 7 twice in same legion, <u>pp.</u> Dead.
C. Arrius Clemens	<u>evoc.</u> , 7 <u>vig.</u> , 7 <u>stat.</u> , 7 <u>urb.</u> , 7 <u>pr.</u> , <u>trec.</u> , 7 <u>leg.</u> , <u>pp.</u> Probably retired.
C. Satrius Crescens	<u>eq. publ.</u> , ..7 <u>praet.</u> , - <u>trec.</u> , 7 <u>leg.</u> , - <u>pp.</u>
M. Tillius Rufus	<u>evoc.</u> , 7 <u>vig.</u> , 7 <u>urb.</u> , <u>princ.</u> , <u>cast.</u> , <u>trec. coh. pr.</u> , 7 <u>leg.</u> , <u>pp.</u> 49-53 years' service.
M. Vettius Valens	<u>evoc.</u> , 7 <u>vig.</u> , 7 <u>stat.</u> , 7 <u>urb.</u> , 7 <u>praet.</u> , <del>7</del> <u>trec.</u> , <u>princ.</u> , <u>praet. leg.</u> , <u>pp</u> - first-echelon ducenarian procuratorship.

(c) Careers with Rome centurionates only

L. Cominus Maximus	<u>evoc.</u> , 7 <u>vig.</u> , 7 <u>urb.</u> , 7 <u>pr.</u> , <u>pp</u> - two ducenarian procuratorships. Dead.
--------------------	--

(d) Fragments or abbreviated careers.

L. Rufellius Severus	7 <u>vig?</u> , 7 <u>stat.</u> , 7 <u>pr.</u> , - <u>pp.</u> , - <u>pp II.</u> Probably retired.
V 795a	....7 <u>urb.</u> , 7 <u>pr.</u> , - <u>pp.</u> , <u>praef. leg.</u>
XI 2112	<u>evoc.</u> , 7 <u>vig.</u> ?, 7 <u>stat.</u> , 7 <u>urb.</u> , 7 <u>pr.</u> , <u>trec.</u> , - <u>pp.</u> .. Career broken off.
VI 31871	<u>evoc.</u> , 7 <u>vig</u> ?. 7 <u>urb.</u> , 7 <u>pr.</u> , - <u>pp</u> - to a centenarian procuratorship, Career broken off.
P. Alfenus Varus	<u>trec.</u> - <u>pp.</u> - <u>praef. cast.</u> - <u>praef. praet.</u>

M. Aurelius Iustus (i)	<u>ex trec. pp.</u>
G. Iulius Caninus	<u>pref. leg. ex trec.</u>
A. Numisienus Gallus	<u>trec., pp.</u>
Oclatius Sacerdos	<u>ex trec. pp.</u>
Q. Raecius Rufus	<u>trec., princ. praet., pp.</u>
Sex. Vibius Gallus	<u>trec., pp., praef. castr..</u> <u>Probably ex equite Romano.</u>
P. Bruttius Gratus	- ... 7 <u>pr.</u> , <u>pp.</u> , career broken off.
C. Didius Saturninus	<u>mil. praet.</u> - 7 <u>pr.</u> - <u>pp.</u>
T. Flavius Caralitanus	7 <u>praet.</u> - <u>pp.</u> , dead.
T. Flavius Maximus	<u>ex 7 praet. pp. praef. leg.</u>
L. Ovinus Rufus	<u>prim. ordo coh. pr., pp. -</u> <u>to praef fabr..</u>
IX 2983	7 <u>praet.</u> , <u>prim. ordo coh. pr.</u> <u>praef. fabr.</u>

---

The first group includes three men ex equite Romano, and two men of uncertain corps of origin. This is far too small a basis to form a conclusion on, but it is worth while asking ourselves whether it is possible that only the men ex equite Romano normally held legionary centurionates before Rome centurionates while the ex-praetorian, if he held the latter, did so immediately upon commission as centurion. If this is valid, the reason may be administrative convenience, the evocatus being in Rome, while the directly-commissioned centurion was probably in his home province, from which he could go to the legion stationed there or to a neighbouring

one as conveniently as to Rome. A definite answer can only be given in the light of fresh evidence. The only outstanding career beyond the primipilate is that of Rufinus, but it is to be noted that C. Cestius Sabinus held the important thirteenth urban cohort, one of those outside Rome, and such a post carried the possibility of direct nomination to a first-echelon ducentarian procuratorship.

In the second group usually only one legionary centurionate was held, in the case of M. Vettius Valens that of princeps praetorii. L. Arbustius Valentinus held two centurionates in the same legion. In this group of six it is notable that only one definitely went beyond the primipilate, Valens. We are not certain about Crescens, and it must be remembered in his case that he may have been ex equite Romano. The others were all evocati.

Only in one case is the career full enough to prove that no legionary centurionate was held, that of L. Cominius Maximus. He died at the age of eighty, but his career had come to an abrupt end several years previously.

Some of the men in the final group, of course, may not have held legionary centurionates. As far as their careers are concerned, ignoring the praetorian prefecture which Alfenus Varus owed to civil war, the highest point reached is pp. II, by L. Rufellius Severus. L. Ovinus Rufus had a career that in the second century might have led to procuratorships, but in his period, before Claudius, led to the post of praefectus

fabrum, as did that of the unknown of IX 2983. This is the post on the staff of a governor commanding legions, and not to be confused with the post held by L. Aemilius Paternus, which was civil. Of those whose careers are broken off, the most notable is that of the unknown of VI 31871, who reached a centenarian procuratorship, but this career was far less likely than that of the Rome tribunes to lead to a number of ducenarian procuratorships.

Having examined these lists of known praetorian soldiers and centurions, to which perhaps the name of Saturninus might be added, surely the first thing that strikes us is the paucity of the evidence, particularly as far as men who served in the ranks are concerned, for their progress beyond the primipilate and the prefecture of the camp. The conclusions of E. Birley in the article cited above may be compared (6). This fact stands out whatever list one examines, even for the men ex equite Romano. This is the starting-point for our estimate of the accuracy of the picture painted by M. Durry (14). That picture was based on two observations, I take it, that a number of outstanding procurators and prefects issued from the primipilares, and that a large number of primipilares were praetorians. In this latter point he could of course base himself on Domaszewski (15). To these two points I would observe the following: (a) the proportion of the recorded primipilares who rose to be procurators or prefects is very small in relation to their number, as appears from a number of

lists throughout this study; and it can indeed be demonstrated that the proportion could never be great, given the number of primipilares available, the posts they had to fill, and the competition they had to face; (b) the period of time within which praetorians received the vast majority of the primipilate is demonstrably the reigns of the last three Antonines, and for no period is it demonstrable that the praetorians provided the bulk of the primipilares proceeding beyond the primipilate. (It is not certain what proportion of men ex equite Romano there was under the last three Antonines, incidently<sup>al</sup>). On the question of men proceeding beyond the primipilate I give below some very significant figures from that same article by E. Birley, with my own, derived from a larger number of examples.

	BIRLEY	DOBSON	
No service prior to pp. recorded	64	122	61%
Prior service in legions only	20	25	12½%
" " in legions and guard	2	9	4½%
" " in guard only	12	12	6%
" " insufficiently clear	3	ex eq. R 7	3½%
		cast. 11	5½%
		Misc. 10	5%
	<u>101</u>	<u>196</u>	<u>98%</u>

Ignoring the other figures, as so many of the careers on which they are based are summarised, fragmentary, or incomplete, notice how little the proportion of those who give no information as to their corps of origin, or even of their centurionates, has varied.

A further point that arises in considering the thesis of M. Durry is the speed of the passage through the Rome centurionates, which he contrasted with that through the legions (16).

However, it seems truer to say that the passage through the Rome centurionates, was governed in its speed by the ability of the individual. Thus Satrius Crescens took twelve years to reach the primipilate from the praetorian centurionates. M. Tillius Rufus spent twenty-three years at least in the centurionate, eighteen or more of which were spent in four Rome centurionates and one legionary. Sextilius Marcianus, on the other hand, held his centurionates in the legions, and spent thirty-one years in that rank, having been an evocatus five years. C. Arrius Clemens spent a minimum of twenty years in four Rome centurionates and the post of trecenarius. C. Didius Saturninus reached the praetorian centurionate forty years after his first decoration. Varius Quintus Gaius served 55 years and died at the age of eighty-five without reaching the primipilate, and L. Laelius Fuscus served forty-two years without reaching it. Both were trecenarii. The true contrast would thus appear to be between the man destined for great things and the man who was a good soldier, and nothing more, rather than between the centurionates at Rome and the centurionates in the provinces. That is not, of course, to ignore the fact that from the social point of view life in Rome was infinitely more pleasant, and the praetorians and men ex equite Romano correspondingly more privileged.

I have no wish to minimise the part played by the guard. It provided first-class material. Some of the primipilares who rose to procuratorships and prefectures and whose early careers

are unknown, must have been praetorians, though we cannot say definitely which. But the evidence does not demonstrate a monopoly or quasi-monopoly. In their most flourishing period, Pius-Commodus, they still faced the competition of the men ex equite Romano. The reasons given by E. Birley in his article (19) would however always ensure them of representation in the corps of primipilares higher than their comparative numbers would warrant, i.e. such things as superior education, the favour of the praetorian prefect, the opportunity to gain the favour of other highly-placed men, and of the emperor himself. Above all, it must be emphasised that for them as for the primipilares as a body the main sphere of usefulness was the centurionate, the primipilate, and the prefecture of the camp. They also helped to fill the Rome tribunates. The procuratorships, however, were only reached by a small number of gifted and favoured men, drawn from the three sources to which we have so constantly referred, of whom an even smaller group was earmarked for the <sup>prefectures</sup> ~~centurionate~~. The most, in my judgement, that can be said with regard to the contribution of the praetorian guard to the primipilate is, that it was more than proportional to their numbers, was not primarily or mainly a contribution to the primipilares procurators, and cannot be exactly calculated in view of the large number of men, both those who retired as primipilares and those who went further, who give us no clue as to their corps of origin.

THE PRIMIPILARIS AND THE EQUESTRIAN ORDER

The seeking and obtaining by equestrians of direct commissions as centurions is clearly attested in literature.

Seneca, controv, 9

Census in castris ordinem promovet, census in foro iudices legit (A.D. 31).

Seneca, d. gramm., 24.

M. Valerius Probus, Berytius, diu centurionatum petiit, donec taedio ad studia se contulit.

Hieronimus ad a. Abr. 2072

Probus Berytius ... Romae agnoscitur (A.D. 56)

Frontin., Strat., IV 6.4

Divus Augustus Vespasianus cum quendam adolescentem honeste natum militiae inhabilem angustiarum rei familiaris causa eductum ad longiorem ordinem rescisset, constituto censu honesta missione exauctoravit.

Juvenal, XIV 19

Dirae Maurorum attegias, castella Brigantum, Ut locupletem aquilam tibi sexagensimus annus Adferat.

Pliny, epist., VI 25.

Metilius Crispus municipes meus: huic ego ordinem impetraveram atque etiam proficiscenti quadraginta milia nummum ad instruendum ornandumque donaveram (97-108)

Florus, fragm. Halm., p. 108

Nempe si mihi maximus imperator vitem, id est centum homines regendos tradidisset, non mediocris honos habitus mihi videretur; cedo si praefecturam, tribunatum: nempe idem honos, nisi quod merces amplior.

SHA Pertinax 1,5,6.

P. Helvius Pertinax grammaticen professus est; sed cum in ea minus quaestus proficeret, per Lollianum Avitum, consularem virum, patris patronum, ducendi ordinis dignitatem petiit... dein praefectus cohortis in Syriam profectus est.

Dio 52, 25  
(Loeb trans.)

If any of the knights, after passing through many branches of the service, distinguishes himself enough to become a senator, his age ought not to hinder him at all from being enrolled in the senate. Indeed, some knights should be received into the senate, even if they

have seen service only as company commanders in the citizen legions, except such as have served in the rank and file. For it is both a shame and a reproach that men of this sort who have carried faggots and charcoal, should be found on the roll of the senate; but in the case of knights who began their service with the rank of centurion, there is nothing to prevent the most notable of them from belonging to the senate.

Only some of these cases of course relate to equestrians. A man who had reached a municipal magistracy might have hopes of obtaining a direct commission as centurion, and in the tables that follow I will attempt to distinguish such men from equestrians, though this cannot be done for every case. It will be noted that the literary references cover most of the first two centuries, and if we take Dio to have been thinking in terms of his own time in the speech he put in the mouth of Maecenas, we have it attested for the first half of the third century as well. Let us now examine the epigraphic evidence. Here I have made a strict division between those where the direct commission is stated or directly implied, and those where I have deduced it, even on strong grounds. I give first a list of cases where equestrians held posts normally associated with primipilares.

Arrius Salanus	Praefectus castrorum.
Cn. Manlius	trib. cohortis praet..
Pompeius Longinus	Praetorian tribune.
Nymphidius Sabinus	praetorian tribune.
Vespsius Pollio	praefectus castrorum.
C. Iulius Pacatianus	prefect of a Parthian legion.

All but Pacatianus belong to the period before 69, and in each case, including Pacatianus, there is a clear reason,

either the post being in an embryonic state, or extraordinary circumstances being at work.

Primpilares who obtained their centurionate by direct Commission

AUGUSTUS TO CALIGULA

P. Anicius Maximus \* ? Pisidian Antioch **P**refect of camp  
in Egypt.

VESPASIAN TO NERVA

Cn. Pompeius Homullus ? Spain ? a rationibus

TRAJAN TO HADRIAN

L. Aemilius Paternius Spain **P**rimuspilus  
T. Pontius Sabinus Italy **P**rocuratorship,  
1st echelon.  
L. Terentius Rufus Spain **T**ribune of vigiles  
L. Decrius Longinus Italy **P**refect of camp.  
M. Calpurnius Seneca? Spain **P**rocuratorship,  
fourth echelon.  
Ti Claudius Secundinus? Italy **P**raefectus annonae.  
L. Gavius Fronto? Attaleia  
Pamphylia. **P**refect of camp.  
N. Marcius Plaetorius? \* Spain **T**rib. vig..  
Celer  
Marcius Titianus Balbura, Lycia pp. II  
Sex. Vibius Gallus Amastris,  
Paphlagonia. **P**refect of camp.  
L. Cammius Secundinus? Italy? centenarian proc..

PIUS TO COMMODUS

Cn. Marcius Rustiūs Rufinus Italy praetorian pref.  
G. Sulpicius Ursulus Spain **P**refect of camp.  
C. Satrius Crescens? Rome **P**rimuspilus  
C. Valerius Pansa ? \* Italy **P**rocurator, 1st  
echelon.  
T. Statilius Solon Heraclea, Asia **P**refect of camp.

## THE THIRD CENTURY

L. Petronius Taurus Volusianus	Italy	Praetorian prefect
M. Aelius Caesonianus	Amastria	primuspilus
C. Iulius Carianus	-	primuspilus
P. Aelius Apollonianus	Aphrodisias, Caria.	primuspilus
P. Aelius Primianus ?	Auzia, Maur. Caes..	trib. vig..
P. Aelius Marcellus?	Apulum, Dacia	praef. leg.
L. Aemilius Marcellinus	-	primuspilus

## APPROXIMATELY DATED

Q. Precius Proculus?	Italy	pp. II
L. Betutius Furianus *	Italy	(Second century) pp..
M. Cocceius Romanus ?	Tipasa, Maur. Caes.	(150+) pp..
Sex. Iulius Severus	Caesarea, Maur. Caes.	(Before 200.) pp.

---

The paucity of evidence for the early period is probably partly due to the general lack of information concerning the antecedents of the primipilares before 69. Those asterisked are cases where those concerned were not necessarily equestrians. It should be noted when considering the distribution in time that L. Decrius Longinus, Marcius Titianus, and Sex. Vibius Gallus could belong to the period of the Flavians, G. Sulpicius Ursulus is not certainly dated to the Dacian war of Commodus, and M. Aelius Caesonianus and C. Iulius Carianus are not certainly third century.

The first question with which we must deal is the

general one of the motive that led the equestrian to choose the centurionate in preference to the normal equestrian career? M. Durry (1) and H. Zwicky (2) have suggested that it was the advantages of the "praetorian" career, i.e. the passage through the Rome tribunates, as an approach to the procuratorships. But I have demonstrated in the chapter on the procuratorships that only a very small proportion of all primipilares obtained procuratorships. The possibility of a young man entering the centurionate reaching the primipilate, the Rome tribunates, and beyond them the ducenarian procuratorships was quite remote. On the other hand, the equestrian officer was eligible for the sexagenarian and centenarian procuratorships, and therefore had more hope of obtaining some sort of procuratorship. The number of possible procuratorships for primipilares was slightly increased by the possibility from Hadrian's time of the primipilaris who had failed to gain selection for the Rome tribunates receiving a centenarian procuratorship, but at all times there was a greater number and variety of procuratorships available for the man who had had the normal equestrian career.

The possibility of eventually obtaining a procuratorship can hardly have appeared cogent to the young equestrian. Much more relevant to him was the fact that service as a centurion meant a life-time career, with retirement at a

ripe age with wealth and prestige. On this reasoning the primipilate was the goal, though even if it were not reached the career would have been financially worthwhile. The centurion had security, whereas the equestrian officer was only in the Imperial service when actually holding a post<sup>(3)</sup> so his career could end at any time. The centurion only lost his post through old age, incapacity due to wounds or ill-health, or dishonourable conduct. This explains why in fact the equestrian regarded the commission as centurion as the better career, and not merely as an alternative or a career "faute de mieux". This is clear from the case of Pertinax, who tried for a direct commission as centurion, but had to be content with the prefecture of a cohort. A further indication of this is that T. Pontius Sabinus, after having held two equestrian militiae, was prepared to transfer to the centurionate. He spent some years in that post, and though he eventually reached the first ducenarian echelon of the procuratorial career, I do not think that his transfer was actuated by any expectation of the procuratorship, for reasons that I have explained in the Prosopography. The same reasoning will apply to L. Asmilius Paternus, L. Terentius Rufus, and L. Decrius Longinus, and probably P. Aelius Primianus, who transferred to the centurionate after the primipilate. The goal of men such

as these was in fact the primipilate, though some of them never reached it. (4) This transfer to the centurionate after the commencement of an equestrian career shows that Karbe was mistaken in thinking poverty, and thus inability to afford to become an equestrian officer, was the motive for seeking a direct commission. (5) In this respect it is interesting to see how much money Pliny thought necessary to fit out young Metilius Crispus as a centurion.

The age at which these men received their direct commissions cannot be directly demonstrated, but it seems most probable that that it was about the age of thirty, as for the majority of equestrian officers (6). L. Petronius Taurus Volusianus had been a iudex selectus at Rome, for which the minimum age was twenty-five, before commencing his military service, and if the identification given in the Prosopography is correct, so had Q. Precius Proculus. We have the case of M. Petronius Fortunatus, VIII 217, who apparently received a direct commission at the age of twenty-nine, though against this is the case of Pilonius Modestus, ILS 2654, who received his commission at the age of eighteen. The explanation of this latter case may lie in extremely strong backing, cf. C. Saturius Secundus, son of the primipilaris Saturius Picens, who was prefect of a cohort at the age of nineteen - see Prosopography. A second reason for taking thirty to be the age of commission would be the

correspondence to the age at which men from the other two sources of centurions, the ranks of the legions and of the guard, received the centurion's vitis. The legionary, according to Baehr (7), did so after ten to fifteen years, and the praetorian did so after a minimum of sixteen years, or rather less if he was promoted to the centurionate from the praetorian prefect's staff. Again, it seems more probable that the equestrians recruited to the centurionate were for the most part men of comparable years to their fellows.

Finally, in considering the approach of these equestrians to the centurionate, we may note the problem of social status. The question whether these men lost their social status on entering the centurionate has been much debated. Some great authorities have asserted that they did lose it. When one comes to examine the evidence, it is clear that there is very little to point either way. In particular, the expression ex equite Romano, on which so much weight has been placed, is paralleled by so many similar expressions beginning with ex, all having the significance of "formerly", referring to the corps of origin or some previous post worthy of mention, that any attempt to make the expression in the case of the equestrians mean a loss of status is unjustified. H. Zwicky has made this point very clearly (8).

The equestrian who received a direct commission then probably did so about thirty. He may well have held municipal posts previously. This is of course true of the municipal worthy, such as P. Anicius Maximus, N. Marcius Plaetorius Celer, C. Valerius Pansa, or L. Betutius Furianus. These after a successful municipal career, terminating generally in the duumvirate or its equivalent, applied for and obtained a centurionate. The duumvirate was generally held at a minimum age of thirty, so these would be about the same age as the equestrians who obtained direct commissions. Quite possibly the men from these two groups would have the backing of influential friends, as Metilius Crispus and P. Helvius Pertinax. The question that next concerns us is whether they had preferential treatment in the race for the primipilate. Karbe, taking as evidence the quotation from Frontinus, given above, concerning the equestrian who had been forced into military service by poverty and had served long years in the centurionate, and that of Pilonius Modestus, who despite, or perhaps because of, his commission at the age of eighteen, served eighteen years as centurion without reaching the primipilate, took it that they did not<sup>(19)</sup>. He attached undue importance to the century commanded by Modestus, however, thinking in terms of the sixty centurions as all of different rank. He further took into account the words of Juvenal, also quoted above,

which as he says, though not to be taken literally, indicate a considerable length of service as centurion to be not abnormal. Further evidence on the length of service in the centurionate of the men ex equite Romano is not readily available, though it does seem that T. Pontius Sabinus spent about fifteen years there - see Prosopography. Also into consideration comes the question of how many of those who reached the primipilate went higher, for as I have indicated elsewhere such advancement generally suggests that the primipilate was reached early. The results are rather surprising, as a study of the table given above will show. Even in the balmiest days of the primipilaris præcurators the majority of the men ex equite Romano never got further than the primipilate or the prefecture of the camp. This table for the primipilares best qualified to advance further perhaps shows more clearly than any other that the majority of all primipilares, whatever their corps of origin, found in the primipilate at once the summit of their ambition and of their attainment. The answer to the question about preferential treatment would seem to be that while undoubtedly certain of them were able to benefit by the apparent preference of Trajan and Hadrian for men ex equite Romano and presumably they benefited by the preference of the last three Antonines for Italians, and in the competition for the primipilate their education and upbringing

would stand them in good stead, they in the majority, like the rest of the primipilares had little hope of proceeding beyond the primipilate.

The approach of the man ex equite Romano to the primipilate had this peculiarity, that like the man from the ranks of the praetorian guard he enjoyed the privilege of holding the Rome centurionates. This was clearly a privilege, as apart from the comfort of life in Rome compared with the provinces there was the chance of catching the eye of the emperor or the praetorian prefect or some other influential person. I am not sure that it was so significant with regard to the training of the future primuspilus, as a sojourn in the Rome centurionates was never a compulsory part of that training.

The equestrian would come to the primipilate after a period in the centurionate determined by the opinion formed of his capabilities by his various commanders and by the bureau ab epistulis at Rome<sup>(10)</sup>. Those same reports would determine whether he was allowed to retire, perhaps after having been prefect of the camp, or whether he was summoned to Rome, to await a commission as tribune. There we must leave him, for from now on it is his own abilities, more and more, that will decide his destiny. In that future his early training, and probably superior education, may still play their part, and I have suggested that the financial

talent displayed by Pompeius Homullus and Ti. Claudius Secundinus may be due to the fact that they were ex equite Romano. But on the whole the career after the primipilate is characteristic of the individual rather than of his corps of origin.

We come now to the question of when was the period of recruitment for men ex equite Romano, whereabouts in the Empire did they come from, and how do we identify them? As far as the dating is concerned, the evidence, literary and epigraphic, covers the period from Tiberius to the middle of the third century. Our knowledge of the primuspilus as he was in the first two and a half centuries also ends at that point. The evidence in general is not abundant, or, for the epigraphic side, always definite, but as Karbe observed<sup>(12)</sup>, the literary evidence alone would indicate that the practice was not unusual. The first epigraphic evidence is the not completely certain case of P. Anicius Maximus, the first certain case coming from the period Trajan-Hadrian. The literary evidence indicates that the practice had begun in the early years of the principate. An interesting group is that of the Spaniards who benefited by their common nationality with Trajan and Hadrian, On the whole, the evidence suggests that direct commissions were granted to equestrians and to municipal worthies throughout the period with which we are mainly concerned,

i.e., from Augustus to Gallienus.

The geographical origins are what we would expect. Only provinces sufficiently civilised to have equestrian families in the first place come into question. Some origins are common to praetorians and equestrians alike, but relatively few to equestrians and legionaries, particularly with the growth of recruitment of the latter from the frontier districts. The men who gained direct commissions came from Rome, Italy, Spain and the cities of the East, of which two, Antioch and Attaleia were colonies. They also come from Apulum in Dacia, (third century), and from the colonies of Mauretania Caesariensis.

The identification of men who are ex equite Romano is simple when they held first an equestrian post, and mention it. In other cases only a reasonable probability can be established, on various bases. If a man calls himself eques Romanus, we are justified in asking why, for I have put forward in the chapter on the social standing of the primipilaris a case for considering him to be ipso facto a member of the equestrian order. One of the points made there is that the primipilaris rarely calls himself eques Romanus, any more than an equestrian officer normally did if he gave his posts. In fact there are only two cases, those of M. Cocceius Romanus and Sex. Iulius Severus, where a primipilaris does so, and I have reckoned these to be

primipilares ex equite Romano. Vir egregius is a different matter, as this means more than that the man is an equestrian. It may mean that a procuratorship has been held, cf. the case of P. Mohius Felix, a primipilaris, who calls himself e.v., and commemorates Sex. Atilius Rogatianus, also a primipilaris, but does not call him e.v.. If a man originated in a part of the empire from which neither legionaries nor praetorians were drawn in large numbers suspicion might be aroused.<sup>(12)</sup> This is the case with M. Calpurnius Seneca, who came from Baetica, and can also be connected with the group of Spanish men ex equite Romano under Trajan and Hadrian. The same applies to Sex. Vibius Gallus, who came from Amastris, and was thus hardly likely to be a praetorian, yet was a trecenarius. We have mentioned the significance of the Rome centurionates. Thirdly, distinguished relations might suggest a direct commission as most likely, e.g. Ti. Claudius Secundinus. This is particularly true for P. Aelius Apollonianus, son of a consular, or for P. Aelius Marcellinus, brother of an equestrian officer. If municipal posts under the rank of duumvir were held they were generally held before the military career, i.e., a direct commission, as municipal magistrates do not normally start in the ranks. These various ways of identifying the man ex equite Romano are represented in the cases marked with a query in the table,

and may be followed up in the Prosopography.

The full importance of this group of centurions and primipilares is difficult to assess. We have seen that direct commissions as centurions were available for as long as our evidence can guide us. The main motive for seeking such a commission would seem to have been the security it gave, the possibility of promotion to primuspilus playing its part, though that promotion could not be presumed on. The talented among them might go far, but the evidence suggests that these were always a small minority. The financial gain of course was considerable, the wealth of the primipilaris in particular being proverbial. We have seen, however, that poverty was not the compelling force, for it would not explain the transfer of men from the normal equestrian career. As has been shown above, there seems to be a distinct preference for the direct commission, as evidenced in the case of Pertinax. The proportion of such centurions in the army cannot be directly assessed, but on balance it seems unlikely that it was considerable. The researches of W. Baehr and E. Birley (13) have shown that the majority of legionary centurions were recruited from the legions themselves. Nevertheless the presence in the army of these men of some social standing and municipal experience must have helped to keep the standards of the corps of centurions high. In this respect, and in their con-

tribution of talented men, the services of the centurions ex equite Romano may well have been of considerable importance to the Roman army and state.

THE PRIMUSPILUS AND THE PRIMIPILARIS.

It is difficult in a work of this nature to avoid repetition. Clearly we cannot divorce the discussion of the actual post of primuspilus from what has gone before, or what will come after. Let us then remind ourselves of some of the conclusions reached elsewhere. In Republican days the primus pilus was the chief centurion of the legion. He must have had the chief voice when the centurions of the first cohort were called to the legate's council. In battle he occupied the place of honour in the vital last line. His age could be under fifty, and his tenure of the primipilate seems to have been for one campaign, generally lasting one year, and to have been renewable. To the best of our knowledge there was no question of a future career for him as a primipilaris. Even the prefect of the camp seems to have been an Augustan creation.

As far as we can see it was the work of Augustus to add, not to subtract. The evidence for the primipilate remaining an appointment of one year's duration is of a dual character, the necessity for it in the more notable careers, and the evidence of the dedications set up at regular intervals by the primuspilus of the legion. I have examined the latter in an appendix. These inscriptions seem to be set up at the end of the term of office of the primuspilus, and everything suggests that this term lasted one year,

though it cannot be demonstrated.

The tenure of the primipilate for one year only is then suggested by the Republican evidence, the official inscriptions of the primipili, and the speed of certain primipilaris careers. It does not conflict with existing evidence, and the acceptance of it assists our comprehension of the primipilaris career. When we come to the question at what age the primipilate was actually held we are on firmer ground. As far as the minimum age is concerned I am inclined to set it at forty. There is only one apparent exception, Nymphidius Sabinus, who cannot have been forty at the time he reached his praetorian tribunate (1), but I doubt if he was ever a primipilaris. There might be a case in some of the careers, where a primipilate at forty makes the resulting speed through appointments scarcely credible, for allowing a man to have become primuspilus before forty. It is an arbitrary figure, but it has been suggested for the following reasons. Baehr (2) gives the age for reaching the centurionate as thirty to forty. This applies to the ex-legionary. The man from the guard would have to wait for his evocatio, about the age of thirty-six, before his centurionate. The man ex equite Romano entered the centurionate about the age of thirty, but he could not expect to reach the primipilate without first serving as centurion for several years, cf. Satrius Crescens. On the

other hand, to make the minimum age above forty would make the careers of Marcius Turbo and Bassaeus Rufus, for example, well nigh incredible. If we allow a man to be "operational" to the age of sixty-five, under the most favourable circumstances a man would have twenty-five years useful service ahead of him after his primipilate. In actual fact few of the men who went beyond the primipilate to procuratorships seem to have served so long. Let us examine the evidence for length of service.

- (a) The time-interval between the centurionate, the primipilate or the Rome tribunates, and the procuratorships.

To 69

M. Vettius Valens - reached first ducenarian echelon after about thirty years' service.

Catonius Iustus - reached praetorian prefecture from centurio primi ordinis in 29 years.

