The Junior Officers of the Roman Army, 91 BC – AD 14

Thomas Wrobel

Trinity Term 2009

Thomas Wrobel
D.Phil. Thesis abstract: The Junior Officers of the Roman Army, 91 BC – AD 14

This thesis examines the evolution of the junior officer positions of the Roman army in the period 91BC – AD14, and the motivations, background, and status of their holders. Two introductory chapters consider the nature of the available evidence and the way in which the agendas and survival patterns of our sources have influenced modern perceptions. There follow three chapters of diachronic analysis, each analysing the number of officer positions available, the roles and functions of the junior officers, and the status of the junior officer positions in the periods 91 – 50BC, 49 – 31BC, and 30BC – AD14, and finally three thematic chapters examining professionalism and other motivations for service, the perception of service as a junior officer, and the role of the municipal elite within the junior officer corps. In addressing these issues, the thesis challenges the modern view that the junior officer corps suffered a dramatic decline in status at the start of the first century BC through unwillingness to serve on the part of the Roman social elite. Instead, emphasis is placed on the important changes which occurred within the junior officer corps during the period 49 – 31BC, when the increasing demands for both manpower and loyalty among the warring commanders had a significant impact on both the junior officer positions and the men who held them, and which also led to innovation in the organisation of auxiliary forces. The reforms of Augustus that followed, and the junior officer corps of the earliest years of the Principate are also discussed, in particular the notable military innovations of the Augustan period and the role of the Italian and provincial equestrian *ordo*. Furthermore, this thesis analyses the development of professionalism within the junior officer corps and the perceptions of service as a junior officer as expressed in literature as well as in epigraphic and iconographic commemoration. The thesis concludes with a series of appendicies which list all attested junior officers of the period, as well as those considered junior officers by modern authorities, with discussion of those officers whose careers or dating might be considered controversial.

Violae, auiae meae dilectissimae

The Junior Officers of the Roman Army, 91 BC – AD 14

Table of Contents

Abbreviations used in this thesis.....iv

Acknowledgements.....vii

Personal note.....viii

Chapter 1: *Introduction*.....1

Chapter 2: *The Development of the Junior Officer Positions and Elite Service in the Roman Army 201 – 92 BC* 43

Chapter 3: *The Junior Officer Positions 91 – 50 BC*.....69

Chapter 4: *The Junior Officer Positions 49 – 31 BC*.....96

Chapter 5: *The Junior Officer Positions 30 BC – AD 14*.....136

Chapter 6: *Motives for Service as a Junior Officer*.....166

Chapter 7: *Perceptions of Service as a Junior Officer*.....195

Chapter 8: *The Municipal Elite*.....222

Conclusion 251

Bibliography.....253

Appendices

Introduction to Appendices A-D.....292

Appendix A: 297

Appendix B: 414

Appendix C: 424

Appendix D: 434

Abbreviations used in this thesis

AE	*L'Année Epigraphique.*
BAR	*British Archaeological Reports.*
BE	*Bulletin épigraphique* (in *Revue des Études grecques*).
BICS	*Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies of the University of London.*
BMCRR	*British Museum Catalogue of Coins of the Roman Republic*, Grueber, H. (1910), London.
CAH	*Cambridge Ancient History.*
CIG	*Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum.*
CIL	*Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum.*
CILA	*Corpus de Inscripciones Latinas de Andalucia*, (1991-), Seville.
EAOR	*Epigrafia anfiteatrale dell'Occidente Romano*, (1988-), Rome.
EDH	*Epigraphische Datenbank Heidelberg* (http: //www.uni-heidelberg.de/institute/sonst/adw/edh/index.html).
EE	*Ephemeris Epigraphica.*
ELST	*Epigrafía latina de Saguntum y su territorium*, Beltrán Lloris, F. (1980), Valencia.
ERAssissi	*Epigrafi lapidarie Romane di Assisi*, Forni, G. (1987), Perugia.
FGrH	*Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker*, Jacoby, F. (1923-1958), Berlin.
HEp.	*Hispania Epigraphica*, (1989-), Madrid.
IG	*Inscriptiones Graecae*, (1903-), Berlin.
IGR	*Inscriptiones Graecae ad Res Romanas Pertinentes*, Cagnat R. et al. (1906-1927), Paris.
ILGR	*Inscriptiones Latinae in Graecia repertae. Additamenta ad CIL III*, Sasel Kos, M. (1979), Faenza.
Inscr.Aqu.	*Inscriptiones Aquileiae*, Brusin, J.B. (1991-1993), Udine.
Inscr.Att.	*Inscriptiones Atticae. Supplementum inscriptionum Atticarum*