#### ✱ VESPASIAN TO NERVA

Subrius Dexter - 5 years - praetorian tribune to first echelon.

L. Antonius Naso - 9 years - praetorian tribune to first echelon.

T. Suedius Clemens - 10 years - primipilaris to ducenarian legionary prefect.

C. Velius Rufus - 7+ years - primuspilus to first ducenarian echelon.

#### TRAJAN TO HADRIAN

Numerius Albanus - 14 years - tribune of vigiles to 3rd echelon.

Ti. Claudius Secundinus - 14-18 years - trib. praet. - secretariat (4th post)

Q. Marcius Turbo - 8 years - centurion to 4th. echelon.  
(his total service from  
centurion to retirement,  
c. 30 years)

Sulpicius Similis - 9 years - "centurion" - prefect of  
Egypt.

#### PIUS TO COMMODUS

L. Cominius Maximus - 17 years at most - evoc. to 2nd.  
echelon.  
Sempronius Ingenuus - 12 years - primipilaris to 3rd.  
echelon.  
Sex. Baius Pudens - 14-5 years - trib. eq. sing. to  
3rd. echelon (his third post in  
that echelon).  
Tattius Maximus - 14 years - trib. eq. sing. to  
prefect of vigiles.  
T. Flavius Genialis - 8 years - praetorian tribune to  
praet. prefect.

#### THIRD CENTURY

Cl. Aurelius Tiberius - 6-8 years - tribunus vigilum to 1st.  
echelon.  
M. Aelius Valens - 11 years - trib. eq. sing. to 2nd/  
echelon.  
M. Aquilius Felix - under 1 yr. - cent. frum. to 2nd/  
echelon (3rd. post)  
VI 1645 - 6 years - tib. praet. to 2nd. echelon  
(3rd. post)  
Cn. Marcius Rustius - 15 years - trib. vig. to praef. vig.  
(5th post)  
L. Petronius Taurus - 8? years - trib. praet. to praef.  
praet..

In addition it should be pointed out that M. Bassaeus Rufus, of the Pius-Commodus period, probably took twenty years from his primipilate to his praetorian prefecture, and his total service from his primipilate must have been about thirty years. P. Valerius Comazon reached the ducenarian legionary prefecture after a minimum of about thirty years' service.

(b) The length of service before the primipilate.

AS CENTURION.

27 years at least	Cassius Chaerea (to praetorian tribunate)
c. 13 years	T. Pontius Sabinus (after two equestrian <u>militiae</u> )
12 + years	C. Satrius Crescens
13 + years	C. Velius Rufus
33-7 years	M. Tillius Rufus
15 years at least	C. Arrius Clemens
29	Sextilius Marcianus

AS CENTURION AND SOLDIER

29 years at least	Sex. Cetrius Severus (to praetorian tribune)
38-42 years	C. Didius Saturninus
22 years	C. Gavius Silvanus (to praetorian tribune)

The detailed consideration of these results belongs to the procuratorial chapter. For our present purposes it is sufficient to note that the age for the primipilate had to be such as would allow a man to reach the procuratorship or prefecture for which he had been selected in fifteen to twenty years, with a possible maximum of thirty years' service after the primipilate. Section (b) suggests that a minimum of ten years might be spent in the centurionate, and it is clear, as will appear later, that this stay in the centurionate was of much longer duration for those whose careers were destined to end at the primipilate. This again fits in with forty being the absolute minimum. I should emphasise that I am not thinking in terms of an official edict that a man could not be primuspilus before forty, but of what happened

in actual practice I suggest that the considerations I have referred to would lead an administration inevitably to taking an age of about forty as the absolute minimum.

The evidence in fact suggests that even the man who had been selected as promising would be fortunate to receive a primipilate at forty, and even for future procurators the age of entering on the primipilate may have been nearer fifty than forty. Of course for the men who were not specially singled out as possible procurators or prefects, that is to say on the evidence the vast majority of primipilares, the primipilate was the reward of a life-time of service. Hence we have the references of Juvenal, XIV 197, Ut locupletam aquilam tibi sexagesimus annus adferat, and Pliny, hist. nat., 14, 19, quid quod inserta castris summa rerum imperiumque continet centurionum in manu vitis et opimo praemio tardos ordines ad lentas perducit aquilas. The former is all the more effective because it refers to the probable lot of a man ex equite Romano, perhaps the most advantageous route to the primipilate. The youngest primuspilus we know of is M. Blossius Pudens, who died at the age of forty-nine when on the point of receiving the eagle. The next youngest is M. Aelius Caesonianus, who died at the age of sixty-nine, probably in retirement. Of course it can be demonstrated that men like Marcius Turbo and M. Bassaeus Rufus must have been primuspilus at an earlier age, but they are not the norm. Unfortunately we have few

cases where the age at which the primipilate was received is known, but the ages at death of primipilares, even though they had no doubt been living in retirement for a number of years, points to them as having become primuspilus at an advanced age.

	65	M. Aelius Caesonianus
	70	VI 32887
	70	Aurelius Marcianus
	71	Philokalos
	72	M. Aurelius Alexander
	75	Aelius Claudianus
	75	Aufidius Felix
Li	76	Cl. Maximus Sabinus
	78	L. Retonius Lucius

We know in fact that Sextilius Marcianus became primuspilus at the age of seventy-two, M. Tillius Rufus at sixty-nine or more, and that Flavius - served forty-five years, and L. Retonius Lucius fifty-eight. This is not just a late phenomenon. Sextilius Marcianus belonged to the hey-day of the primipilares. Caligula deprived certain primipili of their posts on the grounds of their age and bodily weakness. On the whole it seems most probable that throughout the period with which we are dealing the majority of primipili were well advanced in age when they received their posts. A further consideration however, that would play its part in the later years of the second and third centuries is that probably the primipili tended more and more to remain at the base while vexillations did most of the fighting. The paper

work of the Roman army was considerable and the sedentary official requires to deal with it need not be below sixty or even seventy. On the other hand, a man of such an age could hardly lead in the field. The important point that arises from all this is that the importance of the primipilaris in government and society is not primarily based on the fact that a few fortunate men reached the great posts of the Empire. The primuspilus and the prefect of the camp are important in their own right.

We now come to the most difficult matter in a difficult chapter. What were the duties of the primuspilus? He commanded the first century of the first cohort. There are sufficient references to the century of the primus pilus for us to be sure of that. (3) This also appears from the famous inscription of A.D. 162 (VIII 18065). A problem that arises there can best be dealt with now. Are there two primipili in a legion at any time, apart from the primuspilus II? The evidence suggesting this is the aforesaid inscription which has two centurions in the first cohort marked p.p., and a letter mentioning certain veterans of X. Fretensis, (XVI app. 13) *with* their centuries, including two centuries commanded by different men, both described as primuspilus. This is dated A.D. 150. It would be very tempting to believe that Hadrian, say, had altered the composition of the first

cohort to allow of two primipili, to increase the yearly flow of primipilares. It is necessary to say, however, that there is no other hint of this change. The inscriptions to the eagle continue to be set up by one primuspilus, though this of course proves nothing either way. One might expect that the habit of naming the primuspilus in whose century one served, instead of simply calling that century centuria primipili, might be due to the existence of two centuries commanded by primipili, but the two forms cannot be separated in date. Therefore while one agrees that there is evidence for which the simplest explanation is that from A.D. 150 at least there were two ordinary primipili in each legion till further evidence appears it is useless to speculate on the changes in the structure of the legion such a move would bring about. I shall conduct my discussion therefore here and elsewhere on the assumption there is only one primuspilus in the legionary structure we are studying. In the long discussion on the centurions and size of centuries of the first cohort I do not propose to enter.

I assume that the primuspilus continued to be one of the legionary legate's chief councillors. <sup>Probably</sup> ~~Certainly~~ the primi ordines continued to be called to the councils of war (4). I suspect that he tended to withdraw more and more from the actual battlefield, and become an officer on

headquarters staff, who only ~~went~~ to war with the whole legion, when his advice would be most valuable to the legate. Senior to him would be the praefectus castrorum, who might be a primipilaris or a primuspilus iterum. The primuspilus also had a special association with the eagle. I have already mentioned the dedications set up by the primuspilus which were often made to the eagle. In the literary references the eagle is often the symbol of the primipilate. Atilius Verus died defending it, as did the man referred to in Val. Max., 1,6, n. 11. This association has made me think that Gall<sup>us</sup> also was a primuspilus. Both by his rank and his position in the battle-line the primuspilus was the natural defender of the eagle.

All this may not seem to account sufficiently for the importance of the primuspilus. But the following considerations are also to be taken into account. The only qualifications for the post of primuspilus are far as we know were the same as those for the centurionate. In other words, the primuspilus was the senior centurion of the legion, representing the best of the centurionate. He had special duties connected with his position, but nothing that needed special training. The post then was primarily a honour, which could be held by any centurion whose ability had brought him into the ranks of the primi ordines. Among the latter he was primus inter pares,

distinguished<sup>h</sup> by the special privileges that pertained to his post. As already remarked in a previous chapter, the one-year tenure of the primipilate meant that a man who had entered the primi ordines could be confident of the primipilate in about five years. The value of the primipilate then for the majority, who had no expectation of further promotion, was that it represented not a different type of post, but a very senior and specially privileged centurionate, the tenure of which assured him of wealth and prestige in retirement.

So much may be said on the primuspilus. What of the primipilaris? In the first place, it is a title, a rank. Thus Alledius Severus is referred to by one author as an eques Romanus, by another as a primipilaris. The social aspects of this distinction are dealt with in the chapter on the social status of the primipilaris. Here we are concerned mainly with the military aspects. The title primipilaris is borne by men who have been prefects of the camp, e.g. L. Caedicius, Nymphidius Lupus, but not by tribunes or primipili iterum, as far as we can judge. There is an alternative term, used in literature and attested in one case on an inscription (see Prosopography of Doubtful and Rejected Primipilares, VIII vir militaris

The men in question are P. Aemilius, Aemilius Pacensis, Casperius Niger, Cornelius Marialis, Didius Scaeva. They all seem to be primipilares. Leaving aside for the moment the primipilaris who retired immediately after his primipilate, it seems clear that the primipilaris who was retained in the Imperial service proceeded to Rome. There he might receive a tribunate immediately, but more probably took his place for a time in the Numerus primipil-arium. Here the excellent summary of the evidence given by Domaszewski (5) should be consulted. Examples of men from the numerus at Rome are Aemilius Pacensis, Amullius Serenus, Antonius Novellus, Aurelius Catullinus, Casperius Niger, Cornelius Martialis, Didius Scaeva, Domitius Sabinus, L. Petronius Sabinus, T. Suedius Clemens, and possibly S. Sulpicius Similis. Men from the smaller bodies of primipilares attached to commanders in the field were Paullus Aemilius, Aquilius, Arrius Varus, L. Caedicius, Olennius, Paccius Orfitus, and Quintilius Capito. They were used for temporary or emergency tasks. I have already pointed out that in a sense the Augustan use of the primipilares might be regarded as the use of these men where and when desired rather than as a career composed of establishment posts. A literary example of the appointment of a primipilaris to the type of post they held in the early principate is P. Aemilius. For appointment to the

prefecture of a civitas we have Olennius. At Rome they were available for a variety of tasks. In the civil wars they might command expeditions, e.g. Antonius Novellus, Arrius Varus, T. Suedius Clemens, Turullius Cerialis. More normally they might be asked to take charge of a unit in the absence of the commander, cf. Aurelius Catullinus, curator cohortis vigilum, and L. Petronius Sabinus, curator statorum. On occasions they might have an extraordinary task, such as surveying for a canal, Suet., Caligula 21. Assassination was also numbered among their accomplishments, cf. SHA, Pesc. Niger, 2,4.

In the field there were more varied tasks. Very frequently they took charge of vexillations, probably in the first two centurios of their assembly and transit, not leading them in battle, cf. Domaszewski (6). Examples are C. Velius Rufus, N. Marcius Plaetorius Celer, (praep. Numeror.), T. Pontius Sabinus, M. Aquilius Felix, and C. Titius Similis. It is to be noted that the first mentioned had left for Carthage long before the vexillations that he had led to the Chattan war had finished their task and returned to their parent legions. A primipilaris might well be the man to take charge in an emergency, as for example Aquilius did in the Civilis rebellion. He had under him the remnants of some cohorts, and presumably their commanders also. This is certainly true of Paccius

Orfitus, who was in supreme command of a number of small forts, garrisoned by auxiliary cohorts. He seems to have remained attached to the army of Corbulo for a number of years. Cases of extraordinary commands of other troops are that of L. Artorius Castus, who was put in command of a section of the Misenum fleet, and that of L. Petronius Taurus Volusianus, who was praepositus of the equites singulares, there being no evidence to determine whether he was commander in the field or temporarily replaced the tribune in Rome.

There remain a number of quasi-civil posts. Cn. Marcius Rustius Rufinus appears to have been dilectator in the Transpadane region. T. Aurelius Flavianus and M. Septimius - lis were concerned with the suppression of banditry in a region of Italy. L. Gavius Fronto was given the task of conducting three thousand veterans to the colony of Cyrene. Quintilius Captio had the task of bringing back a general's body for burial. Septimius Saturninus was given the common task of laying down boundaries. In addition the primipilares formed a link between the emperor and the municipalities. The municipal prefecture held on behalf of the emperor is dealt with in the chapter on the primipilaris in the municipalities. Here we need only note the post of curator viarum et pontium Umbr. et Piceni, held by C. Caesius Silvester.

Here apparently a municipal responsibility of Tuficum was taken over by the emperor, and conferred by him on a distinguished primipilaris of the town.

All these cases are of course to be regarded as extraordinary use of the primipilares, additions to the wide use already made of them as prefects of the camp and tribunes at Rome. One need scarcely emphasise further the usefulness to the emperor of having an assured supply of men of ripe experience in military affairs, and the soundness of the policy of having a group of them at Rome and with the armies commanding in the field is apparent.

In summary it may be said that the primuspilus of a legion was a centurio primi ordinis, who had been picked out for his qualities as deserving of the highest honour that a centurion could receive. The post was received in turn by most men who had reached the primi ordines, including men from the praetorian cohorts and ex equite Romano, some of whom had passed through the Rome centurionates. For a year the primipilus stood close to the legate and was probably responsible for the discipline and training of the legion. After this post his record would be reviewed, and on its basis he would be allowed to retire, wealthy and honoured, to his home, or be summoned to join the numerus at Rome. He might be asked to become prefect of the camp, from which post he would retire. From the

point of view of the men who retired from the primipilate or the prefecture of the camp, the primipilate was the reward of a more than usually distinguished career in the centurionate. To the men who went to Rome, perhaps 25% of the whole, was open the possibility of a comfortable few years in Rome before retirement, and for a very favoured few a procuratorship, a procuratorial governorship, and for one in three hundred perhaps (ten years' output of primipilares - a generous estimate) the chance of a prefecture. It is in terms such as these that we must estimate the value of the primuspilus and the primipilaris, remembering that probably for three out of four the primipilate was the climax to the career. Augustus did two things, he made the primipilate, and therefore the centurionate, an attractive prize in terms of wealth, social, and municipal prestige, and he took a proportion of those primipili and demonstrated the possibility of their utilisation in a variety of ways. His successors saw further uses, and in the hey-day of the primipilares, the second century, they often held the most important posts in the empire. But they remained essentially a small body both in relation to the administration and to their own corps. We must therefore always distinguish clearly between the value of all primipilares, which is often to be found in their service before the primipilate, and the

value of the small proportion which went further, and not let the latter blind our eyes to the former. I have tried to keep these two sides before the reader throughout this work.

THE PREFECTS OF THE CAMP AND OF THE LEGIONS

The post of praefectus castrorum seems to have been a creation of Augustus, probably as a natural development from the creation of a standing army. Our earliest dated case is that of Hostilius Rufus in 11 B.C., though conceivably the grandfather of Vespasian, Vespasius Pollio, might have become prefect before that date. I propose to discuss the post as follows. First, I will trace its development between its inception and its probable end, in the reign of Gallienus or soon after, paying particular attention to its rank in the legion. Then, after noting what evidence there is for the duties and activities of the prefect of the camp, I will turn to the question of the ducenarian legionary prefectures.

The careers including the prefecture of the camp which belong to the period before the reign of Claudius are given in the chapter on the Augustan primipilate. From the chapter it should be clear that the prefecture was not the summit of the equestrian career of that time, though it was generally a senior post. It is truer to say that no rigid hierarchy of posts had at that time been evolved, which is not surprising as the auxiliary commands had previously to a large extent been held by native princes, the military tribunate had not hitherto been part of a hierarchy, and the prefecture of the camp was a new creation. This is of fundamental importance when we judge the change brought about by Claudius, who to a

large extent replaced centurions and primipilares by equestrian officers in the command of auxiliary units and the tenure of legionary tribunes. In this context we must remember that equestrians were legionary tribunes and prefects of cavalry before Claudius, that cases of centurions or primipilares holding these positions still occur as late as 69, and that the command of auxiliary troops by their own notables did not end till Vespasian. The picture that Domaszewski (1) gives of the primipilares, as virtually monopolising the "equestrian" career before the reign of Claudius, and thereafter being completely excluded from it, is thus a false one. Further, the attempt to deduce from the career of Q. Paesidius Macedo that after Claudius the prefect of the camp was inferior to the equestrian military tribune is false (2). In actual fact, as Macedo was flamen of Nero, his military career might have come to an end before the death of Claudius. In any case we have positive evidence for the respective ranks of the prefect of the camp and the tribunus laticlavus, which we shall come to in a moment.

The emergence of direct promotion to praefectus castrorum from primuspilus is traceable to the early years of Claudius. Examples are P. Anicius Maximus, who was holding the prefecture of the camp in 45, L. Praecilius Clemens, who had held the post before 44, and L. Octavius Balbus. In the case of the last-mentioned, the fact that the third post held is that of praefectus fabrum suggests a date before 69 and possibly before

Claudius. All these, except Balbus, have the title praefectus castrorum legionis, and the term praefectus castrorum without a legion being mentioned only appears in Latin inscriptions in Egypt after the reign of Tiberius. Alfenus Fortunatus calls himself praef. castris but he is writing a poem, not a career inscription. The question thus arises whether our predecessors were right in connecting the disappearance of the title praefectus castrorum with the ending by Domitian of the practice of stationing more than one legion in the same camp. From the literary evidence we do get examples of men termed simply praefectus castrorum, in camps containing more than one legion e.g. Alfenus Varus, Cassius Longus, Iulius Gratus, and possibly Tyrannius Priscus, all about the period 69. Clearly, from the time of Claudius onwards, each legion had its own prefect of the camp, and though there is literary evidence for single prefects of the camp in multi-legion camps after Tiberius, there is no epigraphic confirmation; this suggests that these men attested in literature may well have been attached to a particular legion in the first place, but that they were exercising the duties of prefect of the camp for the whole force stationed there, as (presumably) the senior of the prefects present. This would make sense, for if (as seems probable from the evidence) each legion had a prefect from the time of Claudius onwards, the only sensible way of administering a camp, <sup>would be to appoint one prefect</sup> from the legionary prefects available. This would explain the apparent conflict of evidence.

The title praefectus legionis does not appear till the

beginning of the second century: M. Cocceius Severus (Trajan-Hadrian) is the first, excluding the cases of L. Cirpinus (Egyptian legion) and Vitellius Saturnus (literary source, not contemporary). It is clearly an abbreviation of the previous title praefectus castrorum legionis; its identity with that title, long assumed, is decisively demonstrated by the two inscriptions of M. Porcius Iustus, which call him in the one instance praefectus castrorum legionis, in the other praefectus legionis. The last dated example of praefectus castrorum legionis known to us is in A.D. 201, but M. Aurelius Alexander (iii) is probably later. That the title was officially abolished by Severus in favour of praefectus legionis, as Wilmanns suggested, (3) is completely unjustified by the evidence as Keyes remarks (4).

We have already seen in the chapter on the Augustan primipilate, that before as after the reign of Claudius the prefect of the camp does not normally go to the Rome tribunates. The natural tendency has therefore been to regard the prefecture of the camp as wholly inferior to the Rome tribunates, and the man who became prefect as a failure so far as future promotion was concerned. In fact we know that men who went directly from the primipilate to the prefecture of the camp rarely went further, though there are a few exceptions which we will discuss later. But the evidence for the rank of the prefecture does not bear out the impression of inferiority.

The key to the rank of the prefect inside the legion is

supplied by three inscriptions. The first, VIII 18078, gives a list of tribunes dedicating to Geta. The first of these names, Flavius Balbus, to which the letter L is attached, is to be identified with the tribunus laticlavus Q. Flavius Balbus of the second inscription, AE 1898.12. The second name, Teltonius Marcellus is to be identified with the prefect of the legion of that name, Ti Teltonius Marcellus, of VIII 2666, our third inscription. The conclusion is clear, the prefect of the camp ranks third in the hierarchy of the legion, after the legate and the tribunus laticlavus. A similar type of inscription is presumably VIII 18273, (see under Ulpian Postumus). As third in command, the prefect is in charge of the legion in the absence of legate and laticlavus, cf. Poenius Postumus.

A number of interesting results emerge from this establishment of the prefect as the chief non-senatorial officer, and unquestionably the most experienced staff-officer, of the legion. The first is so important that it is largely dealt with in another place, namely that the pp iterum since he cannot be inferior to the prefect, and there is no room for him above the prefect, must in fact be the prefect, and that is why we never find a pp iterum of a legion carrying out duties. In other words, the difference between the primipilaris who went straight to a legionary prefecture, and the primipilaris who went first to the Rome tribunate and then became primuspilus iterum of a legion, was not in function but in seniority. While the latter always

distinguished himself carefully on inscriptions by using his title primuspilus iterum, he exercised the functions of prefect of the legion. There would be a difference in pay, of course. The ordinary prefect of the camp received between 60,000 and 100,000 sesterces, i.e. more than the primuspilus but less than the centenarian procurators whose ranks he might hope to join. The primuspilus iterum received less than 200,000 sesterces, but more than the praetorian tribune, who received something like 120,000. The difference in actual military experience was negligible. The main value of the stay in Rome was the opportunity to make contact with the central administration and make an impression on the emperor and the praetorian prefect. There are in fact in the Roman administration several parallels for this phenomenon of men holding the same post, but with widely differing ages and prospects. In the centurionate, in the ranks of the equestrian and senatorial officers, and in the Rome tribunates themselves, there were men who had served long years with little prospect of further promotion alongside younger men destined for great things. In none of these cases, admittedly, had the men quite the peculiar career implied by the Rome tribunates, but this difference in career is reflected for the primipilares in different pay and different titles. The point remains that it was possible for men occupying the same position, as far as the unit they were in charge of was concerned, to be of widely different antecedents and prospects.

One further point does arise, how are we to distinguish the

prefects who have been to Rome? As far as career inscriptions are concerned there is no difficulty. On dedications and the like one can only be sure where some such phrase as ex trec. appears. The greater prestige of having held a Rome tribunate would hardly be passed over in silence if such relatively minor career details were mentioned. Where no hint at all is given with regard to the career, certainly is impossible. I will revert to the primuspilus iterum when we come to the ducenarian prefectures.

We now have to deal with the relatively few cases of promotion beyond the prefecture of the camp (held directly after the primipilate). The most notably one is of P. Anicius Maximus from the prefecture of II Augusta in Britain to the prefecture of the camp of Alexandria, in Egypt. He is discussed in the section on the Egyptian legions, so we can content ourselves here with noting that if, as I think, the prefecture in Egypt was at this stage more important than the ordinary prefecture of the camp, but still not of ducenarian rank, the prior appointment as prefect of the camp might have seemed the best way to train a man for the post in Egypt. The reign of Claudius is one in which great changes are taking place, and it is impossible to say whether any others had this pattern of career. P. Alfenus Varus was prefect of the camp sixteen years after being trecenarius, which makes it improbable that he was primuspilus iterum. His appointment as praetorian prefect by Vitellius was due of course to the circumstances of civil war.

Much more important was the emergence of a group of men who went from their first primipilate and prefecture of the camp to centenarian procuratorships. The first of these apparently was Cammius Secundinus. He is also of interest as exemplifying an epigraphic turn of phrase which is not uncommon, the phrase pp. praef. (castr.) leg.. In cases where this is all of the career that is recorded p(rimi)p(ilaris) may be understood, but in other cases, where full career details are given, the only reasonable explanation seems to be ~~that~~ p(rimus)p(ilus) (et) praef(ectus) legionis, i.e. the two posts were held in the same legion.

The next example of a prefecture of the camp, held directly after the primipilate, leading to centenarian procuratorships, is the unknown of VI 31871, who was prefect of the camp of II Traiana at a time when that legion was outside Egypt, and thus had the normal legionary establishment. He proceeded to a centenarian procuratorship after a command of vexillations. That was under Marcus Aurelius, and under Commodus L. Artorius Castus was primuspilus, praepositus of the Misenan fleet, prefect of VI Victrix and as such dux of the British legions, and then a centenarian procurator. *These are all our examples of* primipilaris procurators who were also prefects of legions. Where are we to fit them into our picture of the legionary prefect? The fundamental training for a primipilaris ducenarian procurator<sup>r</sup> is a period at Rome. Therefore, when men who had been allowed to go to a legionary prefecture were afterwards promoted to a centenarian procurator<sup>r</sup>ship, we may

regard such promotion as a second sifting of the material, which might produce quite effective minor officials but rarely produced a man whose career could rival that of the man selected for the Rome tribunates.

We have two cases of a different sort to reckon with. In the careers of P. Vibius Marianus (third century) and Valerius - (undated) the prefecture of the legions is held directly after the primipilate and before the Rome tribunates. Domaszewski described this development as a sign of distrust of the senatorial commanders, and ascribed it to Severus (5). There is in fact no means of dating the development. In fact it could well be experimental in nature, or alternatively a result of the re-appraisal of the merits of the two men concerned. In only one case is it possible to tell whether pp. iterum was held in addition that of P. Vibius Marianus, and in his case no legion is attached to the title, though the legion in which he was primuspilus is mentioned; there is clearly the possibility that the post of primuspilus bis in his case was held at Rome, for he had already served as prefect of the camp. Valerius rose to the top of the ducenarian ladder, so his beginning was no handicap to him.

There is one final development in the career of the praefectus castrorum which we should take cognisance of, the appearance in the third century of the tenure of two prefectures in succession. This is attested for P. Aelius Marcellus, P. Aurelius Cassianus, and for the unknown of X 3342a, though this last is not certain. It may reflect the increasing importance of

the office, but there is no clear reason for it.

We have now considered the development of the post, and noted the few cases where there was promotion beyond it. Incidentally we have established its rank and position in the legion. The question of its duties now arises. As Keyes among others has pointed out (6), Vegetius in his work gave us two definitions. The first clearly belongs to the third century, relating to the prefect after Gallienus, the ducenarian commander of the legion (7),

Proprius autem iudex erat praefectus legionis, habens comitivae primi ordinis dignitatem, qui absente legato tamquam vicarius ipsius potestatem maximam retinebat. Tribuni vel centuriones ceterique milites eius praecepta servabant. Vigiliarum sive protectionis tessera ab eodem petebatur. Si miles crimen aliquod admisisset, auctoritate praefecti legionis a tribuno deputabatur ad poenam. Arma omnium militum, item equi vestes annona ad curam ipsius pertinebant. Disciplinae severitas, exercitatio non solum peditum sed etiam equitum legionariorum praecepto eius cotidie curabatur. Ipse autem iustus diligens sobrius legionem sibi creditam adsidius operibus ad omnem devotionem, ad omnem formabat industriam sciens ad praefecti laudem subiuectorum redundare virtutem.

The second passage seems to follow on naturally (8),

Erat etiam castrorum praefectus, licet inferior dignitate, occupatus tamen non mediocribus causis, ad quem castrorum positio, valli et fossae aestimatio pertinebat. Tabernacula vel casae militum cum impedimentis omnibus nutu ipsius curabantur. Praeterea aegri contubernales et medici, a quibus curabantur, expensae etiam ad eius industriam pertinebant. Vehicula saginarii necnon etiam ferramenta, quibus materies secatur vel caeditur, quibusque aperiuntur fossae, contexitur vallum aquaeductus, item ligna vel stramina arietes onagri ballistae ceteraque genera tormentorum ne deessent aliquando, procurabat. Is post longam probatamque militiam pertissimus omnium legebatur, ut recte doceret alios quod ipse cum laude fecisset.

Yet the following passage in Vegetius (9) deals with the

praefectus fabrum, clearly in an Imperial province, being concerned with legionaries. This officer, as we saw in the chapter on the Augustan primipilate, disappeared after the reign of Claudius, the praefectus fabrum who survived being an officer on the staff of governors of senatorial provinces or of consuls and praetors at Rome. Also the description above of the praefectus castrorum seems to fit the pre-Claudius situation best, though no doubt the duties continued much the same for the following period. I do not want to discuss the list in detail, my main point being that the Keyes argument (that these two quotations establish the existence of a prefect in command of the legion and a praefectus castrorum at the same time) is invalid.

The basic list of the duties of the prefect of the camp given above should not be allowed to give us the impression that he sat back at base and did no fighting. Two prefects were with the army of Varus in A.D. 9, while the third was in charge of a fort on the line of retreat. Hostilius Rufus was with the army of Drusus on campaign in 11 B.C.. It is clear that in the civil wars of 69-70 the prefects came with the legions, and did not stay with the small detachments presumably left to maintain the bases. They did not necessarily stay with the main body of the legion. Aufidienus Rufus was in charge of a detachment repairing roads and bridges. M. Ennius was in charge of a garrison consisting of vexillations from different legions. The unknown prefect mentioned in the Annals, 12, 38,

was killed while superintending the building of auxiliary forts. M. Sabinus Nepotianus was in command of a vexillation of I. Minervia at some time. The unknown of VI 31871 was given a vexillation command after his prefecture, and L. Artorius Castus was appointed dux of vexillations from three legions after being prefect of one of them. Also active in the field were Insteius Capito, who cooperated with a legionary legate in reducing small enemy forts, and Cassius Longus, who was chosen with a legionary legate as leader by the Vitellians. Alfenus Varus won the post of praetorian prefect on his military ability. The prefects of the camp also played their part in council, the advice of Tyrannius Priscus being of vital importance in A.D. 66. The decorations of Sex. Vibius Gallus were almost certainly in part won as prefect of the camp.

The question arises whether the prefect of the camp, like the primuspilus, tended to be of advanced age. The answer is not a simple one. For the prefects our evidence is that Flavius-XIII 8269 served forty-five years. M. Aurelius Alexander (iii) died at the age of seventy-two, but the stone is broken where the years of service would appear. Arguing from the evidence for the primipilate, we may say that prefects of the camp who had been promoted directly to that position from the primipilate, being therefore generally men who had spent long years in the centurionate, would tend to be elderly men. What happened to the prefect of the camp when the primuspilus began to become more and more a civilian in uniform we cannot tell; the details

of this development itself are still unknown to us. All we know is that the old prefect of the camp became the ducenarian prefect of the legion after Gallienus, and as far as we can judge from that time onwards, and perhaps from some little time before, the careers of the prefects of the legions (now their commanders) and the primipilares (whose concern is now the annona) become distinct.

That is as much as can be said about the prefect of the camp; as in the case of the primuspilus, precise definitions of his duties (apart from the passage in Vegetius) are lacking. We turn now to the ducenarian legionary prefect-commanders, and first of all to those in Egypt. Augustus had excluded senators from command in Egypt, so the natural question arises who were the commanders of the Egyptian legions. Our starting-point is the inscription of L. Cirpinus, who was pri(mus) pil(us) iterum praef(ectus) leg(ionis) XXII. The date is before the reign of Claudius, and possibly before the reign of Caligula (if we are right in seeing in the existence of a prefect of one legion evidence for the two legions not yet being in one camp). We note also the early appearance of pp. iterum as the qualification for this post. It is possible that the title was attached as a matter-of course in the case of the Egyptian legions, and did not involve an actual post held before the prefecture; but as we have only two careers of Egyptian legionary prefects, <sup>in which</sup> it is plain that no legion was held with the second primipilate, we cannot be certain. Our next inscription is that of P. Anicius

Maximus. Much has been written about this career, as to whether the post involved is or is not the ducenarian post we would expect from later parallels. The answer seems to be that proposed by Lesquier (10), that the prefecture of the camp in Egypt, possibly at first rated no higher than those elsewhere, rose quickly in prestige. At the time Maximus held the post it was higher than the ordinary prefecture of the camp, which he had held with II Augusta in 43, but had not reached ducenarian rank. Nor of course had it become the rule that it should be preceded by primuspilus iterum and the Rome tribunes. The career is in fact intermediate between the Augustan system and the new, mainly the work of Claudius, which with modifications ruled till the time of Gallienus. The problem is to relate the post held by Maximus, the prefecture of the camp at Alexandria, where at this time both Egyptian legions were encamped, to the prefectures of the legions to which we have referred. The short answer is that we are not in a position to define that relationship. Unfortunately, L. Cirpinus is the first and last ducenarian legionary prefect in Egypt attest<sup>ed</sup> for the period when more than one legion was stationed there. On the other hand, as we shall see, the prefecture of the camp had become ducenarian by the time of Vespasian at the latest. It seems difficult to believe that the legions did not continue to be commanded by prefects, in addition to this prefect of the camp. Apart from the powerful position the camp prefect would hold, if he were, under the prefect of Egypt, commander of two legions, it seems too

great a strain on legionary organisation for a legion to lose its legate and tribunus laticlavus, and not have a commander of its own. We need new inscriptions before we can find the answer.

The next piece of evidence is the case of Liternius Fronto, prefect of the camp in Egypt, who led a vexillation of 2000 men to the Jewish war, and in the council of Titus before the walls of Jerusalem was ranked higher than the centenarian procurator of Iudaea. By the end of 78 or the beginning of 79 he was prefect of Egypt, so everything suggests that the prefecture of the camp in Egypt in A.D. 70 was definitely ducenarian.

Next in the chain of evidence comes the case of T. Suedius Clemens, who is attested as a centurion, as a primipilaris in 69, as a praetorian tribune under Vespasian, and in 79-80 as praefectus castrorum in Egypt. The tenure of the tribunate indicates that he reached the prefecture via the Rome tribunates and the post of primuspilus iterum, and that the prefecture is now definitely ducenarian. There follow a series of inscriptions by men describing themselves simply as praefectus castrorum, all set up in Egypt, in A.D. 90-1, 99, 138-41, 151 or 158-9, 162, and under Commodus. The only example of the title praefectus legionis II Traianae within Egypt is datable to 185. This praefectus castrorum is clearly of ducenarian rank, and ranks immediately after the prefect of Egypt in the military hierarchy. This incidentally is one of the difficulties about supposing the legions to have retained ducenarian commanders when they were both in the camp at Alexandria; why do they not appear on

these inscriptions?

There is no more evidence for the praefectus castrorum of Egypt, except for the papyrus reference to P. Silius Laetus. He as praefectus castrorum assigned a centurion of III Cyrenaica as judge in a case concerning a man stationed at the camp of Babylon, under one of the last three Julio-Claudians. The editor, H.A. Sanders (11), was of the opinion that Laetus was the prefect of the camp of Babylon. P.M. Meyer and E. Levy (12) thought he was the commander of III Cyrenaica, and the camp El Rasad, before the legions had a joint camp. My own feeling is that the prefect of the camp at Alexandria might well have had the power to delegate jurisdiction in the other camps, but clearly, as Lopuszanski (13) remarked, there can be no argument based on this text.

There is no more evidence ~~of~~ <sup>for</sup> the praefecti castrorum in Egypt, but there is one big problem remaining. A praefectus legionis II Traianae appears in primipilaris careers in a position which indicates that the post is of ducenarian rank, from the later years of Hadrian onwards; the first inscription that of Ti. Claudius Secundinus, is datable (owing to a probable identification) to the early 130's. By that time the legion was almost alone in Egypt. The two series of inscriptions then continue side by side, the ducenarian praefecti castrorum in Egypt, and the ducenarian praefecti legionis II Traianae attested on inscriptions from outside Egypt, with the exception noted two paragraphs above. There seem to be only two possible explanations, the Domaszewski theory of the former being

commander of an auxiliary camp (14), and that which I share with others (15), namely that the people concerned in both series are examples of the ducenarian prefect-commander of II Traiana, who retains the old title praefectus castrorum in Egypt because originally he had been ducenarian prefect of a two-legion camp. Outside Egypt, of course, the title lacked its special meaning, and the new title was used.

The solution proposed here has been most recently attacked by Abdullatif Ahmed Aly, in his publication of a new a very important inscription ("A Latin Inscription from Nicopolis", Annals of the Faculty of Arts, Ain Shams University, vol. III, Jan. 1955, pp. 113-46). I am very grateful to Mr. J.C. Mann, for the loan of an off-print of this work. A praefectus castrorum named L. Iulius Crescens appear, after the prefect of Egypt, on the dedication of this stone set up by discharged veterans of II Traiana. The primuspilus of the legion is named in the genitive as Iulius Crescens. A.A. Aly has identified these two, most plausibly, and deduced from this identification the fact that the praefectus castrorum who appears after the prefect of Egypt on inscriptions is only an ordinary prefect of the camp, as elsewhere in the Empire, and not the commander of the legion who was called praefectus legionis, and was at least a primuspilus bis in rank. To this I would oppose the following objections. First, there is the chain of evidence given above. It is true that Liternius Fronto might have reached the

prefecture of Egypt from the ordinary prefecture of the camp under abnormal circumstances, but that does not explain the fact that he ranked above the procurator of Judaea. As for the fact that the case of T. Suedius Clemens depends on an identification, Suedius is a very rare nomen. The greatest difficulty of all in his interpretation is, in my view, the fact that the prefect of the legion supposed by him never appears on these inscriptions from Egypt. Surely he ought to be associated in these dedications. As for the identification of the two, eight of the centurions and ten of the veterans have the nomen IULIUS; and Crescens is not the rarest of cognomina. I therefore reject the identification as in itself uncertain, and as opposed to the other evidence for the rank of the praefectus castrorum in Egypt. I hope I will not seem unjust to A.A. Aly.

As far as the Domaszewski theory is concerned, the following points may be made. The basis of the theory, the possibility of the praefectus castrorum being a commander of a purely auxiliary camp, is unproven. The only additional evidence quoted for it, the fact that T. Flavius Vergilianus supervised the construction of a building for an auxiliary cohort, is not decisive, for such a general supervision of work carried out by a legionary centurion temporarily in charge of the cohort is not irreconcilable with the duties of a legionary commander. Incidentally, if my view of P. Selsius Laetus is correct, there is proof there of the competence of the praefectus castrorum

throughout Egypt. Finally, there is no obvious reason why Egypt should have a ducenarian prefect of an auxiliary camp, whereas there is every reason for a ducenarian legionary commander, who keeps the old title praefectus castrorum on inscriptions and documents from Egypt itself because originally he had been ducenarian prefect of a two-legion camp. The inscription of T. Voconius A.F. represents an experiment in this case, just as the title praefectus legionis was experimented with elsewhere in the Empire as an alternative for praefectus castrorum legionis. One more point: a ducenarian commander or prefect of an auxiliary camp is unattest<sup>ed</sup> in any career inscription, while a ducenarian prefect first of one of two Egyptian legions, then of a two-legion camp, then of the sole Egyptian legion is amply attested. The only question that remains is whether there was also a prefect of the camp such as there were elsewhere in the Empire. The answer is not certain, but since there was no tribunus laticlavus, such an officer would rank next to the ducenarian prefect of the legion, and be a man of very similar military experience apart from the Rome tribunates. This would create a very awkward position. Further, if there was such an official, one would expect more attempt to make clear which was which, and the title praefectus castrorum would become ambiguous. The duties of the prefect could easily be performed by a senior centurion. What I believe must have been the most important part of the prefect's duties, which led in the third century to his becoming commander of the legion, namely advising the legate from his greater

experience, becomes unnecessary when the prefect himself commands. In summary, then, what I envisage is (a) the command of the legions while encamped separately by ducenarian prefects, (b) the command of the combined camp by a ducenarian prefect, with insufficient evidence to show whether the individual legions retained commanders, and (c) when the garrison was reduced to one legion, the command of that legion by a ducenarian prefect. Throughout the second century the old title of praefectus castrorum was retained for this man. We have no similar third-century inscription from Egypt, so we do not know if the title lived on. On the other hand, from the career of the unknown VI 31871 we learn that when the legion went abroad it possessed a normal establishment, including an ordinary prefect of the camp, who is nevertheless anxious to make clear that he is not the praefectus legionis II Traianae, but is the praefectus castrorum of that legion.

Did the tenure of the ducenarian legionary prefecture<sup>f</sup> affect the later career? Before we consider this it would be best to take into account the fact that three new ducenarian prefectures come into the picture from the time of Severus, those of the newly raised Parthian legions. Although C. Iulius Pacatianus held one of these posts in the middle of what was essentially an equestrian career, (of H.G. Pflaum's type I) (16) it is reasonably clear that they soon also became the monopoly of the primipilares. On the careers the following observations may be made. These posts were important. Linternius Fronto rose to be prefect of Egypt, Ti. Claudius Secundinus to be

praefectus annonae, the unknown of XIV 191 to the fourth ducenarian echelon at least. The only apparent failure, L. Cominius Maximus, seems from the timing of his career to have been suddenly forced into retirement, after a favourable beginning. In the case of Secundinus, and less certainly in the case of Maximus and the unknown of XIV 191, a Rome procuratorship was held after the prefecture, and I have suggested the possibility that these men, to avoid their being handicapped by not having <sup>a provincial procuratorship</sup> as their first post, were privileged to gain their experience in administration at Rome. As far as the Parthian legions are concerned, while Pacatianus did not rise high, the position of II Parthica seems to have made it a key command. Aelius Triccianus was sent from it to the senatorial governorship of Pannonia, admittedly in extraordinary circumstances, and it seems probable that this was the only administrative post that Comazon had held at the time of his promotion to the praetorian prefecture. T. Licinius Hierocles, the only prefect of a Parthian legion apart from Pacatianus for whom we possess a full career, was honoured as procurator of Mauretania Caesariensis, and it is interesting to note that he had had a post in Rome as procurator before he went to his prefecture. The discussion of the career of Traianus Mucianus belongs to the chapter on the Late Primpilate. Thus, while the evidence is scanty, it does seem to point to the holders of these ducenarian prefectures as not unimportant. This is what we should expect, seeing that one of them was in command of the military forces of Egypt and another of the legion on the

outskirts of Rome. We know too little of the other Parthian legions to be able to speak about their commanders.

From the reign of Gallienus onwards we know of no senatorial commanders of legions. Instead, each legion is commanded by a prefect of ducenarian rank. There has been a certain amount of controversy in the past as to whether these prefects were the old prefects of the camp or the old primipili iterum. This controversy, as we have seen, side-steps the main issue, namely what position in the legion did the primuspilus iterum occupy? We have put forward the hypothesis that he was the prefect of the legion, and that a prefect of a legion could either be a man who had just held the primipilate or one who had held tribunates at Rome. If this view is correct the new ducenarian prefect can hardly be other than the prefect of the legion, for the only two officers senior to him, both senators, disappear after this period. More on these prefects I do not wish to say, for the following reasons. The chief<sup>e</sup> is that after this reign there is little evidence or none to make us suppose that they were still being recruited from primipilares. This may seem a contradiction to what I have said above, but the point is that the whole nature of the task of the primuspilus was changing, and at some stage it seems probable that a change in the approach to it must have taken place. The second half of the third century is poor in careers, particularly of careers rich in detail of their early stages, so we cannot hope to trace this development. Promotion to the

posts of praesides still occurred, e.g. Aelius Aelianus, Clementius Valerius Marcellinus, but as a whole the period is wrapped in obscurity. It is enough to note that prefects were still commanding legions at the time when some sections of the Notitia Dignitatum were composed. Our interest in prefects of legions really ended with the last certain cases of primipilares holding such posts in or about the reign of Gallienus.

There is little to add about the prefecture of the camp and of the legions. We have seen it as an institution founded by Augustus, to which primipilares were called for varying lengths of time, as they were to other posts in the period before Claudius. It seems probable that it was Claudius who definitely instituted one prefect per legion, though where more than one legion was in a camp there would still be a prefect of the camp in supreme administrative charge. Ranking third in the hierarchy of the legion, the post grew steadily in importance. It was staffed by men drawn from all three main sources of recruits for the primipilares, no corps as far as we can judge receiving preferential treatment. Men came to it either immediately after their first primipilate, in which case it generally marked the end of their careers, or after the Rome tribunates, when they had the distinctive title of primuspilus iterum and a larger salary. These latter are discussed in the appropriate chapter. On their duties I have said little, for there is little to know. At the same time, in Egypt a different development was taking place, compelled

by the fact there were no senatorial commanders or tribuni laticlavii there. The first solution was to create a ducenarian legionary prefect-commander. Beside him was the prefect of the camp, who, from the moment that two legions were stationed together at Nicopolas, began to grow in importance. He soon reached ducenarian rank. When there was only one legion in Egypt this prefect was the commander of the legion. Further ducenarian legionary prefectures were created when the Parthian legions were raised, and the final development was the entrusting of all legionary commands to the prefects of the camp, when the growing reluctance of senators to enter the Imperial service brought about the end of the old order. This final honour, which brought about the disappearance of the prefect of the camp, perhaps reflects as well as anything could, the importance of the institution of Augustus. The part played by these professional soldiers in maintaining the standards of the legions is incalculable.

### THE ROME TRIBUNATES

The Rome tribunates were for the primipilaris the route to the ducenarian procuratorships. But they were much more than this, for, as we shall see in the chapter on procurators, there was not always a demand for primipilaris-procurators, and it is certainly doubtful if every praetorian tribune received a procuratorship, even in the days of the Antonines. But in every period, till deep into the third century, the cohorts at Rome were supplied with primipilares as tribunes, and from those tribunes were chosen the primipili iterum, and the prefects of the ducenarian legions.

The Rome tribunates, then, were more than mere stepping-stones. Their holders controlled under their respective prefects the only military force in Italy, that is till the time of Severus. They were at the centre of the Empire, and those who held commands in the praetorian guard and the equites singulares came into constant contact with the emperor. Though the primipilares who filled these posts included a number of conspirators over the years, the emperors were content to leave to this corps the sole possession of these tribunates. When the legion II Parthica came to Mons Albanus, apart from Iulius Pacatianus its commanders were also primipilares, and in Egypt, where there were no senators, it was the primipilares, not the equestrians by origin, who led the legions as prefects.

Not all primipilares became Rome tribunes. The thirty ~~to~~ so primipili who completed their year of office each year could retire, become prefects of the camp, join the numerus of primipilares at Rome, or obtain a commission as tribune straight away, according to the decision of the bureau ab epistulis at Rome (1). The number of vacancies at Rome was not large. If, as I suspect, the tribunes of vigiles, urban and praetorian cohorts normally held office for a year there were only seven tribunates in the vigiles available. On the next rung, the urban, there were four tribunates at Rome, and two outside the city, at Carthage and Lugdunum. There was in addition the tribunate of the equites singulares. This and the urban tribunates outside Rome seem to have been tenable for a period longer than one year. Finally there were ten praetorian tribunates, and we shall have to consider later how the three vacancies were filled. One thing is clear, that it was not necessarily a slow process passing through the three tribunates, as in fact most primipilaris procurators and prefects appear to have done so. Before discussing this question further it will probably be easiest to discuss each of the corps separately, after we have discussed the beginning of the system.

The praetorian tribunate appears first in order of time. Paullus Aemilius, who is attested in the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius, held a praetorian tribunate after having been primus pilus twice or for two years, and having been praefectus equitum. M. Vergilius Gallus Lusius in the same two reigns was primus

pilus, prefect of a cohort, praefectus fabrum for three years, praetorian tribune, and then became idiologus in Egypt. The praetorian tribunate thus leads to a procuratorship. L. Ovinus rufus, in the same period, marks a further stage in development, or it may be a fresh experiment, being primuspilus, and then tribune in turn of an urban and praetorian cohort, winding up as praefectus fabrum. probably in the time of Augustus is to be placed the career of Cn. Manlius, who was praefectus cohortium and then a praetorian tribune.

The inscriptions that carry us into the reign of Claudius show the career beginning to take shape. On the whole it is the post of pp.iterum and the procuratorships that are added, while the idea of holding tribunates in succession does not re-emerge in our records till the end of Claudius. Thus Maxumus was praetorian tribune, pp. bis, procurator; C. Baebius Atticus was pp., praef. civitatum twice, praetorian tribune, pp.iterum, procurator; the unknown of X1711, was pp., praetorian tribune, pp. iterum, procurator; and L. Rufellius Severus was pp II ...trib.praet.. The inscription is broken, but it seems unlikely that another tribunate was mentioned. Somewhere in this period falls T. Pon<sup>+</sup>inius -, who was primuspilus, praefectus equitum, and then praetorian tribune. The first recurrence of the urban and praetorian tribunate in the same career is in the case of Julius Pollio, who held his praetorian tribunate in 55. Under Nero the full system held sway, as the

careers of M. Vettius Valens and C. Gavius Silvanus testify.

Concerning the vigiles there is little to say. Despite the comparatively large number of tribunes known to us, I have only been able to note two cases, with a possible third, where we are able to show that the same tribunate was held by different people within a short space of years. M. Flavius Raesianus was tribune of the second cohort in 207, and C. Julius Antigonus commanded the same cohort in 210. Flavius Priamus commanded the fifth cohort in 111, but it was in charge of Numerius Albanus in 113. The same cohort was held by M. Bassaeus Rufus about 154, and by Plotienus Sabinus in 156. Interesting is the case of Aurelius Catullinus, who as a primipilaris acted as curator cohortis; Bailie Reynolds has suggested that he was in charge of the remainder of the cohort at Rome when the tribune was commanding the vexillation at Ostia (2). Be that as it may, we have here a clue as to how a temporary vacancy was filled. Catullinus must have been a member of the numerus at Rome.

For the urban cohorts there are no cases recorded where a tribunate has changed hands in a short space of time, and for the normal tenure being one year one can only refer to such cases as that of L. Antonius Naso, who held several Rome tribunes in a short space of time. What is of interest and importance with regard to the urban tribunes is the question of the two commands held outside Rome, namely those of the first and thirteenth cohorts. Epigraphic records of these commands are rare.

- C. Cestius Sabinus            pp., trib. XIII urb..
- C. Velius Rufus                pp., praef. vexillariorum, trib. XIII urb., dux exercitus etc., proc. Imp. etc. Pann. et Delm., proc. Raetiae.
- Cn. Pompeius Proculus        pp., trib I urb., proc. Ponti et Bith..

The case of C. Gavius Silvanus does not belong here, for he comes from a period when the cohorts at Rome were numbered XIII-XVII. In the careers of C. Velius Rufus, and of C. Cestius Sabinus the tribunate of vigiles is not held, and in the former case neither ~~are~~ <sup>is</sup> the praetorian tribunate ~~nor~~ the post of pp. II. Similar to the career of C. Velius Rufus is that of Cn. Pompeius Proculus, except that he held the first, not the thirteenth urban cohort. The second point to notice, which is only demonstrable for Velius Rufus, is that these tribunates could apparently be held for longer than one year. Velius Rufus seems to have commanded his cohort roughly from 85 to 89. From it he went directly to a procuratorship, as did Cn. Pompeius Proculus, whose career ran its course some time between 70 and 138. Of the other tribune of the cohort XIII urbana recorded we know only the name, Numisius Clemens, and as far as I urbana is concerned we know only the names of L. Licinius Licinianus and Papirius Sporus. The basis of evidence is only slight, but I do suggest that it is possible that these two tribunates, being outside Rome and thus to all intents and purposes separate commands, were treated differently from the rest. These differences would seem to involve

excusing the holders the necessity of holding tribunates of the vigiles or the praetorian guard, and of being pp. II. Further the command could last a number of years. In this it would resemble the tribunate of the equites singulares. But it may, of course, be that the unusual nature of the careers noted is to be explained by particular circumstances, and not as a sign of a different type of career. Clearly, one requires a greater number of detailed careers including these particular tribunates. Two further points may be made: (a) C. Velius Rufus apparently did not suffer as a consequence of his long stay in one post, cf. Tattius Maximus; (b) there is no evidence that Velius Rufus was ever at Rome; this will serve to remind us that the ducenarian primipilaris procurator did not necessarily reach his procuratorship by way of the Rome tribunates. This hypothesis can be tested on future career inscriptions including the urban tribunates outside Rome. The evidence at present certainly seems to allow the interpretation I have suggested, though its correctness cannot be demonstrated. In any case, the urban tribunates at Carthage and Lugdunum deserve further consideration than has been accorded to them hitherto.

That the tribunates of the equites singulares were part of the primipilaris career and not of the ordinary equestrian has been conclusively demonstrated by the recent discovery of an inscription giving the early career of Q. Marcius Turbo - see the Prosopography. This is at present the only recorded career

including that tribunate. It was there held after the tribunate of vigiles, and was followed by a praetorian tribunate, with no cohort specified. This may mean either that he was credited with the title without ever exercising its duties, or that the command of the equites singulares was in fact rated as a praetorian tribunate; but the latter explanation would raise the question why in that case none of the other recorded tribunes of the equites singulares are so described. The former seems the more likely explanation, therefore, and it is surely in accordance with the tremendous speed of this part of Turbo's career. Though the post stands in the position normally occupied by the urban tribunate, there can be little doubt that this particular tribunate was in some respects even more important, than the praetorian. The holder had daily contact with the emperor, whereas the praetorian tribune took his turn on duty at the palace. For the greater part of the period with which we are concerned there was only one tribune of the equites singulares, and as we shall see there is evidence that the post was held for periods of longer than one year on occasion, so that the emperor could choose the best from the primipilares who had "come up" to Rome in the previous two or three years.

The first of the two points we have mentioned, the number of tribunes, is demonstrable by the number of tribunes mentioned on the diplomas of the equites singulares and their inscriptions as a unit. I give a table of them below.

139	.alerius Maximus
142	Tattius Maximus
143	Tattius Maximus
145	Tattius Maximus
153	Sex. Baius rudens
189	Atili...
197	Helius Monimus
	Trebius Germanus
202	Occius Valens
	Octavius riso
205	Octavius riso
	Valerius Herculanus
230	Aelius victor
237	Aelius Valens

---

It will be seen that tribunes are attested singly in the second century, up to 189, while from 197 to 205 we have a number of cases where two tribunes are mentioned. It seems best to attribute this change, as Mr. Cleasby does (3) to the work of Severus. In 230 and 237 single tribunes are attested which would seem to imply a reversion to the pre-Severan system of command. We cannot go further into the problems raised by these changes, but must content ourselves with noting them for their relevance to the number of tribunates available.

The second point is the length of service. Here clearly there is no fixed rule. A study of the career of Turbo, as given in the Prosopography, will show that his stay in this tribunate was not long, though his later career was such that the emperor had equal opportunities to see much of him; indeed, I have suggested that some of the posts were held for this very reason. Tattius Maximus, on the other hand, was tribune at least from 142 to 145, but this did not prevent him from

reaching the prefecture of the vigiles in 156 and the praetorian prefecture in 158. Finally, a neat demonstration that it was the emperor's decision which governed the length of stay: Octavius Piso is attested in 202 and in 205, but his colleague has changed.

It is scarcely necessary to emphasise that a post held by a Marcius Turbo or a Tattius Maximus was reserved for the pick of the primipilares. Sex. Baius Pudens must have reached the third ducenarian procuratorial echelon with comparable speed for fourteen years after his tribunates he was holding his third post in that echelon. I have suggested elsewhere that it was extraordinary circumstances that led to this talented man being detained in this echelon, probably a shortage of really able procuratorial governors at a vital period. If we contrast with this the fact that Aelius Valens was tribune in 237 and only procurator of Sardinia, in the second echelon, eleven years later, one cannot help feeling that the tribunate had lost some of its importance, and the indications are that it may have suffered, as the other Rome tribunates probably did, from the competition of the castra peregrina. We cannot consider the career of L. Petronius Taurus Volusianus in this connection, as it is so uncertain what the post of praepositus equitum singulariorum (sic) in his cursus was.

In the praetorian tribunate also it is impossible to find a specific case of the same tribunate being held by two men in a short space of time. On the other side of the picture

Furius Festus is attested to have been tribune of the seventh cohort in the consular years 202 and 203. We know of ten praetorian tribunes at the time of the Pisonian conspiracy of A.D. 65, and eight of the years 68-69.

---

65	68-9
Cornelius Martialis	Antonius Honoratus
Flavius Nepos	L. Antonius Naso
C. Gavius Silvanus	Ti. Antonius Taurus
Gerellanus	Sex. Cetrius Severus
Nymphidius Sabinus	Iulius Martialis
Pompeius	Pompeius Longinus
Staius Domitius	Sex. Subrius Dexter
Staius Proxumus	Varius Crispinus - slightly later
Subrius Flavius	than rest.
Veianius Niger	

---

No-one appears in both lists, though unfortunately the very troubled circumstances that give us our information make it impossible to treat the results as a norm. L. Antonius Naso and Q. Marcius Turbo are examples of men who must have spent little time over their tribunates, and the same applies to most of the distinguished procurators and prefects.

We now turn to consider irregular promotion, and careers which omit one or more tribunates other than those we have already noted, and from the latter careers we will attempt to suggest how promotion within the tribunates worked. Irregular promotions presumably were by the direct intervention of the emperor. Thus we find Pompeius Longinus described as e Galbae

amicis, non ordine militiae. (4) If I am right in deducing from the fact that Dio called Saturninus a centurion, and Herodian called him a tribune, that he was promoted from a praetorian centurion to praetorian tribune as a reward for his informing against Flavianus, (5) this is a further example. For a similar case of unusual promotion for services rendered we have the case of Valerius, who received the praetorian tribunate of Iulius Crispus as a reward for informing against him. Finally there is the case of Nymphidius Sabinus. He was reputed to be Caligula's son, so his birth must have taken place when Gaius was alive and at least late in his 'teens. He reached the praetorian tribunate then in his early thirties, and some time previously he had held the prefecture of a cohort, either as a centurion or as an equestrian. Clearly his mother's connection with the court had stood him in good stead.

We have already noted the omission of tribunates in careers before the time of Nero, careers including certain urban tribunates, and careers including the tribunates of the equites singulares. There are other cases. Generally it is the tribunate of the vigiles which is omitted, as in the cases of L. Appaeus Pudens, T. Licinius Hierocles, Valerius -, and Aur. Flav. Rufinus. In the case of Valerius - the omission may only be presumed, on the basis of the most probable restoration. The omission of the urban tribunate is presumably to be understood in the case of EE VIII 478. In the case of C.

Valerius Pansa it seems quite possible that both of the two junior tribunates were omitted, as in VI 1645. On the other hand, the tenure of two tribunates at the same level is uncommon. It appears in the career of L. Antonius Naso, but that career is so much played out in the civil war period that one must hesitate to base conclusions having general validity on it. The case of L. Petronius Taurus Volusianus is not strictly comparable, as the post of tribune of the first praetorian cohort, with the title of protector, clearly in this career implies the introduction of a new superior post, not the iteration of the same one.

What then are we to deduce as regarding promotion to, within, and from the Rome tribunates? Let me re-iterate that the omission of certain of those tribunates was not a privilege reserved for those it was desired to advance quickly. Several of the more notable procurators and prefects held all three tribunates. The problem involved, already referred to at the beginning of the chapter, may be stated thus. If the tribunes of the vigiles were appointed annually, seven posts would be available for the pick of the thirty or so men completing their primipilates in any one year. Those seven after one year would have four posts available to them, if the urban tribunates in Rome were also of one year's tenure. The tribunate of the equites singulares and the urban tribunates at Carthage and Lugdunum, being tenable for longer than one year, fell vacant at irregular intervals of longer than one year. Beyond this

second stage lay ten praetorian tribunates. There thus must be a delay in the vigiles and praetorian tribunates. Clearly, however, only people of no particular promise suffered in this way, and the future third-echelon procuratorial governors and prefects, a small proportion in any case, wasted no time. How exactly the system worked we do not know, though we have seen above a number of related factors, the omission of tribunates and the tenure of tribunates for longer than one year. There is no point in producing a mathematical solution. We may note, however, that the twenty-four posts involved (in the second century), of which twenty-one might be renewed annually, could be supplied by an intake of seven primipilares a year.

Having considered the development of the career through the tribunates and the individual corps, we come now to consider from what geographical sources and what corps of recruitment the tribunes came. One table may serve to summarise both.

AUGUSTUS TO CALIGULA

Paulus Aemilius	Italian	-
Cn. Manlius	astigi, Baetica	equestrian
L. Ovinus Rufus	Italian	7 <u>praet..</u>
M. Vergilius Gallus Lusius	Italian	-

CLAUDIUS TO NERO

L. Antonius Naso	Heliopolis	legionary?
Ti. Antonius Taurus	Heliopolis	legionary?
C. Baebius Atticus	Italian	-
Sex. Cetrius Severus	Italian	praetorian
C. Gavius Silvanus	Italian	-
Gerellanus	Heliopolis	legionary?
Nymphidius Sabinus	Italian	equestrian.

Pompeius Longinus		equestrian.
L. Rufellius severus	Italian	<u>7 praet..</u>
Sex. subrius Dexter	Italian	-
Subrius Flavus	Italian	-
T. Suedius Clemens	Italian	-
Valerius Paulinus	Forum Iulii	-
M. Vettius valens	Italian	praetorian.

## VESPASIAN TO NERVA

Q. Petronius modestus	Italian	-
Cn. Pompeius pomullus	Spanish;	<u>ex equite Romano?</u>
C. Velius rufus	Heliopolis	<u>legionary?</u>

## TRAJAN TO HADRIAN

Ti. Claudius secundinus	Italian	<u>ex eq. R..</u>
N. Marcius Flaetorius Celer	Italian	direct commission
Marcius Titianus	Lycia	<u>ex eq. R..</u>
Q. Marcius turbo	Epidaurus.	-
T. Pontius Sabinus	Italian	<u>ex eq. R..</u>
L. Terentius Rufus	Bracara Aug..	<u>ex eq. R..</u>

## PIUS TO COMMODUS

Sex. Baius Pudens	Italian	-
M. Bassaeus rufus	Italian	praetorian
C. Cestius Sabinus	Italian	-
L. Cominius maximus	Italian	praetorian
L. Mantennius Sabinus	Italian	-
Cn. Marcius Rustius rufinus	Italian	<u>ex eq. R..</u>
L. Petronius Sabinus	Italian	praetorian
Q. Plotienus Sabinus	Italian	-
C. Rufius Festus	Italian	-
Tattius Maximus	Italian	-
C. Valerius ransa	Italian	<u>ex eq. R. ?</u>

## THE THIRD CENTURY

F. Aelius Primianus	Auzia, Maur. Caes.	direct commission
Aur. Flav. Rufinus	Apamea, Bithynia.	<u>7 dep...</u>
Cl. Aurelius Tiberius	Philippopolis,	-
	Arabia	
Liberalinius Probinus	Area of XIII	-
C. Manilius O-	Italian	-
Papirius Sporus		<u>ex eq. R.?</u>
L. Petronius Taurus Volusianus	Italian	<u>ex eq. R..</u>
M. Flavonius Victor	Area of XIII	-
P. Vibius marianus	Italian	<u>7 frum..</u>
VI 1645		praetorian

The figures confirm general conclusions based on all primipilares. Notice particularly how little we know of the corps of origin under Claudius and Nero, under Pius and Commodus, and in the third century. Very significant is the fact that it is the men ex equite Romano who receive Rome tribunates under Trajan and Hadrian, while the praetorians, as we have seen in previous chapters, in the same period tend to end their careers at the primipilate. On geographical origin note that Astigi, Heliopolis, Forum Iulii, and Epidaurus were all colonies. Marcius Titianus and L. Terentius Rufus were both ex equite Romano, so the fact that their homes were not colonies is not important. In the third century, Auzia, Apamea, and Philippiopolis were all colonies. Of the two men from XIII Victor certainly and Arabinus probably was a tribune of one of the Gallic emperors. We are thus able to lay down the following conclusions. Recruiting for the Rome tribunates tended to be confined to men from Italy or colonies, though this need not apply to men ex equite Romano. It is impossible to judge the extent to which each corps of recruitment was being drawn on up to Trajan and Hadrian, owing to our lack of information, the fact that a man was from Italy not being conclusive evidence that he was from the guard. Up to 69 we have three examples of men holding tribunates who were not primipilares, those I have described as equestrians. Under Trajan and Hadrian the men ex equite Romano are particularly honoured, without reference to geographical origin. Under the next

three emperors the emphasis is on Italians, without any real evidence to tell us whether they preferred praetorians to men ex equite Romano or vice-versa. Finally in the third century there is evidence for all sources of recruitment, and a noteworthy continuation of the insistence on Italy and the colonies as the recruiting-areas.

Finally, we turn to the problem of the chances of further promotion open to the Rome tribune. Again I think a table is the best way to give a picture.

#### AUGUSTUS TO CALIGULA

(a) Dead by violence.

Cassius Chaerea, Cornelius Sabinus, Iulius Celsus, Iulius Lupus.

(b) Dead

T. Pontinius, Cn. Manlius. P. Aemilius.

(c) Retired.

-

(d) Attested as pp. II

-

(i) Early procuratorships.

M. Vergilius Gallus                      idiologus

(l) Miscellaneous

L. Ovinus Rufus                              praef. fab.

#### CLAUDIUS TO NERO

(a) Dead by violence

Aemilius Pacensis, Cornelius Martialis, C. Gavius Silvanus, Staius Proxumus, Subrius Flavus, Varius Crispinus.

(b) Dead

-

(c) Retired

-

(d) Attested as pp. II

L. Rufellius Severus

(e) Attested in a first-echelon post

L. Antonius Naso  
Sex. Subrius Dexter  
~~M.~~ Valerius Paulinus

(f) Early procuratorships

C. Baebius Atticus	Noricum
T. Iulius Ustus	Thrace
Iulius Pollio	Sardinia
M. Vettius Valens	Lusitania
- Maxumus	unnamed
X 1711	unnamed

VESPASIAN TO NERVA

(a) Dead by violence

-

(b) Dead

-

(c) Retired

-

(d) Attested as pp. II

-

(e) Attested in a first-echelon post

Q. Petronius Modestus

(g) Attested in a third-echelon post

C. Velius Rufus

(j) In a secretariat

Cn. Pompeius Homullus

## TRAJAN TO HADRIAN

(a) Dead by violence

-

(b) Dead

-

(c) Retired

N. Marcus Plaetorius Celer            L. Terentius Rufus

(d) Attested as pp. II

Marcus Titianus

(e) Attested in a first-echelon postT. Flavius Priamus                      T. Pontius Sabinus  
Cn. Pompeius Proculus (dating not certain)(g) In a third-echelon post

L. Numerius Albanus

(k) PrefecturesTi. Claudius Secundinus                      annona  
Q. Marcus Turbo                              praetorian prefect

## PIUS TO COMMODUS

(c) Retired

C. Cestius Sabinus

(d) Attested in a first-echelon postC. Rufius Festus                              C. Valerius Pansa  
SB 5731

(e) Attested in a second-echelon post

L. Cominius Maximus

L. Petronius Sabinus

(g) In a third-echelon post

Sex. Baius Pudens

(k) Prefectures

L. Mantennius Sabinus

M. Bassaeus Rufus

T. Flavius Genialis

Cn. Marcius Rustius Rufinus

Tattius Maximus

EE VIII 478

Egypt

praetorian guard

praetorian guard

praetorian guard

praetorian guard

## THE SECOND CENTURY

(c) Retired

L. Appaeus Pudens

(h) Attested in a fourth-echelon post

Valerius-

, XIV 191

## THE THIRD CENTURY

(a) Dead by violence

Iulius Crispus

Saturninus?

(b) Dead

P. Aelius Primianus

Papirius Sporus

Liberalinius Probinus

Aur. Flav. Rufinus

(c) Retired

P. Petronius Felix

III 3126

(e) Attested in a first-echelon post

Aurelius Sabinianus

C. Manilius O- (a ducenar-  
ian prefecture)(f) In a second-echelon post

Aelius Valens

VI 1645

P. Vibius Marianus

(g) In a third-echelon post

T. Licinius Hierocles

(k) Prefectures

L. Petronius Taurus Volusianus      Praetorian prefect

---

The table gives an interesting picture of the variation in opportunity open to the tribune from period to period. It is **a subject we will come back to in the procurators chapter, so we will content** ourselves here with a few obvious points. There was little to expect up to the reign of Claudius. After 43 a number of primipilares received single procuratorships. Signs of a developing hierarchy appear with the careers of Velius Rufus and Pompeius Homullus. Under Trajan and Hadrian such careers become more common, to touch their peak under the last three Antonines. Notice in particular the large number of praetorian prefects provided at this time by the Rome tribunes. The third century shows a decline which, as a comparison with the tables in the procurators chapter will show, was due in some measure to the declining importance of the Rome tribunates. In examining these figures it should be noted that seventy-two tribunes give no information about their career after their tribunates. This leads us to a very important point. Although the tribunes of Rome represented only about a quarter, and therefore the best quarter, of all primipilares, they were not sure of procuratorships. If we take the hey-day of the Rome tribunes, the period of the last three Antonines, there were

available seventeen ducenarian first-echelon procuratorships(6). It seems unlikely that more than about one-third of these fell vacant in any one year. Thus the five to ten praetorian tribunos (depending on how many were relieved each year) had to compete for these posts against the rest of the equestrian order, who had prior experience in centenarian procuratorships. The full implications of this will be explored in the procurators chapter.

For the sake of completeness a note may be added here concerning the special tasks given to tribunes from time to time. As commanding the only troops in Italy till the arrival of II Parthica they had to deal with trouble there, and we find Staius sent to collect the captive leaders of a servile revolt. In Rome itself they were the ministers of the emperor's "justice", as executioners, e.g. Veianus Niger, torturers, e.g. Cassius Chaerea, and as poisoners, e.g. Julius Pollio. Under Caligula they were even called upon to act as tax-collectors, Suet. Caligula, 40. They also served for boundary adjudication., cf. T. Suedius Clemens. Among special commands L. Antonius Naso was in charge of the Reate colonists when they were assembled at Rome, and T. Licinius Hierocles was appointed to a command of Mauri, apparently in the field, between two Rome tribunates.

We have seen then that the Rome tribunates were not mere stepping-stones to the procuratorships. Their maintenance in the hands of the primipilares is one of the great marks of the

trust placed in these men. We have traced the beginnings of the system, and noted some of the complexities of it. Not all the questions have been answered. What is clear is that only a small proportion of primipilares ever held Rome tribuneships. The fact that the tribuneships were held by primipilares, however, meant that the pick of the centurionate came to Rome. The emperor thus had the opportunity to see if he could use their talents further, as did his principal adviser, the praetorian prefect. I have demonstrated above that not every tribuneship could hope for a procuratorship, but the chances of a man who became a tribuneship of reaching the procuratorships were immeasurably greater. Nevertheless, in view of the fact that well below 50% of the tribunes can have got procuratorships, it is true to say that while it was clearly very useful for the emperor to meet the more promising primipilares, and very useful for them to meet important people, and to learn more about the machinery of government, for the majority of tribunes the time at Rome must have been the culmination of their career, a welcome rest after their arduous service, from which they could retire with increased wealth and prestige. This was seen by Karbe, to some extent (7). But to the future prefect or procurator the time in the Rome tribuneships may well have been one of the most important periods in his life.

PRIMUSPILUS ITERUM

The main problem connected with the primuspilus iterum is his precise position in the legion. Apart from careers we have no record of anyone acting as primuspilus II of a legion. Various attempts have been made therefore to equate him with other officers, but before we consider these it will be best to consider the post as it appears in careers.

The probabilities are that the post was an Augustan creation as was the career of which it forms part. So far there is nothing in Republican times to form a parallel. Iteration of the ordinary primipilate was known in Republican times (1), and continued at least into the reign of Claudius. We have no definite evidence of it after that, and as the standard expression for tenure of the ordinary primipilate and the superior one becomes almost immediately pp. bis or pp. II, which would cause confusion if the ordinary primipilate was still being iterated, we may presume its disappearance. The first appearance of pp. iterum is the inscription of L. Cirpinus, who describes himself as pri. pil. iter. praef. leg. XXII. If we are right in thinking that at this time the legion III Cyrenaica was still in a separate camp<sup>z</sup>, the inscription

is at the latest from the reign of Tiberius.<sup>3</sup> The post does not appear in the procuratorial career of M. Vergilius Gallus Lusius, in the reign of Tiberius. The primipilaris procurators of Claudius, (with the exception of Palpellius Clodius Q.), on the other hand, seem all to have held this post. In the career of Maxumus the phrase pp. bis apparently is used already in the new sense of having been primus pilus and primuspilus iterum. The careers of C. Baebius Atticus and the unknown of  $\overline{X}$ 1711 give both primipilates in their position in the career, and it is noticeable that pp. II began to be included in the procuratorial career before the urban tribunates and those of the vigiles were. Finally we have in this period the third possible way of indicating the tenure of the ordinary and superior primipilates, in the career of L. Rufellius Severus, pp. II leg. A and leg. B. Although the inscription is broken I am confident that the iteration of the ordinary primipilate is not meant, because in this case the legions would not be specified, as clearly they were on the missing fragment. Thus it seems reasonably certain that by the reign of Claudius the post of pp. II was generally held between the praetorian tribunate and the first procuratorship, and all three possible ways of indicating it on a career were in use. These are the insertion of it in its proper place, the use of the phrase pp. bis or pp. I I either at the point where the first primipilate would come or where the second would, or the use of the phrase pp. leg. A and leg. B at either of those points. This last can only be

used when both primipilates were held in a legion. From this point in the chapter I shall imply the posts of primuspilus and primuspilus bis when I speak of the two primipilates or the second primipilate. Any reference to iteration of the ordinary primipilates in a legion, will be clearly indicated.

We come now to the question of the omission of the second primipilate in certain careers. Its omission in the careers of C. Velius Rufus and of Cn. Pompeius Proculus is probably to be explained by the fact that both held urban tribunates outside Rome, as I suggest in the chapter on the Rome tribunates. In the case of C. Rufius Festus it is uncertain whether the letter p.p. at the beginning of the career imply both primipilates or not. Nymphidius Sabinus is a case of extraordinary promotion. The unknown of SB 5731 is rather more puzzling, as the career with its omission of the post of primuspilus iterum apparently belongs to the period of the last three Antonines. Perhaps if we had the full career, and it is by no means certain that we have, we might obtain some clue to the reason for this omission.

There is an important group from the third century. Some of the third-century primipilares, e.g. T. Licinius Hierocles, and P. Vibius Marianus, definitely held the post in question. But the unknown of VI 1645, whose career from the praetorian tribunate was under the Philips, L. Petronius Taurus Volusianus, praetorian tribune under Valerian and Gallienus or their immediate predecessors. and Aurelius Sabinianus and Traianus Mucianus

who by their careers belong to the reign of Gallienus or later, did not. We have seen in an earlier chapter that the sole reign of Gallienus is of considerable significance in the history of the primipilares, and it seems probable that the primuspilus iterum as such had disappeared by the end of that reign at the latest. We shall suggest a reason for this later in the chapter.

Of the careers which detail both primipilates, certain give primuspilus iterum or primuspilus bis in the proper place in the career, but without naming a legion. The definite cases only number five. In nine cases two legions are named or implied, and <sup>in</sup> ten no details are given.

Cases of primuspilus iterum without a legion

L. Cirpinus	pri. pil. iter. praef. leg. XXII.
C. Baebius Atticus	primopil. leg. V Macedonic., praef. civitatum Moesiae et Treballia [e, pr] aef. civitatum in Alpib. Maritumis, t [r.] mil. coh. VIII pr., primopil. iter., etc..
Ti. Claudius Secundinus	pp. leg. IIII F.F., trib. coh. prim. vig., trib. coh. XI urban trib. coh. VIIII p [r.], pp. iterum, praef. leg. II Tra. [f.], etc..
T. Pontius Sabinus	primus pilus leg. III Aug., praepositus vexillationibus etc., trib. coh. III vig., coh. XIIII urb., coh. II praet. pp. II, proc. etc..
P. Vibius Marianus	pp. bis, trib. coh. X pr., XI urb., IIII vig., praef. leg. II Ital., pp. leg. III Gall..

Cases where primuspilus iterum is held in a legion

- L. Rufellius Severus  
X̄ 1711
pr[imipilo]
[centurio] primi pili II leg...  
trib. coh. VII pr.. ~~pr imipilo~~  
leg. IIII Scythic., trib. coh.  
[.praet.], primopilo iter.  
leg. XVI Ga[ll.]
- M. Vettius Valens  
[pp.] leg. VI Victr., trib. coh.  
V vig., trib. coh. XII urb.,  
trib. coh. III pr., [pp. II]  
leg. XIII [I] Gem., etc..
- L. Antonius Naso  
[primo] pilo leg. XIII Gem.,  
trib. leg. I Italic., [trib.  
coh.] IIII vigilum, trib. coh.  
XV urba[n.], trib. coh. XI urban  
trib. coh. IX prae[t.], etc.,  
[primopilo iterum le]g. XIV  
Gem., etc..
- Cn. Pope<sup>m</sup>pius Homullus  
pp. bis leg. II Aug. et leg.  
X Fretens., trib. coh. III  
vig., trib. coh. X urb., trib.  
coh. V pr..
- Marcus Titianus  
praef. coh., trib., pp. legg.  
duarum.
- q. Petronius Modestus  
pp bis leg. XII Fulm. et leg.  
I Adiu[t]ric., trib. mil. coh.  
V vig., tr. coh. XII urb., tr.  
coh. V pr..
- Cn. Marcus Rustius Rufinus  
[trib. co]hortium primae prae-  
[co]riacae, XI urban., [VI vigil.,  
prim. pil. legi]onum III  
Cyrenaicae, III Gall[icae].
- C. Manilius O-  
[pp. bis leg. ..] et leg. VI  
Ferrat., trib. c[oh. ..] vig.,  
trib. coh. .. urb.,] trib. coh.  
V pr., praef. leg. d[ucenarius]

Cases where there is no indication where primuspilus iterum was held.

- Maximus  
[t]rib. [c]oh. II praetoria [e],  
pri [m]o pilo bis.
- XI 5744  
pp. iterum.

Q. Marcius Turbo	pp. bis, praef. vehic., trib. coh. VII vigil., trib. eq. sin. aug., trib. pra[e]t..
C. Valerius Fansa	pp. bis., trib. coh. VIIII pr..
Sex. Baius Pudens.	(No complete career).
M. Bassaeus Rufus	trib. [coh.] pr., trib. coh. X urb., trib. coh. V vigul., pp. bis.
L. Petronius Sabinus	pp. legion. III Cyrenaicae, curator statorum, tribuno coh..
P. Aelius Crispinus	pp. II.
L. Cominius Maximus	pp bis...trib. chor. VII praetoriae, XIII urbanae, III vigul..
T. Licinius Hierocles	tribuno cohortis octavae praetoriae etc., praeposito equitum itemque peditum iuniorum Maurorum iure gladii, tribuno cohortis undecimae urbanae etc., primipilum bis.

---

As in the careers in the first section all other posts are detailed, the omission of a legion with the post of primuspilus iterum means in my judgement that that post in those careers was held at Rome. A pointer to this is the case of Tuscenius Felix, pp. II, who supervised the laying-down of a boundary near Ardeate, the actual work being done by a praetorian soldier. Here there is a very clear possibility that he was based on Rome. A further point to notice is that the men who held ducenarian legionary prefectures appear to have held their posts as primuspilus iterum at Rome, cf. L. Cirpinus and Ti.

Claudius Secundinus.

Finally, before leaving the career, we may note that M. Calpurnius Seneca apparently went to ducenarian posts from the ordinary primipilate. It has been thought that the primipilate he mentions was in fact the second, but I give reasons below for thinking that the post of primuspilus iterum in a legion could never be described simply as primuspilus.

We come now to the difficult question of how the primuspilus II is to be fitted into the legionary structure as we know it. Apart from the case of Tusenius Felix, referred to above, there is only one possible case of a primuspilus II setting up an inscription as such, and that is P. Pacilius Zenon Laetus. He could represent a case of the iteration of the ordinary primipilate, however, and in any case, <sup>he had</sup> retired. This does bring up an important point, for which Tusenius Felix is our only guide: would a primuspilus II in any circumstances describe himself as a primipilaris? The evidence is scanty, but the odds seem to be against it. Any attribution therefore to primipili II of inscriptions set up by men calling themselves primipilares is open to exception.

Was Satrius Crescens the pp. II of III Augusta in 162? The answer would appear to be no, for we have inscriptions relating to him which fit in with his having been an ordinary primuspilus (4). Further, there is the letter relating to the veterans of X Fretensis which also mentions two primipili, both commanding centuries. As most are agreed that the

primuspilus II would not command a century, we must explain the two primipili attested for III Augusta and X Fretensis as two ordinary primipili, and not as the primuspilus and primuspilus II. Domaszewski's treatment is at fault here (3), for he has built too much on the III Augusta inscription. Also against any treatment of the pp II as even a very senior centurion is the fact that he had been a tribune at Rome. He could scarcely have ranked after that below equestrian military tribunes, in fact his natural position would be below the legate and the senatorial military tribune.

We have in fact a person in the legion in precisely that position, namely the prefect of the legion, as is demonstrated in the chapter on the prefect of the camp. The objections to identifying the primuspilus II with him are as follows. First, the assumed lowly status of the prefect, which is disproved by the observation above, made in the first place, orally, by Mr. Birley. The objection is then raised that nevertheless the prefecture of the camp is held directly after the first primipilate, while the post of primuspilus iterum is held after the Rome tribunates. The answer to this has two parts. First, rank is of the person, not of the post. Secondly, the passage through the Rome tribunates for the man destined for the procuratorships was not designed to increase his military experience, and did not affect his ability or otherwise to discharge the duties of the prefect of the camp. What it did was to give him an opportunity to meet important people, and

learn. His passage through the tribunes was marked by increases in salary, so that whereas if he had gone to the prefecture of the camp after his first primipilate he would have been receiving about 80,000 sesterces, after his praetorian tribunate in the same post he would receive about 120,000 at least. Hence he is careful to distinguish his superior rank by the title primuspilus iterum, but the post and the duties are the same as the prefect of the camp. To the further objection that everything points to the prefect of the legion holding his post for some years, while the man who becomes primuspilus iterum can hardly have remained at that level for long, the reply must be that this is no worse a problem for administration than those we have seen in connection with the Rome tribunes.

That the primuspilus II and the prefect of the camp were identical has been urged on me by Mr. Birley for some time. I have resisted in the past, but it has been increasingly borne in on me as I have studied material that there can be no other solution. The chief objections were, it seemed, the fact that the prefecture of the camp was held immediately after the primipilate, and in some cases, the only ones where it appeared in Rome careers, before the tribunes. There is the additional point that I have just mentioned, namely the duration of the period as prefect compared to that as pp II. The basis of these objections, it will be readily seen, is the view that the prefect of the camp was rather inferior. Now this view is no longer tenable in view of the fact of his rank in the

legion, and, another point that has come home to me in studying the material, there is no support for it from the way that prefects of the camp are looked upon. Put briefly, since the only person in the legion known to us, of the standing we should expect for a primuspilus II, is the prefect of the legion, the two ought surely to be identified. In passing it may be noted that this enormously simplifies the problem of the ducenarian legionary prefects, of Gallienus. Clearly they were the old prefects of the camp. It allows us to eliminate the possibility of a prefect of the camp for an Egyptian legion in Egypt, as the nearness in rank would have created difficulties. The difficulties done away with are greater than those that remain. I therefore put forward this hypothesis, <sup>inspired</sup> by Mr. Birley, as an explanation of the nature of the primuspilus II.

THE PRIMIPILARIS PROCURATOR

This chapter completes our consideration of the primipilaris in the army and in administration. It has a particular significance, for while the prefectures of the camp and the Rome tribunates were reserved for the primipilares, the procuratorships could only be gained by them in face of the competition from the rest of the equestrian order. Clearly an estimate of their contribution to the procurators will help us to judge their importance outside the purely military realm.

Augustus to Caligula

The dictum of Sherwin-White (1) that there were three largely unrelated bodies in the Imperial civil service before Claudius is borne out by the evidence regarding primipilares. The semi-military prefectures are detailed below. They are not of great importance. Otherwise there is a representative from each of the other two groups mentioned by A.N. Sherwin-White, M. Vergilius Gallus Lusius, who was idiologus in Egypt after being praetorian tribune, and Catonius Iustus, who rose from centurio primi ordinis in A.D. 14 to praetorian prefect in A.D. 43. A.N. Sherwin White has already pointed out (2) that the idiologue at this period was apparently an amateur; concerning Catonius Iustus he remarked that his mission to Rome probably brought him to Imperial notice (3). The history of the great prefects of this period as given by him shows clearly that there was no standard approach to the post. Both

of these appointments therefore are to be regarded as isolated instances. L. Cirpinus held the ducenarian command of xXII Deiotariana at this period, and P. Anicius Maximus was prefect of the camp in Egypt at a time when its rank was not yet ducenarian. I shall refer to the ducenarian legionary prefectures in this chapter, because of their rank and the fact that they do form sometimes the prelude to a procuratorial career, but it should be remembered that they are in a special category as being reserved, with the one exception of C. Julius Pacatianus for primipilares.

The evidence thus points to the primipilaris being considered suitable for the type of military governorships shown below, clearly much lower/ in rank and different in function from the later procuratorial governorship, and of course for the command of the Egyptian legions. The procuratorial structure barely existed, so there could be little possibility of a regular flow of primipilares into procuratorships.

Praefecti civitatum.

L. Antonius Naso

[7 le]g. III Cyrenaicae, [7 le]g. XIII Geminae, ..[praefecto] civitatis Colaphianorum, [primo]pilo leg. XIII Gem., etc..

C. Baebius Atticus

primopil. leg. V Macedonic., praef. civitatum Moesiae et Treballia[e], [pr]aef. civitat. in Alpib. Maritumis, t [r] mil. coh. VIII pr., primopil. iter., procurator etc..

Oleinius

e primipilaribus regendis Frisiis impositus.

sex. Pedius Lusianus Hirrutus

prim. pil. leg. XXI, praef. Maeti[s], Vindolicis, vallis P]oeninae et levis armatur..

L. Vibrius Punicus

praef. equitum, primopilo, trib. mil., praef. Corsicae.

#### CLAUDIUS TO NERO

The next period, up to A.D. 69, is characterised by the replacement of the title praefectus by procurator in the title of equestrian governorships. This reflects a change in type of governorship (4). Nevertheless, the primipilares were still considered suitable to hold them, and in fact we find C. Baebius Atticus governor in Noricum and T. Iulius Ustus governor in Thrace in this period. The first-named may be considered as a link between the two types, as he had already held two posts as praefectus civitatum between his two primipilates, see table above. A change is also apparent in the status of the prefects of the fleet. Up to the reign of Claudius these posts had been part of the military career, but in the career of P. Palpellius Clodius Quirinalis the prefecture of the Ravenna fleet appears as a procuratorship. This is the last appearance of the prefecture of a fleet in the career of a primipilaris before the praetorian fleets of Ravenna and Misenum begin to reappear as ducenarian posts. (Q. Marcius Turbo 113-4)

Undefined procuratorships were held by Maxumus, and the unknown of X 1711. In both cases the preceding career shows the post to have been ducenarian. These two, like C. Baebius Atticus, held a praetorian tribunate and the post of primuspilus iterum before their procuratorship. Iulius Pollio held an

urban and praetorian tribunate, and presumably the post of primuspilus iterum, before the procuratorship of Sardinia, and M. Vettius Valens held all three Rome tribunates, and was primuspilus iterum, before his procuratorship of Lusitania. Finally, of the procurators, Valerius Paulinus was procurator of Gallia Narbonensis in A.D. 69.

Of the praetorian prefects of the period, Nymphidius Sabinus, praetorian prefect in A.D. 65, was probably not a primipilaris at all, and had an extraordinary career. Plotius Firmus was prefect of vigiles, and was made praetorian prefect under Otho arbitrio militum. We do not know the circumstances under which he reached the prefecture of vigiles. Alfenus Varus was a resourceful prefect of the camp, but as praetorian prefect of Vitellius he lost his nerve. Arrius Varus seems to have been made of sterner stuff; his primipilate had been partly the reward of espionage, but he was of considerable military ability, as he showed in the civil wars. He obtained the prefecture through the prestige he and his superior, Antonius Primus, enjoyed, and could rely on his popularity with the troops and populace, and the favour of Domitian. Nevertheless Mucianus was able to demote him to the prefecture of the annona.

These posts are clearly unrelated to the procuratorial career. Each of these men had some factor other than his natural ability to thank for the prefecture. Whether primipilares would in the normal course of events obtain the

praetorian prefecture in this period is an open question. One thing that is illustrated by the cases above is important, however. The primipilaris did not need a long procuratorial career to prepare him for the praetorian prefecture. We shall see that exemplified more than once in later years.

As far as the procurators of this period are concerned, the most important thing to note is that not one is attested to have held more than one post. In fact there is no procuratorial career open to primipilares at this period; only the possibility of a provincial procuratorship or a provincial governorship for the more deserving.

It will be noted that I have made no comment so far on either the origines or the corps of the procurators dealt with. There can be little point in dealing with the first while there is still a large Italian proportion in the legions. It is worth noting, however, that there is a colonist, Valerius Paulinus of Forum Iulii, attested as a procurator. There is little light on the question of corps. M. Vettius Valens was from the ranks of the guard. P. Alfenus Varus was a trecenarius so he could have been either from the guard or have been commissioned ex equite Romano. In any case, Varus was appointed to the prefecture of the camp, normally the end of a career, and it was only the circumstances of civil war that brought him to the praetorian prefecture. C. Nymphidius Sabinus in all probability was not a primipilaris at all.

VESPASIAN TO NERVA

In the Flavian period we must distinguish those affected by the events of 69-70. L. Antonius Naso, from Heliopolis, saw a career that took him through four ~~rome~~ tribunates between 66 and 68 cut violently short by his dismissal by Galba. Otho appointed him primuspilus iterum, but the victory of Vitellius again halted his career. Vespasian appointed him praetorian tribune again, and put him in charge of the Keate colonists, but he had no interest in this man as a prospective high official. In A. D. 78 we find him merely holding the ducenarian first-echelon procuratorship of Pontus and Bithynia. (From this point I shall continually refer to the four ducenarian echelons distinguished by H.G. Pflaum (5).)

T. Suedius Clemens, an Italian, was no more fortunate. Otho had put him in charge of a naval expedition, with two colleagues. He had seized effective leadership, and waged war on Italy with ferocity. He was accepted by Vespasian, but did not receive the preferment ~~of~~ a man of Vespasian's own selection would have done. A primipilaris in 69, he was a praetorian tribune under Vespasian, and in 79-80 ducenarian prefect of the camp in Egypt. As in the case of Naso, the progress is too slow to suppose much hope of his ever attaining to one of the major procuratorships. Time was precious where the primipilaris was concerned, and no emperor would keep a man of promise hanging about in the early posts of his career.

Subrius Dexter was one of the tribunes sent by Galba to try and put down the rising of Otho by persuasion. He reappears in A.D. 74 as procurator of Sardinia, again a first-echelon post. This is rather faster, and Dexter may have had prospects of further advancement.

A complete contrast is the career of the unknown of XI 5744. The explanation I have proposed of the antecedents of this man would make him prefect of an ala and then of the shore in Mauretania Caesarionensis. There he must have rendered some signal service to Vespasian, for he was appointed primuspilus iterum, and had a career unparalleled before the closing years of Domitian. After holding the first-echelon procuratorship of Baetica he went to the governorships of Mauretania Tingitana and Mauretania Caesariensis in turn. There followed the procuratorship of Belgica and the two Germanies in the fourth and highest decenarian echelon, beyond which lay the secretariats and the great prefectures. The career is broken at that point. The significance of this career is immeasurable, for even allowing for the fact that the man may not have been a primipilaris, and for the unusual circumstances in which the rise to the top began, it shows the possibility of a procuratorial career rising to the fourth echelon starting from primuspilus iterum under the Flavians.

A confirmation of Flavian promotion of primipilares may be found in the career of L. Liternius Fronto. In 70 he was present in Jerusalem as prefect of the camp in Egypt, a

ducenarian post, leading a vexillation of the Egyptian legions, and in A.D. 79 he was prefect of Egypt. This rapid rise to almost the top of the equestrian hierarchy is probably in part to be connected with the events of 69. He had no doubt vigorously supported T. Iulius Alexander in the proclamation of Vespasian as emperor.

There does not seem to be any suggestion of special circumstances about the other notable career of the Flavian period, that of C. Velius Rufus. This man from Heliopolis had served as a centurion in the Jewish war, and so had ample opportunity to catch Vespasian's eye. A neatly-executed task in A.D. 72, the bringing back of the sons of the king of Antioch kept him in the limelight. His primipilate must have been shortly before 83, when he commanded a combined force in Domitian's German war. He later distinguished himself in Mauretania, where in addition to his tribunate of the urban cohort from Carthage he had a command as dux (6) over detachments from the armies of Roman Africa. He brought his cohort over to take part in the Dacian and German wars, for his services in which he was decorated. His appointment to the procuratorship of Pannonia and Dalmatia must have been after A.D. 89, probably following on his service in the wars in that region. This was in the first ducenarian echelon, and was followed by the procuratorship of Raetia, with the added privilege of the ius gladii. The latter was a third-echelon provincial governorship, and may have been obtained in A.D. 92 (7), about ten

years after his first primipilate. This is a notable career also, and points definitely to the Flavians having been willing to make use of primipilares. I have commented elsewhere on the significance of the fact that he did not hold a tribunate at home or the post of primuspilus iterum. The other example of this, Cn. Pompeius Proculus, who belongs to this period or to that of Trajan-Hadrian, went to the procuratorship of Pontus and Bithynia. Finally, Q. Petronius Modestus after a normal career held the procuratorship of Asturia and Callaecia, first echelon, under Nerva and Trajan.

To what extent do we need to modify H.G. Pflaum's view on this period, "Il semble donc que l'entrée de prétoriennes dans les cadres administratifs serve à récompenser ces militaires vieillissés sous la cuirasse, mais que l'empereur n'a nullement l'intention de leur ouvrir l'accès aux préfectures" (8)? He did not then know that Liternius Fronto was definitely a primipilaris who rose to be prefect of Egypt. We do not know if AI 5744 reached the prefectures, or how far C. Velius Rufus might have been assisted by the gratitude of the emperor, and also by that emperor being short of reliable men. The answer seems to be that the proposition of H.G. Pflaum may be correct on the whole, but there are notable primipilaris careers, and it is possible that they reflect a new deliberate policy by the Flavians of using primipilares in the higher administrative posts. On the question of origo and corps, T. Suedius Clemens and Subrius Dexter were Italians, at a time when one cannot rule

out definitely the possibility of their having originated in the ranks of the legions. L. Antonius Naso and C. Velius Rufus were colonists, from Heliopolis.

#### TRAJAN AND HADRIAN

This is a crucial period, as we have seen in other contexts. The first man to come under Trajan would seem to be Cn. Pompeius Homullus, for though he was decorated by an unnamed emperor, who ought to have been Domitian, the last of his posts at least on present evidence ought to fall under Trajan. If we are right in supposing him to have been Spanish by origin and a centurion ex equite romano he had much to recommend him to Trajan. He was procurator of Britain in the first echelon, and then went to the procuratorship of the two Gauls in the fourth. The reason for this apparently notable promotion is clear on a comparison with the career of Ti. Claudius Secundinus. The latter had a similar career, except that he held a procuratorship in the second echelon at Rome. As both went on to become head of the bureau a rationibus, it is clear both had shown a flair for the financial side. But when Homullus was active there were no second echelon posts at Rome available, so he was allowed to pass over the third echelon, which contained mainly procuratorial governorships, and go direct to the Gallic procuratorship. After this he went to the secretariat already mentioned. His death leaves unsolved the question whether further promotion was intended. Clearly here we have a primipilaris who has shown talent for the financial side. The

more military-minded primipilaris, as we shall see, had a different pattern of career.

Trajan's reign did not give time for many of his protégés to reach the procuratorships. There are however two notable men. Ser. Sulpicius Similis was called into Trajan's presence as a centurion while the praetorian prefects waited, and well before the end of that emperor's reign, in A.D. 108-9, he was prefect of Egypt. Even if we take Dio's "centurion" as a loose term for primipilaris, the rise is amazing, faster even than the climb of L. Liternius Fronto, and the fact that Similis was praetorian prefect at Trajan's death can hardly surprise us. He had also held the post of praefectus annonae, the first primuspilus recorded to hold it in a regular career (we can hardly count the "consolation prize" of Arrius Varus). His career helps us to understand how such a career as that of Marcius Turbo was possible. Turbo was a centurion some time after 104-5, and prefect of the Misenum fleet, in the fourth echelon, in 113 or 114. In between he had held the two primipilates, the post of praefectus vehiculorum, three tribunes, including that of the equites singulares, and the second-echelon post of procurator ludi magni. The prefecture, centenarian in rank, and the procuratorship, are alike to be explained by the desire to keep him in Rome. Hence he did not hold a provincial procuratorship in the first echelon or a procuratorial governorship in the third. After ~~the prefecture of the fleet followed~~

the prefecture of the fleet followed a number of extraordinary appointments. He was decorated in the Parthian war, in 116 was operating in Cyrenaica against the Jews, in 117 was putting down troubles in Mauretania, and in 118 was commanding on the Middle Danube with the honorary title of prefect of Egypt, accorded to him for its prestige value. His career thus continued through the change of emperors, and the praetorian prefecture is his in A.D. 119 without as far as we know any of the normally preceding posts. Both of these careers are typified by rapidity of promotion, and disregarding of normal rules. The reason in each case is clear, to allow Similis and Turbo to have the maximum number of years available to serve as prefect consonant with their having gained the necessary experience. A man could not well be primuspilus before the age of forty, and therefore he could only afford to take fifteen years to reach the prefecture.

Continuing in strict chronological order, T. Flavius Priamus was trinune of vigiles in 111. His post as iuridicus in Egypt is attested, but not dated, though one would not expect this first-echelon post to be more than five years after the tribunate. L. Numerius Albanus held his tribunate of vigiles in 113, and the prefecture of the Ravenna fleet in 127. The latter was a third-echelon post. The time-interval is appropriate to a man who had climbed to this hieght in the procuratorial hierarchy. Finally, among those who reached their highest recorded post under Hadrian, is M. Calpurnius Seneca, who to me was one of

that group of Spanish knights who received their primipilate under Trajan. There may have been something strange about his early career, for the only post he gives us is apparently his first primipilate, there being no mention of the Rome tribunates or of the post of primuspilus iterum. He held the first-echelon procuratorship of Lusitania and Vettonia, the third-echelon post of praefect of the Ravenna fleet, and the fourth-echelon post of the Misenum fleet. This last is dated to 134. If we take fifteen years as a round figure for probably previous service, his first primipilate could have been under Trajan, or in the early years of Hadrian. This passing-over of the second echelon is the second example we have met (the first was C. Velius Rufus). It is characteristic of the primipilaris. Tenure of a post in the second echelon is always occasioned by special reasons, cf. Q. Marcius Turbo.

One case remains to be noted that stands by itself, which marks a new departure. I have accepted H.G. Pflaum's reasoning<sup>(9)</sup> concerning the career of Cammius Secundinus, though not concerning his origo and antecedents. Secundinus held an ordinary prefecture of the camp after the first primipilate, and was then a procurator. He does not define its nature, but it must have been of centenarian rank. Turbo under Trajan had held such a procuratorship before the tribunate of the vigiles. In passing it may be noted that if I am right in seeing in Secundinus an Italian who was commissioned as centurion ex equite Romano, there is no case for regarding the men who went to centenarian

procuratorships after their first primipilate as all ex-lègionaries.

This period then saw a bold and imaginative use of the primipilaris. There is no apparent distinction of corps or country of origin, though possibly if we knew more we might find a prejudice for men ex equite Romano. Homullus was probably from Spain, Seneca certainly, from the ancient Baetican colony of Hispalis. Turbo came from the colony of Epidaurus, in Dalmatia. I have suggested that Homullus, Seneca, and the Italian Cammius Secundinus, were all ex equite Romano. Note the essential continuity between the two reigns.

#### PIUS TO COMMODUS

The following period has been treated as a whole in the origines chapter. Still regarding it as such, we will nevertheless take the procurators in chronological order, to show the changes, if any, from emperor to emperor. First come two of Hadrian's selections, T. Pontius Sabinus, and Ti. Claudius Secundinus. The first of these was ex equite Romano. He pursued the normal equestrian career upto the post of tribunus angusticlavius, in which capacity he was decorated in the Parthian war; he was then commissioned as centurion, and after his primipilate commanded a vexillation of 3000 men in Britain in the second British war in the 130's (10). He went the round of the Rome tribunates, was primuspilus iterum, and was promoted to the procuratorship of Gallia Narbonensis. The career of Ti. Claudius Secundinus is attested to have gone further. His

praetorian tribunate is datable to A.D. 129. After primuspilus iterum he was prefect of II Traiana, from which post he went to a second-echelon post at Rome, that of the vicesima hereditarium (I have dealt in the chapter on the prefect of the camp with the question why the ducenarian legion prefect generally held a second-echelon post as his initial procuratorship). Secundinus passed over the third echelon, containing the procuratorial governorships, to the fourth-echelon procuratorships of the two Gauls, the secretariat a rationibus and the prefecture of the annona. Here the promotion to the second-echelon has discovered a real talent for the financial side. The career is essentially the same as that of Homullus. I suspect that Secundinus was ex equite Romano also, with his distinguished relations in his home-town of Aquileia.

Clearly Pius was following the precedent set for using primipilares as procurators, and even as prefects. A most notable case of the latter is Tattius Maximus. He was tribune of the equites singulares at least from 142 to 145, was prefect of vigiles in 156, and praetorian prefect in 158. Note again the swiftness of promotion of the man marked out to be a prefect. L. Sempronius Ingenuus was a primipilaris in 152, having probably just completed his first primipilate, and had reached the third-echelon governorship of Davia Porolissensis by 164. This is quite fast, though it should be remembered that normally the procuratorial governor would only hold a first-echelon procuratorship beforehand, so that the third echelon was

reached on the second promotion. Sex. Baius Rudens was tribune of the equites singulares in 153, held a first-echelon procuratorship, and was governor successively of three third-echelon governorships, Noricum, Raetia and Vindelicia, and Mauretania Caesariensis. He died in the last post, which is dated to 167. Clearly here he had reached this echelon in a very short space of time. He then held not the normal one but three posts in this echelon. The reason for this was probably a serious shortage of experienced men at a time of crisis. The fact that Rudens had been tribune of the equites singulares suggests that he might have risen to the top. C. Valerius Pansa is not recorded to have risen above the first echelon, the procuratorship of Britain,

Under the selections of Pius must also be reckoned M. Bassaeus Rufus, an Italian, and by his history from the ranks of the praetorian guard. His first procuratorship was Asturia and Galicia, his second Noricum, still under Antoninus Pius, if the restoration of III 5171, proc. Aug., is correct. The procuratorships were first and third echelon respectively, normal for the primipilaris without special qualifications. The fourth-echelon procuratorship of Belgica and the two Germanies followed, the secretariat a rationibus, the **prefecture of the vigiles, Egypt, and the praetorian guard.** The secretariat may seem at first sight surprising, but it had become common at this period for the future praetorian prefect to hold it (11). Like Turbo, Rufus probably served a good thirty years from his first primipilate.

T. Desticius Severus had quite a different sort of career. Again, Italian, after his first primipilate he was successively subprefect of vigiles, and procurator of Dacia Superior, belonging to the lower and upper classes of centenarian procuratorships respectively. He then entered the ducenarian class with the first-echelon procuratorship of a complex of provinces in Asia Minor, and moved to the third-echelon procuratorial governorship of Raetia. Belgica followed, a fourth-echelon province. This is the best career of a man who went through the centenarian procuratorships, apart from that of M. Aquilius Felix, who had unusual circumstances in his favour.

The policy of Pius then seems the same as that of the two preceding emperors, with one significant change, the apparent disappearance of the non-Italian procurator. T. Pontius Sabinus, Ti. Claudius Secundinus, Tattius Maximus, Sex. Baius Pudens, C. Valerius Pansa, M. Bassaeus Rufus, and T. Desticius Severus were all Italians. As far as corps is concerned, T. Pontius Sabinus was ex equite Romano, and I suspect Ti. Claudius Secundinus was too. Both were Hadrian's choices. C. Valerius Pansa may have obtained his centurionate by direct commission. M. Bassaeus Rufus must have been a praetorian. The rest could have been either from the ranks of the guard or ex equite Romano.

Under Marcus Aurelius comes the career of P. Aelius Crispinus. He was from the colony of Solva in Noricum, and after the first echelon post of Hispania Tarraconensis he developed special talent. That is at least the first impression,

for he held in succession three second-echelon posts, the governorship of Mauretania Tingitana, and the procuratorship XX hereditatium and that hereditatium, the last two both at Rome. There followed the third-echelon governorship of Mauretania Caesariensis. The tenure of both Mauretaniae is easy to understand, and the tenure of two Rome posts in succession is common, but it is not easy to understand to what type this career belongs, with its elements of the career of the procuratorial governor and of the financial specialist. One would not expect it to have been a swift career, though it is not impossible.

The remaining careers are not distinguished, though they have points of interest. The unknown of VI 31871, after the prefecture of the camp of II Traiana, held outside Egypt and therefore not a ducenarian post, was a commander of vexillations and then procurator XL Galliarum, in the first centenarian echelon. The top of the inscription is missing, but he is unlikely to have risen far. The career of L. Petronius Sabinus ran its course in the reign of Marcus; he was decorated as a centurion in the German war, and became procurator of Marcus and Commodus (sc. A.D. 171-80). His tenure of the second-echelon post of statio hereditatium, followed by the first echelon post of Gallia Narbonensis, is a mystery, to which the solution may be, as H.G. Pflaum suggested (12), a demotion for some dereliction of duty. L. Cominius Maximus presents problems of his own. He died at the age of eighty, having held the

post of prefect of II Traiana, and a post as procurator M. Antonini Augusti which was probably one of those at Rome. He was evocatus Augustorum, thus at earliest 161, and presumably procurator of Marcus before Commodus became co-emperor, giving a maximum of fifteen years. What went wrong with this brilliant career? Again disgrace may be the answer, or ill-health.

On this reign there is little more to add. P. Aelius Crispinus was a colonist. L. Petronius Sabinus, L. Cominius Maximus and the unknown of VI 31871 were from the ranks of the guard, the first two being definitely Italian. The unknown of Presigke Sammelbuch 5731 may have belonged to this reign, as he was proc. M. Aurel. Ant... Apart from M. Bassaeus Rufus, there is a lack of outstanding careers from this reign, though this may be due to deficiencies in our information.

L. Mantennius Sabinus was prefect of Egypt 193-4. He had been a praetorian tribune some time previously, possibly under Marcus Aurelius. If he had a career resembling that of M. Bassaeus Rufus he must have held procuratorships under Commodus. T. Flavius Genialis, praetorian tribune in 185, was identified by A. Stein (15) with the praetorian prefect of Didius Iulianus. The space of time is very short, and he was chosen suffragio praetorianorum, so it is clearly an open question whether Commodus had ever envisaged him as a praetorian prefect. L. Artorius Castus after his primipilate was praepositus of a

detachment of the Misenum fleet, leader of a combined force, and then a centenarian procurator with the ius gladii.

To these we may add two men who had been selected under Commodus. Cn. Marcius Rustius Rufinus was commissioned as a centurion ex equite Romano. He was dilectator regionis Transpadanae before starting the rounds at Rome, where in 190 he is attested as tribune of vigiles. So far he was the man of Commodus. The advent of Severus, significantly, did not hold up his progress, for some time after 194 he held the procuratorship of Syria Coele, in the first ducenarian echelon, passed over the second echelon like most viri miliares, held the fleets at Ravenna and Misenum in turn, in the third and fourth echelons, respectively, and was praepositus annonae some time after 197. This last post is not connected with the prefecture of the annona but was the duty of provision for the need of the army on the Parthian expedition, presumably held at the same time as the prefecture of the Misenum fleet. Rufinus was prefect of vigiles in 205-7, just about the right time, as he was a Rome tribune fifteen years before. Finally, he was praetorian prefect.

Quite a different type of career is that of M. Aquilius Felix. He was sent by Julianus as centurio frumentarius to kill Severus. He had already a reputation for disposing of senators which he must have acquired under Commodus. He clearly changed sides, received his primipilate, was praepositus of vexillations, procurator hereditatum patrimonii privati, a centenarian post, procurator rationis patrimonii, and then for

a time procurator operum publicorum. He is apparently attested in this latter post in August 193, which makes the career so far detailed move at a fantastic speed. In explanation one can only invoke the circumstances of the period. The fact that he returned to the post of procurator rationis patrimonii suggests that his tenure as procurator operum publicorum may have been short, and occasioned by some emergency. Having held these two posts in the second ducenarian echelon, which contained mainly civil posts at Rome, he was promoted to the Ravenna fleet, in the third echelon, which had the advantage of not being out of Italy. It was the first post he had held in the procuratorships with a military association, and his last of which we know, for the next post, praepostus a censibus equitum Romanorum, though its precise nature is a matter for dispute, clearly is a civil post as those he had already held.

In the choices of Commodus we note a continuing Italian element. L. Mantennius Sabinus was Italian, from his nomen. Cn. Marcius Rustius Rufinus was from Beneventum. He is also the only one of whom we know the corps. M. Aquilius Felix, from Rome, we cannot really count, as his primipilate was given to him by Severus, and we have no evidence that Commodus saw him as a future procurator.

We thus see over the period of the last three Antonines a preference for the Italian to the virtual exclusion of others. The idea of using the primipilaris as a procurator or even as a prefect was continued by Pius, and his successors. The

centenarian procuratorship was carried on, another Hadrianic idea. This period and the one preceding it may be regarded as the heyday of the primipilaris procurator.

A few careers remain whose dating is uncertain, though on balance the second century seems the most probable period. This is not entirely true of the first, EE VIII 478, however. This records a man who was apparently promoted to the praetorian prefecture from the praetorian tribunate, and then held an extraordinary command in the two Syrias. The number of Syrias gives the period as some time 135-194. H.G. Pflaum has tried to place it exactly, in the period 175-76 (14), but though his is a very ingenious and tempting hypothesis, I thought it would be misleading to put the inscription under Aurelius, as if the date was proven. Valerius (IX 4678) is dated to the second century simply on the grounds of probability. On H.G. Pflaum's restoration (see Prosopography) he held an unknown procuratorship, probably in the first echelon, and the procuratorship of the two Gauls, in the fourth echelon.

He held, unusually, a prefecture of the camp after the first primipilate and before the tribunate of vigiles. He died after reaching the fourth echelon. The unknown of XIV 191, again placed in the second century rather than the third on the grounds of probability, was prefect of II Traiana, procurator XX Hered., and prefect of the two praetorian fleets in turn, a post being held in each of the four ducenarian echelons. This career is partly restored, as will be seen on reference to the Prosopography. Truttedius Clemens was procurator of Asturia and Callaecia, a first-echelon post, and then of Dalmatia and Histria, in the same echelon. This is the only case I know of where a primipilaris held two posts in the first ducenarian echelon, and the reason seems to be, as suggested by H.G. Pflaum (15), that the loss of his wife in the first post led him to request a transfer from a place with such unhappy memories. P. Cussius Phoebianus was procurator of Asturia and Callaecia, C. Ruffus Festus of Dalmatia and Histria. The latter definitely belonged to the second century, and was Italian, as was Truttedius Clemens.

#### THE THIRD CENTURY.

Two men whom Severus promoted to high position have already been named. One whom Severus presumably selected was M. Oclatinus adventus. After an apprenticeship in the castra peregrina we find him as procurator in Britain in 205-7, and as Caracalla's praetorian prefect at the time of his death. He refused the Empire, and became prefect of Rome under Macrinus.

Herodian's description of him is worth noting - "a military genius, in everything else an ignoramus." He was also of advanced years, which he gave as his reason for declining the Empire. Neither of these factors need mean that he was unfitted for the prefecture, in fact both must have applied to M. Bassaeus Rufus. Probably of Severan recruitment was Iulius Honoratus, procurator of the Maritime Alps in 213, a post in the upper centenarian echelon.

The reign of Macrinus brought with it two more praetorian prefects from the castra peregrina, Ulpianus and Iulianus Nestor. The former had been a censibus shortly before Caracalla's death. This post is unique in a primipilaris career. As both had been principes peregrinorum under Caracalla, i.e. presumably after 211, their rise to the praetorian prefecture was rapid. It may have been affected by the need of Macrinus for men he could trust, even if they were not entirely qualified but there are too many cases of praetorian prefects who have only had a few years between their primipilate and their prefecture for us to say that these two prefects were unfitted for their great responsibility. Also under Macrinus we have the case of Aelius Tricilianus. Prefect of II Parthica at the accession of the former, he was adlected into the senate as a consular, and sent to govern Lower Pannonia. The primipilaris normally only could reach the senate via the praetorian prefecture, and the adlection of Tricilianus must be reckoned as a measure forced on Macrinus by the lack of senators that he

could trust.

Under Elagabalus yet another praetorian prefect appeared, r. Valerius Comazon. Dio says that he had held neither procuratorship nor prefecture before his praetorian prefecture, his only important post being as prefect of a legion; I suspect that this will have been the ducenarian post of II Parthica, and I have shown in the Prosopography that the services rendered in this post by him in 218, <sup>would fully explain the praetorian prefecture, which he held</sup> to some time before 222. He was also urban prefect, and all the evidence suggests that Severus Alexander retained him in that position.

T. Licinius Hierocles had probably begun to pass through the tribunates at Rome under Caracalla. He began his procuratorial career with the post of procurator hereditatium, a Rome post, normally in the second echelon. Then he became prefect of I Parthica. One normally expects ducenarian legionary prefectures to be held directly after the second primipilate, but there may have been special reasons for this apparent reversal of the normal order. This second post was under Elagabalus, and was followed by the post of praeses of Sardinia, a second-echelon military governorship, and by the third echelon governorship of Mauretania Caesariensis, held in 227. The career thus need not have been slowed by the number of posts held, four instead of two. In 237 Aelius Valens was tribune of the equites singulares, and in 248 procurator of Sardinia, in the second echelon. This seems a much slower career for such a tribune in comparison with those of Marcius Turbo,

Tattius Maximus, and Baius Pudens. Also in this period, between 194 and 208, falls the career of C. Titius Similis, legionary centurion, centurio frumentarius, princeps peregrinorum. His first primipilate was followed by the procuratorship of Moesia Inferior, a centenarian post, and then the same post iure gladii, which H.G. Pflaum takes to mean that he was deputising for the legate of the province (16). There followed the procuratorship of Lusitania and Vettonia, in the first ducenarian echelon.

Cl. Aurelius Tiberius is attested as tribune of vigiles and, under the philips, as iuridicus in Alexandria, a first echelon post. The unknown of VI 1645 started in the guard, became a centurion, was dux of the Dacian legions, primuspilus, praetorian tribune, procurator of Lusitania (first echelon), procurator ludi magni (second echelon), and praefectus vehiculorum, now apparently at least in the second echelon. All the posts from the tribunate onwards were held under the Philips, and the man died before the end of the reign, so it was a swift career. It is possible that the two posts in the second echelon were held less to give a specialised training than to retain the holder in Rome, close to the emperor, cf. the career of Q. Marcius Turbo.

L. Petronius Taurus Volusianus was the last certain primipilaris to become praetorian prefect. His career, though still in a sense regular, is not a procuratorial one. He was ex equite Romano, having served as a juryman on one of the five

decuriae in Rome. His commission was as centurio deputatus, on the staff at Rome. Without apparently any experience in the legionary centurionate he received his primipilate. After this he was praepositus of the equites singulares, quite possibly in the field, tribune in turn of two field forces each consisting of detachments from two legions, and then held in turn the three tribunates at Rome. So far there is a pattern we can recognise. Now followed the tribunate of the first praetorian cohort, with the title protector augusti, which presumably put it above the praetorian tribunate he had previously held. From this post he was promoted to the prefecture of vigiles, and then was made praetorian prefect, with the additional honours in 261 of consul ordinarius and in 267-8 of the prefecture of Rome. The problems raised by the timetable and the related question of whether in fact the praetorian prefecture could be held at the same time as the other honours mentioned are discussed in the Prosopography. Here I only wish to draw attention to the way that the conditions of the third century have hastened this development of the non-procuratorial career for the praetorian prefect. When fighting ability is the prime requirement a long procuratorial career is pointless and wasteful.

This purely military career does not mean that the primipilares have ceased to hold procuratorships. Aurelius Sabinianus held the procuratorship of Dalmatia, a first echelon post, after having been tribunus protector. The career can hardly be later than the sole reign of Gallienus. On the other

hand, the fact that the two ducenarian legionary prefects, Aelius Aelianus, and Clementius Valerius Marcellinus, were praesides of Mauretania Caesariensis and Mauretania Tingitana respectively, clearly after the reign of Gallienus, cannot be used as evidence for primipilares becoming praesides or procurators after Gallienus. As I have indicated in the chapter on the late primipilate, there are indications that the primipilaris has lost any military characteristics at latest after Gallienus.

Among third-century procurators who are not closely dated we may note P. Vibius Marianus, who was primuspilus after being centurio frumentarius, and after a career normal except for the tenure of the prefecture of a legion between the first primipilate and the tribunate of vigiles was procurator and praeses of Sardinia, a ducenarian second-echelon post in the third century. His death prevented further advancement, if contemplated. His career should be noted as evidence that the man from the castra peregrina could go to the Rome tribunates. Centenarian procuratorships are numerous. It should be noted that H; G. Pflaum has suggested that the majority, if not all, are at latest of the time of Caracalla (17). C. Publicius Proculeianus was procurator of rannonia and Achaia. Ti. Claudius Demetrius was procurator of the Maritime Alps, after being soldier and centurion in the frumentarii. M. Aurelius Antoninus held an unnamed one.

In a rather special category comes the case of Bryonianus

Lollianus, who called himself primipilaris, ducenarius, ex procuratoribus. H.G. Pflaum has made a special study of the problem of the appearance of the title ducenarius in certain inscriptions where the post described would not seem to have that financial status, and has come to the conclusion that from 267 onwards the term is used as a title independently of any financial qualification. (18) On this basis the career of Bryonianus Lollianus would be dated to the second half of the third century. For the reasons given above I would be reluctant to believe that the inscription post-dated the reign of Gallienus.

On the case of Flavius Clemens I have indicated in the Prosopography reasons why I do not agree with his identification with the procurator of Mauretania Caesariensis.

The origines and corps of origin for this century, or rather half-century, are interesting. We saw how Severus used Cn. Marcius Rustius Rufinus, from Beneventum, and M. Aquilius Felix, from Rome. Other Italians, were L. Petronius Taurus Volusianus, P. Vibius Marianus, and C. Publicius Proculeianus. Other people tended to come from colonies, C. Titius Similis from Cologne, and Cl. Aurelius Tiberius from Philippopolis. Those from the East, however, tend to come from cities that are notable, but not colonies, e.g. Ti. Claudius Demetrius from Nicomedia, M. Aurelius Antoninus from Prusias, in Pontus and Bithunia, and Bryonianus Lollianus from Sida, in Lycia and Pamphylia. As far as corps of origin is concerned, we note

particularly the large number who passed through the castra peregrina, M. Aquilius Felix, C. Titius Similis, P. Vibius Marianus, Ti. Claudius Demetrius, M. Oclatinus Adventus, Ulpus Iulianus, and Iulianus Nestor. Two praetorian prefects were ex equite Romano, though Rustius Rufinus had been selected before Severus, the other being L. Petronius Taurus Volusianus. From the ranks of the guard was the unknown of VI 1645. M. Oclatinus Adventus could equally have been from the guard of the legions. Aelius Triccianus was definitely a legionary. P. Valerius Comazon may have been an auxiliary. We are thus justified in saying all sources of recruits are still being drawn on, the castra peregrina was a common approach to procuratorships and prefectures, and that the primipilares were still drawn from the best elements in the army.

Before tracing the main lines of development it will be convenient to summarise the careers we have mentioned in a table.

#### AUGUSTUS TO CALIGULA

M. Vergilius Gallus Lusius	Italian	pp., praef. fab. III, trib. praet., IDIOLOGUS.
Catonius Iustus		7 prim. ord. - PRAETORIAN PREFECT.

#### CLAUDIUS TO NERO

C. Baebius Atticus	Italian	pp. praef. civ. II, trib. praet., pp. iter. PROCURATOR IN NORICO
T. Iulius Ustus		trib. praet. - PROCURATOR THRACIAE.

P. Palpellius Clodius Quirinalis	Italian	pp., trib. mil. leg., PROC. AUG. PRAEF. CLASSIS.
Maxumus		trib. praet., pp. bis, PROC. TI. CLAUD. etc..
X 1711		pp., trib. praet., pp. iter., PROC. TI. etc..
Tulius rollio		trib. urb., trib. praet.- PROC.SARDINIAE
M. Vettius Valens	Italian praetorian	pp., trib. vig., urb., pr., pp. iter., PROC. LUSITAN..
Valerius Paulinus	Forum Julii	tr. pr.-PROC. NARB..
Nymphidius Sabinus	Italian equestrian	praef. eq.-tr. pr.- PRAETORIAN PRAEFECT.
Plotius Firmus	miles	PRAEF. VIG., PRAEF. PRAET..
P. Alfenus Varus	trecenarius	praef. cast.-PRAEF. PRAET.
Arrius Varus		praef. coh., pp., PRAEF. PRAET., PRAEF ANNON..
VESPASIAN TO NERVA		
L. Antonius Naso	Heliopolis legionary	praef. civ., pp., trib. leg., tr. vig., urb., urb., pr., pp iter., tr. pr., PROC. PONT. ET BITH..
T. Suedius Clemens	Italian	pp.-tr. pr.-PRAEF. CAST. IN AEG..
Sex. Subrius Dexter	Italian	tr. pr.-PROC.SARDINIAE
XI 5744	equestrian?	praef. a <sup>l</sup> ae item orae pp. iter., PROC. BAETICAE (I) PROC. MAUR. TING. (II)

		PROC. MAUR. CAES. (III) PROC. BELG. ET DUARUM GERMANIARUM (IV)
L. Liternius Fronto		PRAEF. CAST. IN AEG.- PRAEF. AEG..
C. Velius Rufus	Heliopolis legionary	pp., praep. vex., trib. XIII urb., PROC. PANN. ET DALM.(I) PROC. RAETIAE IUS GLAD. (III)
Cn. Pompeius Proculus		pp., trib. 1 urb., PROC. PONT. ET BITH (I)
Q. Petronius Modestus	Italian	pp. II, 3 Rome tribunate PROC. ASTUR. ET CALLAEC. (I)
TRAJAN AND HADRIAN		
Cn. Pompeius Homullus	Spanish? ex eq.R?	pp. II, 3 Rome tribunate. PROC. BRITANNIAE (I) PROC. LUGUD. ET AQUIT. (IV) A RATIONIBUS (secretariae).
Ser. Sulpicius Similis		centurion, PRAEF. ANNON.. PRAEF. AEG.. PRAEF. PRAET..
Q. Marcius Turbo	Epidaurus Dalmatia.	legionary centurion,- pp. II, PRAEF. VEHIC. (centenarian), tr. vig., tr. eq. sing., tr. pr., PROC. LUDI MAGNI (II) PRAEF. CLASS. MISEN. (IV) PRAEF. AEG. (honorary title, PRAEF. PRAET..
T. Flavius Priamus		tr. vig.- IURIDICUS (I)

L. Numerius Albanus		tr. vig.- PRAEF.CLASS.RAVENN. (III)
M. Calpurnius Seneca	Hispalis, Baetica. ex eq. R.?	pp., PROC. LUSIT. ET VETT. (I) PRAEF.CLASS.RAVENN. (III) PRAEF.CLASS.MISEN. (IV)
Cammius Secundinus	Italian ex eq. R.?	pp., praef. cast., PROCURATOR (centenarian)
PIUS TO COMMODUS		
T. Pontius Sabinus	ex eq. R.?	Equestrian militiae, pp. II, 3 Rome tribunes. PROC. GALL. NARB. (I)
Ti. Claudius Secundinus	Italian ex eq. R.?	pp. II., 3 Rome tribunes., PRAEF.LEG. II TR. PROC. XX HER. (II) PROC. LUGUD. ET AQUIT. (IV) A RATIONIBUS (secretariat) PRAEF. ANNON..
Tattius Maximus	Italian	tr. eq. sing.- PRAEF. VIG.. PRAEF. PRAET..
L. Sempronius Ingenuus		pp.- PROC.DAC.POR. (III)
Sex. Baius Pudens	Italian	tr. eq. sing.- PROC. - (I) PROC. NORIC. (III) PROC. RAET. (III) PROC. MAUR. CAES. (III)
C. Valerius Pansa	Italian direct commission?	pp. II, tr. pr., PROC. BRIT. (I)
M. Bassaeus Rufus	Italian praetorian	pp. II., 3 Rome tribunes, PROC.AST. ET CALL. (I) PROC.NORIC. (III) PROC.BELG. etc. (IV) A RATIONIBUS (secretariat) PRAEF.VIG.. PRAEF.AEG.. PRAEF. PRAET.

T. Desticius Severus	Italian	pp., SUBPRAEF. VIG. (lower cent.. PROC. DAC. SUP. (upper cent.. PROC. CAPPAD. etc. (I) PROC. RAET. (III) PROC. BELG., etc. (IV)
P. Aelius Crispinus	Solva, Noricum.	pp. II, PROC. HISP. TARRAC. (I) PROC. MAUR. TING. (II) PROC. XX HER. (II) PROC. HER. (II) PROC. MAUR. CAES. (III)
VI 31871	praetorian	pp., praef. cast., PROC. XL. GALL. (cent.)
L. Petronius Sabinus	Italian praetorian	pp., curator stat., - PROC. STAT. HERED. (II) PROC. GALL. NARB. (I)
L. Cominius Maximus	Italian praetorian	pp. II, 3 Rome tribun- ates, PRAEF. LEG. II TR.. PROC. AUG. PATRIM? (II)
SB 5731		pp., 3 Rome tribs., PROC. AUG. (I ?)
L. Mantennius Sabinus	Italian	tr. pr. - PRAEF. AEG.....
T. Flavius Genialis	. . . . .	tr. pr. - PRAEF. PRAET..
L. Artorius Castus		pp., PROC. LIBURN. IURE GLAD (centenarian)
EE VIII 478		tr. vig., tr. pr., tr. / pr., PRAEF. PRAET..
Valerius		pp., praef. cast., 3 Rome tribunates, PROC. - (I) PROC. - (III) PROC. LUGUD. ET AQ. (IV)

## XIV 191

		tr. urb., tr. pr.- PRAEF. LEG. II TR. PROC. XX HER. (II) PRAEF. CLASS. RAVENN. (III) PRAEF. CLASS. MISEN. (IV)
Truttedius Clemens	Italian	tr. vig.- PROC. AST. ET CALL. (I) PROC. DALM. ET HIST. (I)
P. Cussius Phoebianus		tr. vig.- PROC. AST. ET CALL. (I)
C. Rufius Festus	Italian	pp., 3 Rome tribunates, PROC. DALM. ET HISTR. (I)

## THE THIRD CENTURY

Cn. Marcius Rustius Rufinus	Italian ex eq. R.	pp. II, 3 Rome tribunates PROC. SYR. COELE (I) PRAEF. CLASS. RAVENN. (III) PRAEF. CLASS. MISEN. (IV) PRAEF. VIG.. PRAEF. PRAET..
M. Aquilius Felix	Rome	7 frum., pp., PROC. HERED. PATR. PRIV. (centenarian) PROC. RAT. PATR. (II) PROC. OP. PUB. (II) PROC. RAT. PAT. (II) PRAEF. CLASS. RAV. (III) Praep. a cens. eq. R..
M. Oclatinus Adventus	praet./ leg.	7 frum., princ. per.,- PROC. BRIT. PRAEF. PRAET. PRAEF. URB..
Iulius Honoratus		pp., PROC. ALP. MARIT. (centenarian)
Ulpianus Iulianus		princ. per.,- A CENSIBUS PRAEF. PRAET.
Iulianus Nestor		princ. per.,- PRAEF. PRAET..
Aelius Tricillianus	legionary	PRAEF. LEG. II PARTH.

		Consular governor of Pannonia Inferior.
P. Valerius Comazon	Auxiliary?	PRAEF. LEG. II PARTH.? PRAEF. PRAET. PRAEF. URB..
T. Licinius Hierocles		pp. II, PROC. HERED. (II) PRAEF. LEG. II PARTH. PRAESES SARD. (II) PROC. MAUR. CAES. (III)
Aelius Valens		tr. eq. sing.,- PROC. SARD. (II)
G. Titius Similis	Cologne.	7 leg., 7 frum., pp., PROC. MOES. INF. (centenar- ian), PROC. MOES. INF. IURE. GLADII PROC. LUSIT. ET VETT. (I)
Cl. Aurelius Tiberius	philippopolis arabia	tr. vig.- IURIDICUS IN ALEXANDRIA (I)
VI 1645	praetorian	pp., tr. pr., PROC. LUSIT. (I) PROC. LUDI MAGNI (II) PRAEF. VEHIC (II)
L. Petronius Taurus Volusianus	italian ex eq. R..	7 dep., pp., praep. eq. sing., tr. legg. II, 3 Rome tribunates, tr. I pr. prot., PRAEF. VIG.. PRAEF. PRAET. Cos. ord.. PRAEF. URB..
Aurelius Sabinianus		trib. prot., PROC DALM. (I)
P. Vibius Marianus	Italian	7 frum., pp., praef. leg., 3 Rome tribunates, PROC. SARD. (II)
C. Publicius Procul- elianus	Italian	pp., PROC. PANN. ET ACH. (centenarian,

Ti. Claudius Demetrius	Nicomedia	mil.frum, 7 frum., PROC. ALP. MARIT. (centenarian)
M. Aurelius Antoninus	Prusias	pp., PROC. (centenarian)
Byronianus Lollianus	Sida	pp., duc., EX PROCURATORIBUS.

---

It will be clear from the text and the table that there is no question of a procuratorial career for primipilares before 69. In the period up to the reign of Claudius we note in particular that apart from the praefecti civitatum the primipilares have only casual contacts with the nascent civil service. Under Claudius and Nero procurator<sup>r</sup>ships begin to appear, including two of the new procuratorial governorships, but they are single posts, not forming a career. The period 69-70 did bring out one significant truth, that the primipilaris could be a praetorian prefect, and that a procuratorial training was not necessary for the post.

The Flavian period is fascinating, with its half-suggestion of a developed career for primipilares. We must however remember that the two vital careers, that of XI 5744, and of L. Liternius Fronto, were probably both vitally affected by the events of 69-70. Nevertheless the fully developed career of XI 5744 clearly foreshadows the careers of the Trajan-Hadrian period, as that of Liternius Fronto foreshadows those of the great prefects of the same period. The career of C. Velius Rufus shows clearly that Domitian understood the possibility of

using primipilares as procuratorial governors.

With Trajan and Hadrian emerge clearly the three types of career already foreshadowed. These are that of the man who receives a first-echelon procuratorship as a reward for faithful service, that of the man who is intended to serve as a procuratorial governor in the third echelon, though he generally finishes his career in the fourth, and that of the man who is destined to become a prefect. Unless a man has retired when the inscription giving his career is set up clearly we cannot be too dogmatic in placing careers in these categories. The typical second-type career is I, III, IV, the Roman numerals indicating the ducenarian echelon to which each post belonged, on the basis of the tables of H.G. Pflaum (18). We will examine each type in detail, so will content ourselves with noting the distinctive type represented by Pompeius Homullus, and under Pius, by Ti. Claudius Secundinus, where a special ability on the civil side has developed. It will be noted that so far, while there is little evidence on origo and corps of origin, what there is suggests that there is no discrimination on the basis of either, with one qualification. That is Trajan and Hadrian seem to have given particular preference to men ex equite Romano. It will be noted that these cases are not all certain, as I have indicated by queries, but my general impression, backed by the lack of success of the known praetorians under those emperors, is that this was so.

Under the last three Antonines, on the other hand, there

is a clear preference for Italians. What there is little evidence on, however, is whether these Italians were ex equite Romano or from the ranks of the praetorian guard. The number going from the first primipilate to the centenarian procuratorships, an innovation of Hadrian, seems to increase, but it is noticeable that with one exception they do not rise as high as the men passing through the Rome tribunates.

In the third century there is a perceptible diminution in the number of full procuratorial careers. This may be due to procurators not stating their primipilaris origins. It is also noticeable that the tendency for the primipilaris prefect to ~~to~~ dispense with a procuratorial career seems to be gaining ground. There is still evidence for careful selection, for while the pro-Italian policy of the Antonines is brought to an end there is no violent reaction against it. Praetorians and men ex equite Romano are still drawn on, the latter providing two praetorian prefects at the beginning and end of our period. A very important point is the advantage clearly possessed by men who had at some time been in the service of the castra peregrina.

I shall now attempt a general conspectus of the relation of the primipilares to the procuratorships. In the chapter on the Rome tribunates we saw that an intake of seven or eight primipilares out of thirty or so available each year would keep those tribunates filled. These men after holding their posts as primuspilus iterum would have to compete for whatever pro-

portion of the procuratorships in the first ducenarian echelon fell vacant each year, possibly one-third (of fifteen under Hadrian-Commodus). Our first main point must be therefore that only a handful of all primipilares can have held procuratorships. Of these a large proportion are not attested to have gone beyond the first echelon, and in many of them it is probable that they never did. In this context again we must remember the importance of the age at which the first primipilate had been reached.

Of the posts in the first echelon the following do not appear in primipilaris careers, proc. bibliothecarum, ab epistulis Graecis, archiereus Alex., proc. Baeticae, proc. tractus Karth. Of these <sup>the</sup> first three are normally held by people who had a predominantly civil career. The last occurs in equestrian careers of H.G. Pflaum's type II. One suspects that there is nothing in the omission of Baetica that the fragmentary state of our evidence does not explain. The normal practice seems to have been that the primipilaris should commence his procuratorial career with a provincial procuratorship.

There is one case of a starting-post that is puzzling. L. Petronius Sabinus was proc. stat. hered., a post at Rome that should have been second-echelon, and then was proc. Narb., a first-echelon post. The explanation may be demotion.

A good general rule is that the tenure of a second-echelon post by a primipilaris ought to mean something special as far as his career is concerned. These posts were generally omitted, or apart from the procuratorial governorship of Mauretania

Tingitana, and in the third century that of Sardinia, there were only some posts, two provincial procuratorships, and an Egyptian post in that echelon. There was one group of primipilares, however, who had to pass through that echelon, those who held a ducenarian legionary prefecture instead of a first-echelon procuratorship. The only way that these men could enter the procuratorial hierarchy without being disadvantaged by their start was for them to begin in the second echelon. Ti. Claudius Secundinus was procurator XX hered., and showed such talent in that post that he leapt over the echelon of the procuratorial governorships, to hold a great provincial procuratorship. We shall revert to him. T. Licinius Hierocles did precisely the opposite, i.e. he was first proc. XX her., and then prefect of II Parthica. This may be due to a rise in the status of the latter post. He then held a further second-echelon post, the governorship of Sardinia, before going on to the governorship of Mauretania Caesariensis, in the third echelon. Claudius Secundinus held the procuratorship of the vicesima hereditatium, but he went to a normal primipilaris career, holding the two fleets in turn. Finally, on the ducenarian prefect, L. Cominius Maximus held an unnamed procuratorship after the prefecture of II Traiana, which H.G. Pflaum suspects to have been proc. patrimonii.

Among those who held one or other of the two procuratorial governorships in this echelon are T. Licinius Hierocles (Sardinia), P. Vibius Marianus (Sardinia), Aelius Valens (Sardinia), all

third century, and P. Aelius Crispinus (Mauretania Tingitana), and the unknown of XI 5744 (Mauretania Tingitana). Of these, apart from P. Aelius Crispinus, whom we shall discuss in a moment all clearly were having a normal type of career. As far as we can detect the tenure of these second-echelon governorships did not necessarily affect the career unfavourably.

There are two cases of men who had a prolonged career in the second echelon. M. Aquilius Felix clearly discovered a genius for the civil side of the procuratorial system. On the other hand, P. Aelius Crispinus had rather a baffling career, incorporating features of the career of the financial specialist and of the ordinary procuratorial governor.

Finally there are two careers where the posts held are very similar and the reason for their tenure apparently the same. Q. Marcius Turbo held the centenarian post of praefectus vehiculorum between his first primipilate and his tribunate of vigiles, and his first ducenarian procuratorial post was the second-echelon one of procurator ludi magni. The unknown of VI 1645 held in turn the post of procurator ludi magni and that of praefectus vehiculorum, both then in the second echelon, after a first-echelon post. The object seems to have been in each case to keep the man in question at Rome, near the emperor.

The posts held by the primipilares in the second echelon are those of procurator XX hered., proc. hered., proc. patrim., proc. ludi magni, proc. mauretaniae Ting., proc. Sardiniae. Not attested are a studiis aug., a voluptatibus Aug., praep. a

censibus, proc. Asiae, proc. Lyciae etc., and diocetes aegypti.

It is equally interesting to note the men who did not hold a post in the second echelon, M. Bassaeus Rufus and Cn. Marcius Rustius Rufinus, praetorian prefects, M. Calpurnius Seneca, prefect of the Misenum fleet, and Valerius, T. Desticius Severus, and C. Velius Rufus, all procuratorial governors. Note this advancement is not the mark of a particular corps of origin, nor is it necessarily a mark of favour over those who held second-echelon posts.

The third echelon is pre-eminently that of the procuratorial governorships, though there was the alternative of the Ravenna fleet. This is the destination of the second type of primipilaris procurator, though, as already remarked, promotion of such to the fourth echelon was not unknown. The only post not held by primipilares in this echelon was that summarum rationum, the assistant of the a rationibus at Rome. The normal time taken to reach this height from the primipilate was about fifteen years, of C. Velius Rufus (pp. c. 82 - 92), L. Numerius Albanus (from tr. vig. 113 to 127), L. Sempronius Ingenuus (from pp. 152 to 164), Sex. Baius Pudens (from tr. eq. sing. 153 to 167), his third post in the third echelon. This period of time is governed by the consideration that the primipilares were in their mid-forties at least when they began their procuratorial career.

In the fourth echelon only the procuratorial ~~is~~ <sup>post</sup> career of Syria is not attested for primipilares. We will take first

those men who passed over the third echelon. This is as significant as the tenure of a post in the second echelon. They fall into two classes. Turbo was pursuing a career destined to fit him for the prefecture, and keep him at Trajan's side. There was no point in his going off to hold a procuratorial governorship. Cn. Pompeius Homullus and Ti. Claudius Secundinus had shown a flair for the civil side, and were reserved for that side. Of those who held both the Ravenna and the Misenum fleet, Cn. Marcius Rustius Rufinus definitely went on, M. Calpurnius Seneca and the unknown of XIV 191 are not known to have done so. M. Bassaeus Rufus went on after holding Belgica and the two Germanies, T. Desticius Severus and the unknown of XI 5744 are not known to have done so. Ti. Claudius Secundinus and Cn. Pompeius Homullus went on after holding the two Gauls, Valerius is not known to have done so. It will be noted that while there was a definite tendency to use primipilares, though not only primipilares, for the procuratorial governorships, in the fourth echelon and beyond they were in competition with all. It is interesting to note that we have only one case each from the first and third centuries.

A primipilaris was a military man par excellence. We need not therefore be surprised at the smallness of the number who held some secretariats. Secundinus and Homullus stand apart. Their flair for administration brought both to the secretariat a rationibus along similar paths. The only other example of this post is in the career of M. Bassaeus Rufus, and there

clearly it is part of the preparation <sup>for</sup> of the praetorian prefecture. In the absence of any evidence on the question how did Ulpian reach the secretariat, a censibus speculation is useless.

We come now to the prefects. The characteristic of these is the way their procuratorial experience is non-existent, or a bare minimum. This is true probably of Catonius Iustus, and certainly so of the prefects of 69-70. More to the point, it is true of the first primipilaris praetorian prefect in an age of a developed procuratorial hierarchy, Sulpicius Similis, who raced to the prefecture of Egypt in ten years at most from his primipilate. One may compare the earlier case of Liternius Fronto, from prefect of the camp in Egypt to prefect of Egypt in nine years, but we are uncertain how far his career was influenced by the events of 69-70. This speed of the prefect's career continued with Turbo, who had reached the fourth echelon in ten years at most from being centurion, though another five elapsed before his praetorian prefecture. He illustrates the adoption of the procuratorial career to the needs of the future prefect. He never held a provincial procuratorship, having two posts at Rome to keep him near Trajan, and the prefecture of the Misenum fleet to enable him to accompany him to the Parthian war. He further illustrates the reason for the speed of prefects' careers, for it was only the foresight and planning of Trajan which allowed him to have thirty years' active service after his primipilate, perhaps ten to fifteen as praetorian

prefect. The future prefect had to be chosen early and promoted fast.

The post of T. Claudius Secundinus as prefect of the annona is clearly the logical outcome of his previous career, the peculiarities of which I have referred to time and again. His prefecture came perhaps eighteen years after his praetorian tribunate.

Continuing the list of praetorian prefects, Tattius Maximus served as tribune of the equites singulares for at least three years, but this did not prevent him becoming prefect of vigiles eleven years later. It will be noted that if Gavius Maximus was a primipilaris, as has sometimes been suspected, we would have an unbroken line of primipilaris prefects from Similis in the closing years of Trajan to the death of Tattius Maximus in 160. M. Bassaeus Rufus, after a career little different from the procuratorial governors, became praetorian prefect in 169. He like Turbo served altogether up to his death about thirty years from his first primipilate. He died between 177 and 180. If H.G. Pflaum is right in his dating of EE VIII 478 he had a primipilaris colleague in the 170's.

There is then rather a gap, apart from L. Montemnius Sabinus prefect of Egypt 193-4, and Flavius Genialis, prefect to an ephemeral emperor, till Cn. Marcius Rustius Rufinus, prefect of vigiles 205-7, and praetorian prefect. He was tribune of vigiles in 190. He only held one procuratorship, excluding the two praetorian fleets.

praetorian prefect to Caracalla was M. Oclatinus Adventus, first to come from the castra peregrina. He had only held one procuratorship, in Britain. He was of considerable military ability, but not an educated man (The same was true of M. Bassaeus Rufus). His was the last procuratorship certainly held by a primipilaris praetorian prefect. Adventus was also well advanced in age. Both of the prefects of Macrinus were primipilares, and had been through the castra peregrina. Ulpian had been a censibus, but how he got there, and whether Ulpian Nestor had had any procuratorships, we do not know. On the other hand, P. Valerius Comazon is specifically stated by Dio to have held neither procuratorships nor prefectures. He had probably been a ducenarian legionary prefect at the time of his promotion to the prefecture. Howe has pointed out that if, as is generally believed, he held the urban prefecture under Severus Alexander, the latter must have had a higher opinion of him than Dio (19).

This group we have just discussed, from Adventus to Comazon, was clearly one of primarily military men, who had not probably had much administrative training. This applies most completely to the last primipilaris prefect, L. Petronius Taurus Volusianus. This career, as a glance at the table will show, was purely military.

In summary of what has been said, a table is given of the echelons reached by primipilares from 69 onwards. Naturally it shows the last post recorded, as certainty that it is the last

post reached is rarely possible.

VESPASIAN TO NERVA

First echelon

L. Antonius Naso  
Sex. Subrius Dexter  
Cn. Pompeius Proculus  
Q. Petronius Modestus

Third echelon

C. Velius Rufus

Fourth echelon

XI 5744

Prefectures

L. Liternius Fronto

TRAJAN TO HADRIAN

First echelon

T. Flavius Prianus

Third echelon

L. Numerius Albanus

Fourth echelon

M. Calpurnius Seneca

Secretariat

Cn. Pompeius Homullus

Prefectures

Ser. Sulpicius Similis  
Q. Marcus Turbo

PIUS TO COMMODUS

First echelon

T. Pontius Sabinus  
C. Valerius Pansa  
SB 5731  
Truttedius Clemens  
P. Cussius Phoebianus  
C. Rufius Festus

Second echelon

L. Petronius Sabinus  
L. Cominius Maximus

Third echelon

L. Sempronius Ingenuus  
Sex. Baius Pudens  
P. Aelius Crispinus

Fourth echelon

T. Desticius Severus  
Valerius  
XIV 191

## Prefectures

Ti. Claudius Secundinus  
 Tattius Maximus  
 M. Bassaeus Rufus  
 L. Mantennius Sabinus  
 T. Flavius Genialis  
 EE VIII 478

## THE THIRD CENTURY

## First echelon

C. Titius Similis  
 Cl. Aurelius Tiberius  
 Aurelius Sabinianus

## Second echelon

Aelius Valens  
 VI 1645  
 P. Vibius Marianus

## Third echelon

M. Aquilius Felix  
 T. Licinius Hierocles

## Prefectures

Cn. Marcius Rustius  
 Rufinus  
 M. Oclatinus Adventus  
 Ulpus Iulianus  
 Iulianus Nestor  
 P. Valerius Comazon  
 L. Petronius Taurus  
 Volusianus

The division into the three types appears clearly. Note the size of the first-echelon group.

The men who went to the centenarian procuratorships were naturally of inferior quality to those who were sent to the Rome tribunates. Hence it is hardly surprising that they did not on the whole reach the same heights. A table appears below. They are first attested under Hadrian.

## TRAJAN AND HADRIAN

Cammius Secundinus

centenarian procurator

## PIUS TO COMMODUS

T. Desticius Severus

proc. Belg., fourth  
 echelon

VI 31871

L. Artorius Castus

centenarian procurator-  
ship  
centenarian procurator-  
ship

## THE THIRD CENTURY

M. Aquilius Felix	Third ducenarian echelon
Iulius Honoratus	centenarian procuratorship
C. Titius Similis	First ducenarian echelon
C. Publicius Proculus Meianus	centenarian procuratorship
Ti. Claudius Demetrius	centenarian procuratorship
M. Aurelius Antoninus	centenarian procuratorship
Bryonianus Lolianus	centenarian ?

The only real successes are T. Desticius Severus, and M. Aquilius Felix, and the latter was fortunate in his period.

In recapitulation, H.G. Pflaum has seen clearly and rightly that the primipilares and some equestrians formed a class distinguished by their occupation of the procuratorial governorships. The second century was clearly their peak of success in this, the third century seeing a certain falling-off (two governorships, Raetia and Noricum, disappeared under Marcus Aurelius). This is not so marked as far as the prefects are concerned, there being a primipilaris praetorian prefect operating from the end of Trajan to the beginning of Severus Alexander, with only two long gaps, from the closing years of Hadrian to 158, and 180 to c. 212, not counting Flavius Genialis. H.G. Pflaum also appreciated how the advanced age of the primipilares, generally at least forty-five when they began their procuratorial career, shortened their working-life, and made their promotion rapid. I have modified his picture of origines and corps of recruitment to some extent. It seems clear that

up to Trajan and Hadrian neither were a primary consideration in selection for procuratorships. Under those two there seems a certain preference for men ex equite Romano. Then under the last three Antinines there was a definite preference for Italians, though I do not see how we can dogmatise as to whether those Italians were praetorians or men ex equite Romano. In the third century recruitment is once again wide, though like M. Pflaum I must underline the importance of the castra peregrina. I would differ from him on an even more fundamental consideration, that of the relative importance of the primipilares in the procuratorial order. To me the paramount fact here is the small number of primipilares entering the procuratorships, and the even smaller number reaching the prefectures. On the question of the prefects a study of H.G. Pflaum's figures in Procurators, p. 257 and 294-5, will show the large number of prefects not from the primipilares. If my own remarks about the long line of praetorian prefects from the primipilares are quoted against me, it must be remembered that those men represented the absolute cream of the primipilares, themselves the cream of nearly 2000 centurions. The primipilaris contribution, while notable, was not so great as to prejudice the success of the equestrian officers proper. This question of the total numbers of primipilares entering the procuratorships makes me wonder if they did indeed form the majority of H.G. Pflaum's group I (20). Still, I suppose that the number of primipilares required to fill, say, three out of four

procuratorial governorships, probably at least of three years duration, would be quite small. Notice that the important secretariats are rarely held by primipilares. The primipilares, <sup>were never</sup> then, ~~is~~ more than a distinguished part of a body of procurators and prefects in which the higher ranks, like the lower, were mainly composed of men who had had a normal equestrian career. Among those primipilaris procurators, incidentally, the men ex equite Romano played no inconsiderable part.

I cannot close this chapter without paying tribute to H.G. Pflaum. Without his work, which has laid down the lines of the procuratorial structure and hierarchy, this chapter could never have been written.

THE SOCIAL STANDING OF THE PRIMIPILARIS

The term primipilaris is descriptive of a rank, and of a social class. It covers the actual post of primuspilus, the technically incorrect phrase primipilaris legionis often occurring and thereafter the ex-primuspilus, except at such time as he is holding an establishment post. The most familiar use is for the man who has retired after his primipilate, or for the members of the "pool" at Rome, or for members of that group attached to commanders in the field. It is also used for a praetorian tribune who had lost his tribunate, Cornelius Martialis. Quite commonly it is used for a retired prefect of the camp, e.g. on some of the inscriptions referring to C. Caesius Silvester. On the other hand the primuspilus iterum seems to have preferred to make clear his rank, cf. Q. Precius Proculus. This implies that men in retirement calling themselves primipilares never got further than at most prefect of the camp.

Praetorian prefects and high-ranking procurators mention the fact that they started as primipilares on their career inscriptions. To have held the primipilate was an achievement, and relationship to a primipilaris was worth mentioning in the same inscription that boasted of relationship to senators, equestrians, and chairmen of provincial councils (IGRR III 474). The title primipilaris could only be borne by a man who had held the post of primus pilus. I have emphasised elsewhere in this work the rarity of the distinction, with only thirty

primipilates available each year. The primipilares represented the cream of the centurions of the Roman army.

What was their exact social status ? I have said allittle on this in the chapter on the men ex equite Romano. First it must be said that there is no decisive text or inscription on this point. I am of the opinion that primipilares were equestrians ipso facto, for the following reasons. primipilares could be equestrians, cf. Alledius Severus. One would expect a large number of them to become equestrians, if they were originally plebeians, and to state the fact. In fact, as I have noted in the chapter on the men ex equite Romano, there is no inscription which must imply that the man became an equestrian after his primipilate, and very few where the expression eques Romanus appears at all. we are than left with three possibilities, either the primipilares occasionally became equestrians, **but did not bother to mention the fact, or few or none became such,** or, finally, they do not say whether they had received the equestrian title or not for the same reason as equestrian officer did not, because the post they had held showed they were equestrians. That may be a little involved. But simply, if the title eques Romanus was for the primipilaris an additional honour, occasionally bestowed, it should appear on a few inscriptions. It does not appear in that sense. The primipilaris then is a member of the equestrian order. I have already referred to the fallacy of the argument against this from the title ex equite Romano. The question of the use of the title vir egregius does not arise, as that title implies more

than that the person so entitled is an equestrian.

We know very little about the ancestry of the primipilares, apart from the obvious generalisation that it was the same as for the centurionate as a whole. P. Palpellius Clodius Quirinalis was probably the son of a soldier of XV Apollinaris, and Aelius Aelianus, of a veteran custos armorum of II Adiutrix. The men who were sons of primipilares we shall discuss elsewhere. Otherwise the only men of whose ancestry we can form any idea are the men ex equite Romano. However, the places from which the primipilares were drawn, as shown in the chapter on the origines, and the ability to choose from a large body of centurions, would tend to keep the standards high.

The primipilaris, unlike his equestrian colleagues, rarely or never became a senator. Three reached the senate via the praetorian prefecture, M. Oclatinus Adventus, P. Valerius Comazon, and L. Petronius Taurus Volusianus. One, Aelius Triccianus, was elevated to consular rank from the ducenarian prefecture of II Parthica by Macrinus, but this clearly was an emergency measure occasioned by that emperor's lack of trustworthy senators. The reasons why they did not enter the senate are fairly clear. The ordinary primipilaris was too old when he reached the primipilate to make a transfer worth-while. The man who did reach the primipilate young was clearly going to be of far more use to the emperor in the career he was in. On the other hand, the rise of descendants of primipilares in the second or even in the first generation is well attested. One

cannot count the case of Vespasius Pollio, as he was probably not a primipilaris, though he was a prefect of the camp, but the following table shows there is ample evidence.

## CLAUDIUS AND NERO

Helvidius -	pp.	son	consul
Glitius Barbarus	praef.fabr.	grandson	consul II, urban pref. cos. ord.?
Minicius Iustus	praef.castr.	son	cos. ord.?
Vitelllius Saturninus	praef.castr.	son	frater arvalis

## TRAJAN AND HADRIAN

Q. Raecius Rufus	pp.	descendant	senator
L. Gavius Fronto	praef.castr.	son grandson	quaestor praetor

## PIUS TO COMMODUS

L. Alfenus Avitianus	trib.urb.	grandson?	frater arvalis
----------------------	-----------	-----------	-------------------

I have excluded from this table the procurators M. Vettius Valens, Valerius Paulinus, Subrius Dexter, C. Rufius Festus, Aurelius Sabinianus and Ti. Claudius Demetrius, and the prefects Q. Marcius Turbo, Ti. Claudius Secundinus, L. Mantennius Sabinus, and L. Petronius Taurus Volusianus. Interesting though their families are, they are clearly not relevant to the question of the social standing of the simple primipilaris. Pompeius Longinus is excluded as not actually a primipilaris, though a praetorian tribune. In the list quoted a slight

doubt attaches to Minicius Iustus and Vitellius Saturninus, though in the former case his marriage to a distinguished senator's sister may explain much. L. Gavius Fronto was in my opinion ex equite Romano, which helps to explain his family's rise.

The sons of primipilares who were not fortunate enough to become senators seem to have had a triple choice. They could seek a direct commission as centurion and aim at the primipilate, become equestrian officers, or quietly pursue a municipal career.

In the first category we number the following:-

#### FIRST AND SECOND CENTURIES

Fabius Longus pater	primipilaris	Ostia	0-200
Fabius Longus filius	primipilaris	Ostia	0-200
L.Publicius Apronianus	primipilaris	-	
L.Publicius Florianus	trib. praet.	-	193
L.Decrius Longinus	primipilaris	Paeligni	100-50
L.Decrius	princeps	Paeligni	100-50
Iulianus qui et			
Numisianus			
T.Servaeus Sabinus	primipilaris	Iconium ?	0-150
L.Servaeus Sabinus	centurion	Iconium ?	0-150
L.Umbricius Clemens	primipilaris	Arretium	100-200
C.Umbricius Celer	eques praet.	Arretium	100-200

#### THIRD CENTURY

Domitius Iulianus pater	primuspilus XXII Pr?	-	
Domitius Iulianus filius	primuspilus XXII Pr	-	229
Arrius Germanus senior	primipilaris	-	
Arrius Germanus junior	primipilaris	-	
Cornelius Saturninus	primipilaris	Pannonia	
Cornelius Victor	singularis cos.	Pannonia	

The third column represents origines, and the fourth more exact dating, where it is available. The relationship is father to son, though in the case of the Umbricii it is not stated, though implied, and the Arrii need be no more than members of the same family. L. Decrius Iulianus was still alive, and so undoubtedly would reach the primipilate, whereas L. Servaeus Sabinus died as a centurion. Celer died when he was due for evocatio, though of course he should have been able to secure a direct commission, not have to serve in the ranks. Even more surprising is the case of Cornelius Victor, who served twenty-six years. In these two cases possibly parental influence could not overcome the difficulty of filial incompetence.

We turn to the sons who chose to become equestrian officers, or at least mention their equestrian status.

#### FIRST AND SECOND CENTURIES

Nymphidius Lupus pater	praef. cast.	-	c. 81
Nymphidius Lupus filius	praef. cohort	-	c. 111-3
Marcus Titianus	pp. II	Balbura	Tr.-Hr.?
T. Marcus Deiotaranus	tr. leg.	Balbura	Tr.-Hr.?
L. Satorius Picens	primipilaris	Asculum	0-200
C. Satorius Picens	praef. coh.	Asculum	0-200
Sex. Julius Severus	primipilaris	Caesarea	0-200
Julius Pompilius	eq. R.	Caesarea	0-200
Julius Bassinus	eq. R.	Caesarea	0-200

#### THIRD CENTURY

P. Petronius Felix	trib. praet.	-
P. Petronius Felix	eq. R.	-
Fuscus		
P. Petronius Severus		

Acutius -	primipilaris	-
M. Acutius Acutianus	eq. R.	-

## UNDATED

Aelius Lucilianus	primipilaris	-	100-
Aelius Flavianus	eq. R.	-	100-

M. Vergilius Gallus Lusius is omitted, as he did reach the rank of idiologus in Egypt. Marcius Titianus will come up again in connection with the question of relationship to chairmen of provincial councils. He was ex equite Romano, as was most probably Sex. Iulius Severus. We are not sure whether the second son of P. Petronius Felix was an eques Romanus. M. Acutius Acutianus used the formula, eq. R., p.p. filius, which reminds us that primipilaris was a personal title.

As there are cases of sons who followed in their fathers' footsteps and became primipilares, so there are brothers who reached the same position.

## CLAUDIUS AND NERO

L. Gerellanus Fronto	praef. castr.	Heliopolis
Gerellanus -	trib. praet.	
Sex. Subrius Dexter	trib. praet.	Italian
Subrius Flavus	trib. praet.	
Iulius Fronto	trib. vig.	-
Iulius Gratus	praef. castr.	

## FIRST AND SECOND CENTURIES

Q. Anatius Paulus	pp. VI Ferr.	Italian
Anatius Rufus	hast. VI Ferr.	

## THIRD CENTURY

	Aurelius Apollinaris	trib. praet	-
	Aurelius Nemesianus	trib. praet	-
M.	Aurelius Alexander(ii)	primipilaris	-
M.	Aurelius Valens	centurion	

## UNDATED

Ti.	Claudius Celer	trib. vig.	-
Ti.	Claudius Petronius Lusitanicus	prefect of a legion	

Both Anatius Rufus and M. Aurelius Valens might well have reached the primipilate if death had not intervenéd. Note the striking case of the Anatii, two brothers holding two of the three major centurionates in the same <sup>*legion at the same*</sup> time. The heavy representation from the early period comes from literary sources.

Where men are commissioned ex equite Romano it is not uncommon for their brothers to remain in an equestrian career. The converse I have taken to be true, that where a primipilaris has an equestrian brother, it is more probable that that primipilaris was directly commissioned as centurion than that he began in the ranks.

## SECOND CENTURY

L.	Cammius secundinus	pp., proc..	Aquileia
L.	Cammius Maximus	praef. coh.	

## THIRD CENTURY

L.	Aemilius Marcellinus	primipilaris	-
L.	Aemilius Salvianus	trib. coh.	
P.	Aelius Marcellus	praef. leg.	Apulum
P.	Aelius Antipater	a militiis	
P.	Aelius Iulianus	eq. R.	

Papirius Sporus	trib. vig.	-
Papirius Socrates	v.e.	
Cassius Ligus	trib. vig.	-
Cassius Ligurinus	proc.	
L. Septimius Domitianus	e.m.v. ex primip.	-
L. Septimius Marcellinus	e.m.v. ex cornic. praeff.	

P. Aelius Marcellus adopted the children of his brothers. Papirius Socrates possibly may have been a primipilaris, though one would have expected him to mention it. The relationship of Cassius Ligus and Cassius Ligurinus is only a suggestion of FIR.<sup>2</sup> On the last pair the best parallel to the title of Marcellinus is ILS 4721, Q. Peltradius Maximus, trib. ex corniculario praef.. praetorio eemm. vv.. In view of the phrasing in the inscription of the Septimii it looks as if Marcellinus had not been a primipilaris. I doubt if we have enough examples for the larger number of cases from the third century to have significance.

It would be interesting to know into what class the primipilares married, but with a few exceptions the wives identified are of primipilaris procurators. The most notable among the exceptions is Minicius Iustus, already mentioned, prefect of a legion in 69 yet the husband of Corellia, sister of Q. Corellius Rufus, consul in or about 78. This seems to me so remarkable that I cannot help wondering if the identification is sound. P: Rapellius Kalendinus, prefect of a cohort, married the daughter of the urban tribune, L. Licinius Licinianus, the date being uncertain. For marriage within the ranks of the

primipilares we have the case of Sex. Atilius Rogatianus, father-in-law of P. Nonius Felix, both men being primipilares from Carthage, near the end of the second century. An interesting case is that of Numitoria Moschis, the widow of the primipilaris procurator L. Cominius Maximus, who married the praetorian tribune L. Graecius Constans in the early third century. It has been suggested that the Atilia Vera that set up the honorific inscription to L. Aemilius Paternus, under Trajan or Hadrian, was the daughter of the primuspilus Atilius Verus who was killed in 69, but this is only a possibility. The daughter of Annius Callimachus married a centurion, and the daughter of Flavius Albinus married a trierarch of the praetorian fleet of Misenum. Trierarchs were allowed to become primipilares in the third century, so perhaps she did not marry too far beneath her station.

There are a number of relationships where the exact degree is not known. C. Mucius Scaeva was presumably related to the centurion C. Mucius whom he commemorated. Q. Mantius - was presumably related to the Q. Manlius Severus who died as a praetorian soldier after transferring to the guard from XXII Primigenia (I have suggested in the Prosopography that one of these inscriptions contains an error, and that the nomen was the same). Clearly also the Titecii of Supinum had more than one member who reached the primipilate or was an equestrian. T. Desticius Severus presumably was connected with the senatorial

family of the Desticii Iubae. Iuvenalis, prefect of a legion, must have had some connection with the Vellei of Capua, a member of whom received equestrian rank at the age of five.

An interesting family tree, which illustrates the fact that we do not fully understand all the fluctuations in status of the primipilaris, is that of P. Aelius Apollonianus. The first generation of which we know is P. Aelius Hilarianus, a consular. His son, the second generation, P. Aelius Apollonianus, was a primipilaris. His son, the third generation, P. Aelius Hilarianus, was an equestrian, and there may have been others who were senators, as the wife of Apollonianus boasts that she was mother to senators. Mr. Birley has suggested to me as a possible explanation that Apollonianus sought and obtained a direct commission as centurion while his father was an equestrian. Later his father was transferred into the senate and attained to the consulate. In these circumstances the sons of Apollonianus would not find it difficult to become senators. On this latter point however, the fact that the younger Hilarianus is only called "relative" of senators and consulars suggests the possibility that the wife of Apollonianus may have had senatorial children by a former marriage. There is room for much speculation here, but the vital point to grasp is this movement from one social class to another.

Finally, we may consider as a separate little group the primipilares who had connections with another social group, that of the chairmen of provincial councils. In the West the only

certain case is that of AE 1954. 104, who was chairman of the provincial council of Gallia Narbonensis some time before the reign of Claudius. The case of C. Suiccius La- is more puzzling, and as I have indicated in the Prosopography, I am not sure at all that he was a primipilaris, or even a prefect of a legion. He was chairman of the council of the three Gauls. In the East Marcius Titianus was a Lyciarch, and so was his son-in-law, ~~the~~ latter in 127. Titianus was ex equite Romano. T. Arruntius Nichomachus Tiberinianus, son and grandson of chairmen of the provincial council of Asia, was descended from a primipilaris, included in the Prosopography as Arruntius, and also on the question of descent we may note M. Aurelius Thoantianus, IGRR III 474, who was descended from a senator, a consular, a Lyciarch Pamphyliarchs, primipilares, and equestrians. Finally, L. Gavius Fronto, also in my opinion ex equite Romano, was a Pamphyliarch.

The primipilares, then, were ipso facto equestrians. Of their social origins we know little, except that a small proportion of primipilares came from equestrian families, and one suspects that many of them came from soldiering families. They did not receive adlection into the senate under normal circumstances, but their grandsons or even their sons might reach that rank. (I am speaking of ordinary primipilares. The procurators or prefects of course had raised their status so much that their descendants' success was inevitable). If, on the other

other hand, their descendants could not or would not enter the senate, they had the choice of applying for direct commission as a centurion, becoming equestrian officers, or remaining quietly in their municipality. Clearly most of these sons preferred a military career. These families might almost be regarded as a military caste, for we have brothers also pursuing military careers in the same or different branches of service. Marriage helped to cement these families together. One point should be emphasised. Unless the sons follow in their fathers' footsteps and become primipilares, a family whose fortunes were based on a primipilaris ancestor in a generation is indistinguishable from an equestrian family. Thus unless fortune comes to our aid we are unlikely to be able to trace the rise of a primipilaris family beyond the first generation.

The social rank of the ordinary primipilares is then seen to be equal to that of the ordinary equestrian. They represented the best of the centurionate, drawn from all the constituent elements of that body, providing a constant and valuable stream of fresh talent into the equestrian order.

THE PRIMIPILARIS IN THE MUNICIPALITIES

Having placed the primipilares in their context in Imperial Society, we now turn to their position in the municipalities. There would normally be open to them two senior magistracies, and two junior, with an ordo composed of magistrates. There were also various priesthoods, including the Imperial ones, and the post of patron to the town. I have chosen to present the information on the posts actually held by primipilares in tables, representing periods of time, with comments on the most interesting individual careers and on the general picture. The name of the primipilaris is given, followed by the rank he attained in the Imperial service, the town or towns in which he held posts, and the posts themselves.

## AUGUSTUS TO CALIGULA

P. Anicius Maximus	prefect of camp in Egypt	Pisidian Antioch	praef. Cn. Domiti Ahen..
C. Apidius Bassus	pp.	Amiternum	VIII vir.
L. Aponius	praef. castr.	Baeterra	flam. Aug. prim., praef. pro. IIvir. C. Caes. Aug.f.
Sex. Aulienus	praef. fab.	Venafrum Forum Iuli -	II vir II vir flam. Augustalis.
C. Baebius Atticus	proc. Noric.	Iulium Carnicum	II vir i.d.
Q. Carrinas	pp..	Alba Pompeia	aed., II vir.
M. Cestius	tr. mil.	Therm. Him?	II vir.
L. Cirpinus	praef. leg. duc..	Ricina	II vir i <sup>ter</sup> . q.
L. Curiatius	praef. fab.	Nola	flam. Div. Aug.
Curtilius	praef. fabr.	-	II vir q., aug.

P. Fannius	praef. eq.	Verona	III vir i.d.
C. Norbanus Quadratus	praef. cast.	Alexandria Troas	augur, II vir.
L. Ovinus Rufus	praef. fabr.	Venafrum	II vir.
Sex. Pedius Lusianus Hirrutus	praef. civit.	Interpromium	IIII vir i.d., praef. German. Caes. q.i. ex s.c., q. iter..
L. Praecilius Clemens Iulianus	praef. cast..	Salona	pontif., quinq. desig., flam., patron..
M. Tarquinius Saturninus	tr. mil.	Veii	centumvir
M. Vergilius Gallus Lusius	idiologus	Venafrum	II vir. iter., pontif..
XI 711	praef. classis	Bononia	II vir quinq., pontif..
XI 1221	pp..	Flacentia	II vir
AE 1954. 104	praef. navium	Arelate	II vir bis, Augustalis.

Arrius Salanus and Cn. Manilius are omitted from this table, as they are not primipilares, but equestrians holding posts otherwise associated with the primipilares. Note especially P. Anicius Maximus, who in my view received a direct commission as centurion after a municipal career culminating in this prefecture. Such prefects officiated in place of the normal II vir, the post being offered to some great man, who named someone to hold the office for him. It will be noted that only in one case, that of Q. Carrinas, is a post below the highest magistracy, the duvirate, mentioned, that of aedile. The question arises whether in fact the primipilares were excused the lower magistracies, or they held the posts but did not mention them on inscriptions as too unimportant.

Certainly it seems a lot to ask a distinguished man of advanced years to hold junior magistracies.

#### CLAUDIUS TO NERO

C. Gavius Silvanus	tr. pr.	Taurini	patron..
L. Gerellanus Fronto	praef. cast.	Heliopolis	praef. Aug., flam. Aug., pont.
Q. Paesidius Macedo	tr. mil.	Dyrrhachium	augur, flam. Neronis.
L. Rufellius Severus	pp II	Fanum Fortunae	quinquenn., et Claudi quinq. praef..
C. Valerius Clemens	pp.	Taurini	II vir quinq., flam. Divi Aug., perpet., patron.
M. Vettius Valens	proc. Lusit..	Ariminum	patron..

L. Gerellanus Fronto held his prefecture on behalf of the emperor between his primipilate and his prefecture of the camp. There are rather more patronages, compared to the one of the last table. A table follows which gives the posts held by men who had a career of the Augustan type, but who cannot be securely dated before Claudius.

#### EARLY CAREERS

Cn. Baebius Celsus	praef. fabr.	Hispellum	pontif.
P. Cornelius Cicatricula	praef. coh.	Pisaurum?	II vir. II vir quinq., pont.. <i>Ln</i>
Q. Lucilius Gallus	praef cast.	Marruvium	IIII vir q., patron.
C. Meffius Saxo	praef. fabr.	Brixia	pontif., quinq.

L. Octavius Balbus	praef. fabr.	Marruvium	II vir
C. Purpurius Atticus	praef. eq.	Forum Livi	IIII vir quinq.
XI 712 (i)	praef. eq.	Bononia	II vir i.d.
XI 712 (ii)	praef. fabr.	Bononia	II vir quinq. pot.
XII 4371	tr. mil.	Narbo	II vir quinq. praef. pro II viro.

The types of post held are the same. Note how often the primipilaris receives the higher honour of a senior magistracy in a year of internal census, e.g. II vir quinq..

For the period Vespasian-Nerva there are only two cases, those of Q. Petronius Modestus, who rose to be a first-echelon ducentarian procurator, and was flamen to Claudius at Tergeste, and the unknown of III 14387i, who did not go beyond the primipilate, but was honoured with the IIviralia ornamenta at Heliopolis. Here too we may note two cases that cannot be dated more exactly than to the first century. L. Aufellius Rufus, a primipilaris, was IIII vir quinquenn., patron, and flamen Divi Aug. at Cales, and the unknown of X 218 was II vir quinquenn. at Grumentum.

#### TRAJAN AND HADRIAN

<b>Li</b> C. Arrius Clemens	pp.	Matilca	II vir quinq., patron, curator.
C. Caesius Silvester	praef. cast.	Tuficum	IIII vir quinq., patron.
Ti. Claudius Secundinus	praef. annon.	Aquileia	flamen Vesp.
L. Gavius Fronto	praef. cast.	Attaleia	a number of posts.
N. Marcius Flaetorius Celer	trib. vig.	Abella	quaestor, II vir, patron.

Octavius Secundus	pp..	Actia Nicopolis Ulpia	adlect. decur. <b>adlect. decur.</b> adlect. decur.
C. Oppius Bassus	p p.	Auximum	praef. i.d., patron.
T. Pontius Sabinus	proc. Narb.	Ferentinum	IIII vir. i.d., flamen, patron.

We have here quite an interesting collection. N. Marcius Flaetorius Celer I suspect to have been another case of a municipal worthy who obtained a direct commission, from the arrangement of his career, which implies that he was first quaestor<sup>r</sup> and IIII vir, had his military career<sup>e</sup>, and then returned and became patron. As<sup>r</sup> T. Pontius Sabinus was ex equite Romano, and probably so were Ti. Claudius Secundinus and L. Gavius Fronto, they may have held some of their posts and honours before they began their military career. One final note, C. Oppius Bassus was praefectus iure dicundo between two centurionates.

#### PIUS TO COMMODUS

C. Cestius Sabinus	trib. urb..	Urb <sup>r</sup> inum	IIII vir i.d., patron..
T. Desticius Severus	proc. Belg.	Concordia	flam. Hadr., pontif., patron.
C. Didius Saturninus	pp..	Colonia Saturnina	patron
L. Oranius Iustus	praef. cast.	Reate	Laurens Lavinus, sacer., flamen Augustalis, patron.
L. Petronius Sabinus	proc. Narb.	Ancona	patron.
L. Publicius Apron <sup>u</sup> inus	pp.	Ricina	patron.
C. Valerius Pansa	proc. Brit.	Novaria	flamen Vesp., Traj., Hadr..

I suspect that C. Valerius Pansa was given a direct commission as centurion after a municipal career, and after he had received his flaminates - see Prosography. Note the numerous patronages, and particularly the fact that it is the reward for the simple primipilaris equally with the procurator. We now have two small groups of approximately dated examples, belonging to the first and second centurion<sup>ies</sup>, and the second century respectively.

## FIRST AND SECOND CENTURIES

C. Disidenus Secundus	pp.	Sassina	IIII vir i.d.
Iulius -	pp.	Forum Iuli	II vir i.d., praef. i.d.
P. Minnius Salvius	pp.	Concordia	decur. grat. ornam. II viralibus.
Q. Precius Proculus	pp. II	Ostra	augur desig.
C. Tifanus Cilo	pp.	Carsulae	quinq. augur
XI 3112	pp.	Falerii	patron.

The office assigned to Q. Precius Proculus depends on the correctness of the identification in the Prosography. It was gained before he was commissioned ex equite Romano.

## SECOND CENTURY

M. Apicius Tiro	praef. leg.	Ravenna <sup>8</sup>	patron, pontif.
L. Appaeus Pudens	tr. p <sup>r</sup> .	Sassina	flamen / Flav., patron.
L. Betutius Furianus	pp.	Ariminum	III vir aed. cur. et pleb., II vir i.d., II vir q., pont., flam. Nerv., patron.
A. Caesilius Acastinus	pp.	Aquileia	IIII vir i.d. quinq.

Herennius Priscus	pp.	Puteoli	patron.
C. Iulius Lepidus	pp.	Barcino	adlect. dec.

L. Betutius Furianus is yet another case of a man who received a direct commission as centurion after a municipal career. Notice again the patronages, so common in the second century.

## THIRD CENTURY

P. Aelius Marcellus	prefect of a legion -		flamen Lucular., sacer., Laurens Lavinias.
		Apulum	decurio, patron.
		Fulginae	patron.
		Forum Flamini	patron.
		Iguvium	patron.
P. Aelius Primianus	tr. vig.	Auzia	decurio
		Rusgunia	decurio
		Equizetum	decurio
M. Aquilius Felix	praef. Ravenn.	Antium	patron.
		Canusium	patron.
		Lenuvium	pontif.
T. Aurelius Flavinus	pp.	Oescus	princeps / ord.
		Dionysopolis	buleuta
		Marcianopolis	buleuta
		Tungri	buleuta
		Aquincum	buleuta
		Oescus	patron. colleg. fabr.
Maerius Gallus	pp.	Volturni	patron. fabr.
L. Petronius Taurus Volusianus	praetorian prefect	Arretium	patron.
M. Septimius - lis	pp..	Ancona	patron?
		complures civitates	patron?
M. Tillius Rufus	pp.	Atina	patron.
III 3126	tr. pr.	Curicta	patron.
X 3342a	praef. leg	Misenum	decur.

P. Aelius Marcellus was in my opinion commissioned ex equite

Romano. It is interesting to note his family's municipal record. Apart from his own posts, of his two equestrian brothers one had been IIvir and his son, adopted by Marcellus, was a decurion, while the other had been flamen and IIvir. P. Aelius Primianus may have acquired his decurionates before he obtained a direct commission as decurio alae. L. Petronius Taurus Volusianus was also ex equite Romano. M. Tillius Rufus, like C. Oppius Bassus, received the patronage of his native city before he reached the primipilate. Notice how in the third century there is an apparent tendency to multiply patronages and municipal posts generally.

There are only two inscriptions undated even within the wide limits of some of the preceding tables. P. Pacilius Zenon Laetus was pp. bis, aedile and praefectus iure dicundo et sacris faciundis at Ficulez. The unknown of XI 1059 rose to at least the prefecture of a legion, and was patron of Parma, Forodruentum, and Foronovanorum, and patron of the collegia fabrum, centonariorum and dendrophorum of Parma. In view of the examples in the preceding table, it is tempting to think it is inscription third century.

The most interesting general factor in these lists of primipilaris municipal honours is the growth of the number of patronages in the second as compared with the first centuries. While the assessment of the meaning of this is really the task of a student of the whole subject of patronage, I suggest tentatively that this increase may reflect the growing prestige of the primipilaris, which made him a very useful patron indeed, with considerable influence.

The primipilaris of course was no passive recipient of honours. We have mentioned the influence he would wield on his town's behalf

as patron. His wealth was also often at the disposal of his fellow-citizens. I give a short list of notable examples of this.

## AUGUSTUS TO NERO

L. Aurelius Rufus	pp.	Built a temple.
M. Helvius Rufus Civica	pp.	Built a bath.
Sex. Pedius Lusianus H.	praef. civ.	Built an amphitheatre.
IX 2983	praef. fab	Restored some object.
XI 711	praef. clas.	Restored a <u>crypta</u> .

## CLAUDIUS TO NERO

L rufellius Severus	pp. II	Restored a <u>bassis</u> .
---------------------	--------	----------------------------

## EARLY CAREER

XI 712 (i & ii)	praef. eq., praef. fab.	They and possibly others built <u>porticus</u> .
-----------------	----------------------------	--

## TRAJAN AND HADRIAN

C. Caesius Silvester	praef. cast.	Built a temple
M. Calpurnius Seneca	praef. clas..	Banquet to town on
	Mis.	occasion of dedication.
Marcus Titianus	pp. II	Described as founder of Balbura.

## PIUS TO COMMODUS

L. Oranius Iustus	praef. cast.	Gave 100,000 <u>sesterces</u> for <u>comparatio annonae</u> , and distributed money also.
C. Valerius Pansa	proc. Brit.	Restored and enlarged a bath. His wife left 200,000 for it.

## FIRST AND SECOND CENTURIES

P. Minnius Salvius	pp.	Had temple roads improved.
XI 3112	pp. II	He and another patron built <u>and</u> amphitheatre.

## AFTER 150

M. Cocceius Romanus	pp.	Acted as <u>defensor patriae</u> , i.e. as advocate.
---------------------	-----	--

## THE THIRD CENTURY

P. Aelius Marcellus	praef. leg.	Distribution of money and food
L. Aemilius Marcellinus	pp.	Built temple at Lambaesis.
C. Manilius O -	praef. leg. duc.	Restored library at Volsinii
Bryonianus Loll.	duc. ex proc.	Called founder of City (Side).

P. Petronius Felix	tr. pr.	Distributed money.
C. Cornelius Egrilianus	praef. leg.	Left money for <u>dies gymnas</u> at Theveste.

## UNDATED

P. Pacilius Zenon Laetus pp. II Restored a temple.

Clearly Nero's action in transferring rich primipilares to his new colony at Antium was in that colony's best interests (Suet., Nero 9).

The majority of the primipilares, as we have seen, retired after their primipilate or the prefecture of the camp. That did not mean an end to their usefulness, however. As magistrates, as patrons and general benefactors they brought new wealth and energy to their chosen domiciles. The contribution of the primipilaris to town life is not to be overlooked merely because it is not directly related to the purposes for which he was selected. In return for that contribution the towns offered to the man who had never gone beyond the primipilate, as to the procurator, an honoured and useful retirement, an aspect of the primipilaris career not to be neglected by the young man choosing a lifetime occupation.

### CONCLUSION

The primipilaris was originally the centurio primi pili of the Republic. That officer was the chief of the primi ordines, but he had not yet been separated from them by special privileges. He held office for a period of one year, after which his tenure might be renewed or another take over. It did not mark the end of his service as centurion or bring any of the later commoda. He was simply the senior centurion.

Augustus made a number of important innovations, some of which may have been the result of expedients of the civil war period. The title primipilaris was apparently for the first time given to the man who had held the primipilate. After that tenure the man might either retire with a large lump sum, sufficient to qualify him for the equestrian status that the primipilaris now had, or continue in the army, in a variety of posts. These may be divided into two classes, those which are no longer held by primipilares after 69, and those which became established in their possession. In the first category come the posts of praefectus cohortis, praefectus equitum, tribunus militum (legionis), praefectus civitatum, and praefectus fabrum. We may include praefectus classis, as the post was then. All these posts ceased to form a career for the primipilaris after Claudius, though isolated cases of them still occur up to 69. The other category includes the prefecture of the camp, again apparently an Augustan creation, and the Rome

tribunates.

There is no need here to recall details of the development of the primipilaris career. We may come back to certain facets. The career continued much the same until, by a process the details of which we do not know because the evidence is lacking, the primipilaris became a quasi-civil official, concerned with the annona.

It has been assumed in the past that the majority of primipilares up to the end of the second century were from Italy, and had risen to that station from the ranks of the praetorian guard. My own conclusions are that there is no definite evidence for a preference for a particular province or corps, except perhaps for a certain favour to men ex equite Romano under Trajan and Hadrian, until the last three Antonines. They definitely favoured men from Italy, though on present evidence it is impossible to say whether that preference was for praetorians or for men ex equite Romano. <sup>What is notable for</sup> the whole period is that <sup>most come from Italy or colonies. That</sup> is not so true for the East, though of the men who did not come from colonies some at least were ex equite romano. This does suggest that the primipilares, the cream of the centurionate, were expected to be well educated men, as was befitting those who would receive senior magistracies on their return to their home-towns.

The primipilares were drawn from three main sources, men who had started in the ranks of the legions, men who had started in the ranks of the praetorian guard, and centurions who had

been directly commissioned, the latter mostly ex equite Romano, i.e. from equestrian families. The third group was the best placed as far as possible patronage was concerned, the second next, and the first worst of all. Therefore the proportions of them among the primipilares are not purely related to the numbers of them in the centurionate, but my point is that with the exception of the periods mentioned above, there is no evidence that those proportions were affected by a preference for any one body additional to the natural one for the better educated and most powerfully backed individual. In passing it may be noted that the men who had passed through the castra peregrina enjoyed notable success in the third century, but these were drawn from all three sources.

The primuspilus himself in this period, from Augustus to Gallienus, remained much the same as under the Republic. He was still the senior centurion, playing his part as counsellor to the legate, and was now marked out by a special title on completion of his primipilate and the grant of equestrian rank. The post must be seen not so much as the prelude to further service, which it was only for a small minority, but as the finale to a lifetime of service to the emperor as centurion. His service as primuspilus was still apparently for one year. As primipilaris, if he did not retire, he was available for a wide variety of tasks, tabulated elsewhere.

The prefecture of the camp, established apparently by Augustus, at first a temporary post, attached to a camp rather

than to a legion, under Claudius had become an establishment post in each legion. It could be held directly after the first primipilate or after the praetorian tribunate. In this latter case it was held by the primuspilus iterum, distinguished by his seniority and higher salary. The prefect of the camp ranked third in the legionary hierarchy, with the result that he was the natural commander in those legions where there were no senatorial officers, first in II Traiana, then in the Parthian legions, and finally in all legions. The history of the prefecture of the camp in Egypt when there was more than one legion there is still ill-attested, but there seems to have been a rise in its importance till it reached ducenarian rank.

On the subject of the Rome tribunes I would emphasise the special nature of the tribunates (urban) outside Rome, and the fact that only about 25% of all primipilares ever reached the tribunates. As to the origines and corps of those who held them the same remarks hold good for the primipilares as a whole. Of them only a small proportion could hope to reach procuratorships, and for these the time at Rome was useful for making a favourable impression on the emperor and other influential people. For those who could not hope to go further, the time at Rome was a holiday after the rigours of thirty or more years service.

On the procurators who came from the ranks of the primipilares perhaps too much attention has been focussed, as they were in fact a very small minority. They flourished in the second

century. Three groups may be distinguished, first, those who obtained a first-echelon ducenarian procuratorship, and no more, as a reward for long service. Here we might mention those who from the time of Hadrian onwards went to centenarian procuratorships after their first primipilate. These clearly were inferior to those who went to the Rome tribunates, and in fact only two of them, T. Desticius Severus and M. Aquilius Felix, rose to the heights. The second group was destined to hold the procuratorial governorships of the third ducenarian echelon. They sometimes reached the fourth echelon, but went no further. The third group, and here we are dealing with very small numbers indeed, perhaps one or two in ten years' output of primipilares, were chosen as future prefects. Perhaps we should treat as a <sup>fourth</sup> ~~third~~ group those primipilares who showed talent for the financial side, and had correspondingly different careers.

Here a word needs to be said about the age of the primipilaris. In the most favourable conditions, i.e. where a man is showing promise of being in due time capable of becoming a procuratorial governor or a prefect, the primipilate might be held about the age of forty. For the vast majority it must have been first held between fifty and sixty. Hence procuratorial careers of the second and third type referred to tend to be rapid in terms of the number of years between the first primipilate and the commencement of the post for which the man has been pre-selected.

A word may be added about the primipilaris who retired as

such. As far as his position in Imperial society was concerned, he himself was of equestrian rank, and he could expect to be able to secure commissions either as centurions or as equestrian officers for his sons. Some families numbered more than one primipilaris, either father and son, or brothers. In two generations a family founded by a primipilaris might enter the senate. In municipal society the primipilaris could expect a senior magistracy, and the patronage of the city where he took up his abode.

In comparing my results with those of my predecessors, the following points seem to me of importance. On the career, there is no real hierarchy before the time of Claudius. On geographical origins, the period Pius-Commodus is the only one in which Italians were preferred out of proportion to their representation in the centurionate and their natural advantages. As far as the corps are concerned, I emphasise that it is impossible to demonstrate for the praetorian guard, even for the period Pius-Commodus, the type of preference referred to in the last sentence, as not all Italian primipilares were from the guard. The men ex equite romano are important out of proportion to their numbers in the centurionate, especially under Trajan and Hadrian. The post held by the primuspilus iterum was that of prefect of the camp, the different title indicating seniority and higher pay. Finally, and most definitely, the majority of the primipilares never passed the primipilate or the prefecture of the camp. The success of perhaps a quarter of them in the

Rome tribunates, and an even smaller proportion in the procuratorships and prefectures, must not blind us to the fact that the primipilaris is in the main a centurion, who after years of service has been chosen as worthy to serve as senior centurion for one year before passing into a wealthy and honoured retirement. Only when we keep this fact firmly in mind can we judge the contribution of the primipilares to the Roman empire. That contribution lies in the main in the staffing of the senior centurionates of the legions, the prefectures of the camp, and the Rome tribunates, all key positions. That a few of them beyond that became procuratorial governors, and praetorian prefects, is a tribute rather to the individuals than to the corps. The contribution of the primipilares represents the contribution of the body of centurions to the staffing of key positions in the army. That it was not found necessary to draw on any other body for these posts, even for the Rome tribunates, is perhaps a sufficient testimony to the value of that contribution.

A number of problems have been raised but not answered in the course of this work. In the main they are problems that require studies in the centurionate as a whole. I would like to see a study of all the centurions ex equite Romano, of the question of multiple centurionates, and of those centurions who reached administrative posts without holding the primipilate. Naturally, I would like to see a study of the primipilaris and the annona. Other problems I must put down as not soluble on

present evidence, e.g. that of the trecenarius, and his functions

Finally, I come to the giving of thanks. In the matter of materials, I am most grateful to the Thesaurus Linguae Latinae for providing me with all the references in its files to the primipilaris and the trecenarius. I am indebted to M. Pflaum on two accounts, first for allowing me to have the proofs of his these complémentaire, with their vital bearing on the primipilaris procurators, and secondly for his patient reading and kindly criticism of the thesis at an advanced stage, which produced several important points, and also led me to include all the tables in the text. On the point of criticism of text I must thank Mr. M.G. Jarrett for his forthright condemnation of the obscure and unintelligible. To Professor H. Nesselhauf I owe guidance and help in the difficult first year, when as far as method is concerned the research student still sees through a glass darkly. Finally, my debt to my supervisor, Mr. Birley, is incalculable. I have been constantly stimulated by his suggestions, assisted enormously, particularly in the Prosopography, by his encyclopaedic memory, and have lacked for nothing. He has also sacrificed much time to reading drafts in order to secure clarity of phrasing. The methods of work used in this thesis are based on his, and if it is kindly received much of the credit must go to him.

THE PRIMIPILARIS AND THE CASTRA PEREGRINA

The castra peregrina makes its first appearance as far as the primipilares are concerned in the career of Q. Geminus Sabinus, who was primuspilus et princeps peregrinorum after having been hastatus of a legion. This presumably means that he was given the rank of primuspilus but performed the duties of the princeps peregrinorum at Rome. The case of T. Flavius Domitianus may be compared, who calls himself hastatus leg X Fretensis princeps peregrinorum (ILS484), and is clearly carrying out the latter's duties. Sabinus died as prefect of a legion.

The most remarkable men from the castra peregrina, however, belong to the period of Severus and the early years of the third century. M. Aquilius Felix begins them. As centurio frumentarius, already notorious for assassinations, he was sent to kill Severus, and changed sides with such effect that he rose to a procuratorship of third-<sup>c</sup>enelon rank after a career spent almost entirely at Rome. Next is M. Oclatinus Adventus, a praetorian prefect, who after being speculator in an unknown corps was successively a frumentarius and princeps peregrinorum. The two prefects who succeeded this man, Ulpianus Iulianus and Iulianus Nestor, also came from the castra peregrina. Finally, at a later date, and from a different body of centurions of the castra peregrina, came L. Petronius Taurus Volusianus, ~~came~~

~~L. Petronius Taurus Volusianus~~, another praetorian prefect.

Of the others C. Titius Similis in the period 194-238 rose to the first ducenarian echelon after holding centenarian procuratorships. P. Vibius Marianus rose to be procurator of Sardinia, after holding the Rome tribunates. It is to be noted that both possibilities are open to the man from the castra peregrina, to hold centenarian procuratorships after his first primipilate or to go to the Rome tribunates. However, the man who passed through the castra peregrina did not necessarily rise to the procuratorships.

M. Oclatinus Adventus	Praetorian prefect
Ulpius Iulianus	praetorian prefect
L. Petronius Taurus Volusianus	praetorian prefect
Ulpianus Nestor	praetorian prefect
M. Aquilius Felix	third-echelon ducenarian proc.
P. Vibius Marianus	second-echelon ducenarian proc.
C. Titius Similis	first-echelon ducenarian proc.
Ti. Claudius Dmmetrius	centenarian proc.
Aur. Flav. Rufinus	urban tribune
P. Aelius Marcellus	prefect of a legion
C. Sulgius Caecilianus	prefect of a legion
M. Aurelius Priscus	primuspilus
Q. Germinius Sabinus	primuspilus
L. Trebonius Sossianus	primuspilus

L. Petronius Taurus Volusianus and Aur. Flav. Rufinus were centuriones deputati. These results tend to confirm our general impression that the majority of primipilares,

whatever their corps of origin, tended not to get far beyond the primipilate. Nevertheless they underline the importance of the castra p̄eregrina, a position in which implied the emperor's trust.

THE PRIMIPILARIS AND THE FLEET

There are only two definite examples of posts in the fleet other than the prefectures being held by primipilares, though there is in addition the rather baffling problem of X 3342a, which is discussed in the Prosopography.

C. Sulgius Caecilianus was navarchus after being optio peregrinorum and before he received his first centurionate.

T. Flavius Antominus calls himself primuspilus ex navarcho principe classis, and in the light of the career of Caecilianus we may take it there were intervening posts. Neither had distinguished careers as far as advance beyond the primipilate was concerned, and the promotion of navarchi to the centurionate need not mean that a considerable proportion of them reached the primipilate.

THE PRIMIPILARIS AND THE PROTECTORES

The evidence from legal sources makes it doubtful if we should regard the primipilaris as a military man, i.e. a man whose duty it is to command forces in the field, much later than the sole reign of Gallienus. The result is that the period of time in which the protectores and the old type of primipilares co-existed must have been brief. The former are at present first recorded in or shortly before the reign of Valerian and Gallienus. Only two careers in fact record the post of primuspilus and a post as protector, those of L. Petronius Taurus Volusianus and of Traianus Mucianus. There are cases of prefects of legions with the title, Aelius Aelianus, (praefectus leg. protector Aug) Valerius Marcellinus (A.D. 290, praefectus leg. ex prot.), but there is a strong probability that they have never been primipilares. As far as the Rome tribunates are concerned, Aurelius Sabinianus was tribunus protector. The fact that his son was a tribunus laticlavus suggests a date before 260, and it is not improbable that Sabinianus was a primipilaris. The date of the unknown of III 3126 is unknown. He was urban tribune and trib. praet. et protector Auggg. nnn.

Clearly there are signs here of a developing conception. In the career of Volusianus protector was the title of the first praetorian tribunate, and gave it a special status.

This is very early, and may in fact be under the reign of Gallus. Before the end of the sole reign of Gallienus it qualifies ducenarian legionary prefects, and certain centurions, (Traianus Mucianus). Somewhere here is to be fitted in the important inscription AE 1954. 135, that has a primipilaris described as protector, who was centurion of IV Flavia and protector, but centurion of III Augusta without the title protector. A final stage of development is represented by Aurelius Firminus, who had been a protector, a sort of officer cadet, cf. Valerius Thumpo, referred to in the chapter on the late primipilate. I do not see how I can hope to unravel the development of the protectores, and their relations to the problem of the change in the nature of the primipilares, till the protectores have been studied by a specialist in the Late Empire, tracing them back from their fully developed state.

TRECEENARIUS

While the subject of the trecenarius has been covered well recently in the work of Passerini, Le coorti pretorie, p. 89 f., it is still necessary to re-state and re-emphasise certain facts in regard to the primipilate. The trecenarius is first attested in A.D. 53 or 54, in the case of P. Alfenus Varus. He is last attested in A.D. 238-44, in the case of Oclatius Sacerdos, so the post exists throughout the time in which the primipilaris as he was up to the sole reign of Gallienus existed. His precise position is unknown to us. This needs emphasising, for Domaszewski's suggestion that he was commander of the three hundred speculatores (Rangordnung, p. 99) has gained wide credence, although there is still no evidence that he was correct. The appointment is clearly important, for it is never to our knowledge separated from the primipilate by more than one post, and the decorations associated with it are the hasta pura and corona aurea, given to C. Arrius Clemens by Hadrian, not the most generous of emperors in the matter of decorations. Further, when the custom grows of mentioning only the highlights of the career, the post of trecenarius is often the only one before the primipilate to be mentioned, cf. M. Aurelius Iustus, G. Iulius Caninus, Oclatius Sacerdos, Varius Quintius Gaianus (VI 33033), Q. Raecius Rufus, C. Satrius Crescens, and Sex. Vibius Gallus.

I have said above that the precise position of the trecenarius is unknown to us. This needs qualification. Whenever a full career including this post is given it is associated with the Rome centurionates. This applies even in the cases where the title is trecenarius legionis, as in the cases of L. Aemilius Paternus and of L. Laelius Fuscus, VI 32709a. In relation to these cases and the case where the title trecenarius coh III pr. is used, that of M. Tillius Rufus, it should be pointed out that the normal title is trecenarius (trecenarius Augusti in the case of P. Alfenus Varus), and its appearance in conjunction with the name of a unit suggests a temporary attachment rather than an establishment post with that unit. Four further points may be made. The post could hardly be other than at Rome, except in special circumstances. Where the phrase ex trec. is used, with Domaszewski, op. cit., p. 100, I do not think that this necessarily implies direct promotion from trecenarius to primuspilus, though clearly this was possible, cf. L. Aemilius Paternus. The trecenarii were apparently, like the other Rome centurions, either evocati or men ex equite Romano. Evocati were Amblasius Secundus, C. Arrius Clemens, M. Tillius Rufus, M. Vettius Valens, and the unknown of XI 2112. C. Satrius Crescens, L. Aemilius Paternus, and Sex. Vibius Gallus were ex equite

Romano, at least Paternus was, and so were the other two in my opinion. We do not know the corps of origin of P. Alfenus Varus, M. Aurelius Iustus, G. Iulius Caninus, Oclatius Sacerdos, and Q. Raecius Rufus. Finally, despite their high rank among the centurions of the Roman army, not all trecenarii rose to the primipilate. Varius Quintius Gaianus died as a centurion at the age of eighty-five after fifty-five years' service. L. Laelius Fuscus died at the age of sixty-five after forty-two years' service, having reached the rank of centurio trecenarius of a legion.

PRINCEPS PRAETORII

The treatment of this officer by Domaszewski on pp. 97-8 of his Rangordnung is a step in the right direction, where he describes him as the head of the governor's officium. He does seem to go beyond his evidence, however, on p. 101 of the same work, in identifying the post held by M. Vettius Valens as a similar post, but held as head of an Imperial officium in Rome, inserting a centurial sign not on the stone. His attempt to buttress his case by identifying the princeps castrorum of a later date as his hypothetical officer's successor must fall down in view of the lack of evidence for this identification. The only certain princeps praetorii known to us, then, is the head of the governor's personal staff, who ranks equal with the princeps of the legion.

The paper of Picard and Le-Bonniec, in Révue de Philologie, 11, 1937, pp 112-30, set out to prove that this officer in fact was the primuspilus iterum. Their first point, that there were two primipili in a legion, <sup>citing</sup> C. Satrius Crescens and Gigennaus Valens in III Augusta, and Pontipus Magnus and an unknown in X. Fretensis, <sup>falls down, as</sup> it is abundantly clear that there is no primuspilus iterum, just two ordinary primipili. C. Satrius Crescens, mentioned first, was holding his first primipilate, as a comparison with another inscription of him shows, and both primipili of

X Fretensis were commanding centuries. The suggestion of the collaborators that this latter is to be explained by a division of the large first "century" is ingenious, but reminds us that their argument is largely based on conjecture. Their second point, that the princeps tabularii of the legion must be distinct from the princeps prior, is unproven, and is rejected by G.R. Watson in his work on Roman Military Bookkeeping, vol. II, p. 52, note 63, an unpublished M. Litt. thesis of the University of Durham. These two points are then combined to prove that the princeps tabularii = princeps praetorii was the primuspilus iterum. The Domaszewski solution of the princeps praetorii was rejected, because the inscription quoted by him had the vital word restored. This argument falls down on the evidence of P. Oxy 1637, 10, IGRR I 1629, and AE 1933. 57, which show Domaszewski was right to restore IGRR III 1630 as referring to a princeps praetorii of a governor. The complete argument of the collaborators falls down on the M. Vettius Valens inscription. There is no evidence for a man being primuspilus iterum in two legions consecutively. (The Sabidius inscription is difficult, but it can be explained without the hypothesis of Le Bonniec and Picard.) On whatever principles you restore the M. Vettius Valens inscription, the post of princeps praetorii is clearly held before the Rome tribunates, whereas the post of primuspilus iterum was held after them, and if you restore the primipilate

where every other career inscription indicates that it should be restored, it is also inferior to the first primipilate.

OFFICIAL PRIMUSPILUS DEDICATIONS

I ADIUTRIX  
Victoriae Augg. nn. et leg. I Adi. p .f.  
Antoniniana (sic), P. Marcius P. filius  
Sextianus Epheso, p.p., d.d., dedicante  
Egnatio Victore leg. Augg. pr. pr. et Cl.  
Pisone legato leg., V. Idus Iunias, Apro et  
Maximo cos..(A.D. 207).

Aquile et Genio leg. I Adi. p.f., Anton [iu]s  
Lucius, p.p. leg. s.s. posuit.

Though this first inscription is of the  
type we are to discuss, its date, that of the  
victory of Severus (Domaszewski, Religion des  
Röm. Heeres, p. 37), and subject show that it  
is not one of the annual series.

I ITALICA  
Dis Militaribus, Genio Virtuti Aquilae sanc.  
signisque leg. I Ital. Severianae, M. Aurel.  
Iustus, domo Horrei Margensis m(unicipio ?)  
Moesiae Superioris, ex CCC p.p., d.d., dedic.  
XII Kal. Oct., Iuliano II et Crispino Cos., per  
Annum Italicum leg. Aug. pr. pr.. (A.D.222)

Ritterling, RE. XII 1408, accepts the date  
as that of the legion's foundation.

I MINERVIA  
Victoriae Aug., C. Publicius C. filius Septimia  
Priscillianus p.p. leg. I.M. [Alexandrianae]  
sic p.f., d.d., Coresni [o] Marcelli leg. leg. eiusdem  
[.K]al. Maias, d.n. [Severo Alexandro] Aug.  
cos.. (A.D.222)

Again this is not one of the annual series,  
but a special one in honour of the victory of  
A.D. 222.

II AUGUSTA  
N.N. Augg., Genio leg. II Aug., in honorem  
[aquilae...]p. p. , d.d., VIII Kal. Octob.,  
P [e] r [e] gr. e [t Ae] m [i] l. cos., cur. Urso  
actar. [l] e [g. e] ius [dem. (A.D. 244)

The reading is that of Haverfield, reproduced in the Catalogue of the Caerleon inscriptions produced by the National Museum of Wales. For the significance of the appearance of the numina Augustorum on the official dedications of the legion see Domaszewski, op. cit., p. 68 f..

III AUGUSTA

lovi Au[g. sacr.], dedic[ante] Cn. Suellio Fl[acco] leg. Aug. pro p[r.], Q. Mantius Q.f. Cam. [Severus?] Alba Pompeia... leg. III Aug., d.s.[f.]. (Late 85 or 86)

[Imp. Caes., Divi Traiani Parth. fil., Divi Ner]-vae [nepoti, [r]aiano Had [riano Au]g., pont. max., [trib. p]ot. XIII, cos. III, p.p., dedicante Q. Fabio Catullino leg. Aug. pro pr., ...s C.f. Camil. Memo [r Al]ba Pompeia, [p.p. leg III Aug..] (A.D. 129)

Imp. C [aesari] T. Aelio Ha [driano] Antonino [Aug. Pio], pont. max., tr [ib. pot. VII], cos. III, p. [p.], dedicante C. Praestina Mess[alino] leg. Aug. pro [pr.], P. Timinius P.f. Pal[at.] Tertullus Roma p.p. [leg. III] Aug.. (A.D. 144)

Imp. Caesari T. Aelio Hadriano Antonino Aug. Pio, pontifici maximo, trib. pot. X. imp. II cos. IIII, p.p., dedicante L. Novio Crispino leg. Aug. pr. pr., T. Flavius T.f. Tromen, Firmus Salona, p.p. leg. III Aug. (A.D. 145)

Imp. Caesari T. Aelio Hadriano Antonino Aug. Pio, pontifici maximo. trib. potest. XV, cos. IV p.p., dedicante M. Valerio Etrusco leg. Aug. pr. pr., L. Sempronius Ingenus primipilaris. (A.D. 152)

Divo Antonino, C. Satrius C.f. Fab. Crescens Roma, eq. publ., ex CCC p.p. leg. III Aug., dedicante D. Fonteio Frontiniano. (A.D. 160-62)

Deo Marti Militiae Potenti statuam in honorem leg. III Aug. Valerianae Gallienae Valerianae Sattonius Iucundus p.p., qui primus leg. ren-

ovata aput aquilam vitem posuit, votum dedit,  
 dedicante Veturio Veturiano v.c., leg. Auggg.  
 pr. pr.. (A.D. 253)

The Satrius Crescens inscription here  
 is to be distinguished from VIII 18065, set  
 up by the centurions and evocatus of the legion.  
 It will be noted that the inscription of  
 Sattonius Iucundus is quite distinct from  
 the preceding ones. This may be due to a  
 loss of tradition while the legion was dis-  
 solved. The inscription is clearly influenced  
 by the rise of the Mars cult noted by  
 Domaszewski, op. cit., pp. 34-5.

XIII GEMINA Libero Patri sacrum pro salute Imp. Caes. M.Aur.  
 Commodi Antonini Aug. Pii p.p., L. Calvisius  
 L.f. Velina Secundus Falerione, p.p. leg.  
 [XIII]G. d.d., sub Vespronio [Can]dido cos.,  
 dedic [ante C]at[er]ello Sabino l [eg.] (A.D. 183-5)

XXII PRIMIGENIA [I.] O. M. [Iu]noni Reginae, [For]tunae,  
 Minervae ... [leg. X]XII Pr. p. [f., Commodo  
 Aug. VII. et P]ertinace II [C]os.. (A.D. 192)

The inscription is that of Sextilius  
 Marcianus. So much of its text is unreadable  
 that it is difficult even to be sure that we  
 are concerned with an inscription of the same  
 type as the rest or even that the man was a  
primuspilus.

...Aquilae...Pr. p.f. ... leg. ei...V Kal...  
 Sever... (A.D. 209) ...ono...eg XXII.nian...

f. Tere...tinae...CCC...r Avito... d.n. Im...  
 Au... Balbin... (A.D. 213)

Both of these last two inscriptions have been largely reconstructed by Domaszewski, but I thought it might be salutary to show what remains on the stone. The second is that identified with M. Tillius Rufus.

Pietati leg. XXII Pr. Alexandr. p.f., et honori Aquilae, L. Domitius [s ...Do]miti Iuliani quondam p.p. fil.d.d. ob merita, dedicante Maximio Attiano c.v., leg. Aug. [p]r. pr. G(ermaniae) [S(uperioris)], V Kal. April., [D]n. Alexand[er] - o [Aug. III et] Dione c[os.. (A.D. 229)]

As will be seen in the Prosopography, I have rejected Domaszewski's reading of the son Iulianus as a tribune, which is inherently unlikely on a type of inscription so clearly connected with primipili, and is only supported by a half-visible I.

...i et nu[m]inibus] castro[rum] hon[ori]q. leg. [XXII Ale]xandr. [P.p.f...]s Du[...p.]p. leg. s s.d.d., dedican te Sex. Catio Clemen[tino... (231-5)

Forunam Superam honori Aquilae leg. XXII Pr.p.f., M. Minicius M. fil. Quir. Lindo Mar[cellinus?..] p.p. leg. ei [usdem... (second century or early third)

Genium legionis XXII Pr. p.f., honori Aquilae leg. s.s., Aurelius...

I.O.M. Sabasio Conservatori, honori Aquilae leg. XXII Pr. p.f. ...ianae, M. Aur. Germanus, d. Emone. (A.D. 222-35?)

These inscriptions are marked out by their mention of the Eagle or of the Emperor, and their being set up in the headquarters of the legion, by the primuspilus, the dedication ceremony being performed by the legate of the legion. Not all fulfil all these conditions, but they do fulfil at least one. These inscriptions were clearly official, and set up at regular intervals, being probably of one year's duration, cf. the examples for III Augusta. From a phrase on the dedication of Sattorius Iucundus, of III Augusta, in A.D. 253, qui primus leg(ione) renovata apud aquilam vitem posuit, it would seem that this was the occasion of the laying-down of office by the primuspilus symbolised by the deposit of the vitis in the legion's shrine. In this case his term of office was probably one year, and it will be seen from my discussion in the chapter on the primuspilus and the primipilaris that this is most probable on all grounds, and consonant with the Republican practice. The date of the dedication appears normally to have been the official one for the founding of the legion, though there are other inscriptions, called forth by Imperial victories and other special occasions, which take a similar form, but are not part of the annual series. It will be apparent that the dedications vary in format from legion to legion; thus of the two legions

best attested, III Augusta and XXII Primigenia, the first dedicates to the emperor, the second to the honor Aquilae.

DONIS DONATUS.

One of the many subjects due for a re-examination is that of the dona militaria. Here we can only treat them as they bear on the primipilate. It has been recognised for some time that as in most armies decorations tended to become standardised in the Roman army, and the quantity and quality of award to be determined by rank. Acting upon this, Domaszewski sought to make the hasta pura the distinctive sign of the primipilate and the equestrian militiae.<sup>1</sup> He neglected to note that C. Arrius Clemens had received this decoration as a trecenarius, and L. Petronius Sabinus it as a centurion. In the case of M. Tilius Rufus, who also received this decoration as a centurion, he presumably thought it bound up with his receiving the equus publicus at the same time. The hasta pura is also recorded as awarded to a prefect of the camp, P. Anicius Maximus. At the other extreme, the only certain case we have for the decorations given to a man as primuspilus, M. Vettius Valens received torques, armillae, phalerae. Of interest in our attempts to fix points in individual careers by the dona given is that M. Vettius Valens ~~was~~ given torques, armillae, phalerae for the Claudian invasion as a beneficiarius praefecti praetorio, and then a corona aurea as an evocatus.

C. Gavius Silvanus received the t.a.p. and the crown for the Claudian invasion, and as his career's fixed points coincide almost exactly with those of Valens it is tempting to think that he was an evocatus in 43.

The standard award for a centurion seems to have been a crown and t.a.p. and on the whole there are no real problems as far as we are concerned in these decorations. What we do have to consider are decorations often clearly given as totals for the career, which involve large numbers of crowns, hastae, and, in some cases, vexilla. First let us consider the decorations of the Rome tribunes. C. Velius Rufus was on two distinct occasions awarded a corona muralis and two vexilla, the first time probably and the second time certainly as the commander of the thirteenth urban cohort. This is roughly equivalent to the decoration of a prefect of cavalry.<sup>2</sup> If we now examine the career of L. Antonius Naso we find his dona, which may or may not be a summary including one or more separate awards, given as corona val-laris, corona aurea, vexilla duo, hastae purae II. Clearly it is quite possible that the last two groups at least were given to him as a Rome tribune, and most probably as praetorian tribune.

There remain three large collections of dona.

C. Purtilius Atinas presumably received two hastae and

two crowns as praefectus equitum, of M. Vergil<sup>ius</sup>/Gallus Lusius, and also two vexilla. Domaszewski does not refer to this<sup>3</sup>, although he maintains that the vexillum was not granted to such prefects before Claudius, quoting this inscription, and in his appendix of inscriptions<sup>4</sup> he does not refer to the three vexilla illustrated. The third vexillum cannot certainly be accounted for, but the possibility that it was granted to him as primuspilus cannot be excluded. T. Statius Marrax had t.a.p., two hastae, and five crowns. This could well be a decoration with a crown as centurion and two decorations with a hasta and two crowns while primuspilus. It may be objected that a primuspilus, if he did only serve for one year, would be unlikely to be twice decorated in the time, so we should allow alternatively for one hasta and crowns to have been won as a senior centurion, which we have attested above. The largest collection is that of Sex. Vibius Gallus. Here Domaszewski's suggestion that he received t.a.p. as a centurion, was three times decorated as primuspilus with a crown and hasta, and then was twice decorated as prefect of the camp with a hasta and vexillum<sup>4</sup>, though useful, is probably a little too rigid. He was a trecenarius, when he could have collected one hasta. He is unlikely to have remained a primuspilus

long enough to have been three times decorated as such. Also, what were in fact the decorations of the prefect of the camp? Unfortunately we have no certain record after Claudius but as he ranked higher than the equestrian tribune of the legion<sup>5</sup>, it does not seem unlikely that his decorations may have been equivalent to those of the praefectus alae, two hastae, two crowns, two vexilla. This cannot be demonstrated, but the point should now be clear that it is unwise to take a particular combination, as Domaszewski does, and state it as the final solution. Clearly a number of combinations are possible.

This is necessarily an imperfect and incomplete study, as all evidence must be studied before the dona militaria can be dealt with adequately. Nevertheless it should serve to point out what is acceptable and what is not in Domaszewski's remarks on the dona in the Rangordnung.<sup>6</sup>

#### Notes.

1. Rangordnung, p. 117.
2. Op. cit., p. 138.
3. Op. cit., p. 137.
4. Op. cit., p. 247.
5. See chapter on the prefect of the camp.
6. Op. cit., pp. 117-8, 187-8 are the important ones for our purposes.