	VI, Miller, M.C.M. (1992), Chicago.
I. de Délos	*Inscriptions de Délos*, Roussel, R. and Launey, M. (1937), Paris.
IEAquil.	*Itinerari epigrafici Aquileiesi*, Lettich, G. (2003), Trieste.
Inscr.It.	*Inscriptiones Italicae*, (1933-), Rome.
IK-53	*Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien 53: The inscriptions of Alexandreia Troas*, (1997), Bonn.
IK-59	*Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien 59: Greeks and Romans in imperial Asia*, (2001), Bonn.
I.Koptos	*De Koptos à Kosseir*, Brenand, A. (1972) Leiden.
ILA-Sant.	*Inscriptions Latines d'Aquitaine (I.L.A.): Santons*, (1994) Bordeaux.
ILJug.	*Inscriptiones Latinae quae in Iugoslavia inter annos 1940 et 1960 repertae et editae sunt*, Sasel, A. and Sasel, J. (1963), Ljubljana.
ILLRP	*Inscriptiones Latinae Liberae Rei Publicae,* Degrassi, A. (1966), Florence.
ILPBardo	*Catalogue des Inscriptions Latines Paiennes du musée du Bardo*, Benzina ben Abdallah, Z. (1986), Rome.
ILSard.	*Iscrizioni latine della Sardegna, Sotgiu*, G. (1961), Padua.
ILS	*Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae*, Dessau, H. (1892-1916), Berlin.
ILTun.	*Inscriptions Latines de la Tunisie*, (1944), Paris.
I.Paestum	*Le iscrizioni latine di Paestum*, Mello, M. and Voza, G. (1968), Naples.
I.Philae	*Les inscriptions grecques de Philae*, Bernand, A. and Bernand, E. (1969), Paris.
I.Priene	*Inschriften von Priene*, Hiller von Gaertringen, F. (1906), Berlin.
IRC	*Inscriptions romaines de Catalogne*, Fabre, G. et al. (1984-2002), Paris.
IRConcor.	*Iscrizioni romane di Iulia Concordia*, Lettich, G. (1994), Trieste.
LSJM	*A Greek-English Lexicon*, Ninth Edition with Revised

	Supplement, Liddell, H., Scott, R., Jones, H.S. and McKenzie, R. (1999), Oxford.
NS	*Notizie degli scavi di antichità*.
OCD	*Oxford Classical Dictionary.*
OGIS	*Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae*, Dittenberger, W. (1903-1906), Leipzig.
Ostrakon Tait	*Greek Ostraka in the Bodleian Library and Various other Collections,* Tait. J.G. (1930), London.
Pais	*Corporis inscriptionum Latinarum supplementa Italica*, Pais, E. (1884), Rome.
PIR	*Prosopographia Imperii Romani Saeculi I, II, III*, First Edition, Klebs, E. and Dessau, H. (1897-1898).
PIR(2)	*Prosopographia Imperii Romani Saeculi I, II, III*, Second Edition, Groag, A. et al (1933-).
P.Mich.	*Michigan Papyri,* (1931-).
P.Oxy.	*Oxyrhynchus Papyri,* (1898-).
PSI	*Papiri Greci e Latini, Pubblicazioni della Società italiana per la ricerca dei papiri greci e latini in Egitto*, (1912-).
RE	*Realencyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft.*
RRC	*Roman Republican Coinage*, Crawford, M.H. (1974), Cambridge.
Ruppel, *Dakke*	*Der Tempel von Dakke. Bund 3: Die griechischen und lateinischen Inschriften von Dakke, nach den Aufnahmen von Oric Bates und Günther Roeder bearbeitet on Walter Ruppel*, Roeder, G. et al. (1930), Cairo.
SB	*Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten*, (1915-).
SEG	*Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum.*
SIG	*Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum,* Dittenberger, W. (1915-1924), Leipzig.
Supp.It.	*Supplementa Italica*.

Acknowledgements

In addition to the various works cited in this thesis, I would like to acknowledge the generous assistance of: Dr François Cadiou (Université Nancy 2) for his insights into military service in the second century BC; Dr Duncan Campbell for his comments on *cohortes uoluntariorum* and the possible difference between *praefecti equitum* and *praefecti alae*; Professor Claude Eilers (McMaster University) for his help in interpreting the decrees preserved in Book 14 of Josephus' *Antiquitates Iudaicae*; Professor Toni Ñaco del Hoyo (Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona) for his comments on *praefecti praesidii*; Dr Michael Ng for his views on early commanders of the urban and praetorian cohorts; and Dr Jonathan Prag (Merton College, Oxford) for his thoughts on auxiliary command in the late Republic, and for a pre-publication copy of his article in *JRS* 2007.

Personal note

My heartfelt thanks go to my supervisor, Mark Pobjoy, without whose guidance, support and encouragement this thesis would simply not exist.

To my family, and especially my parents, I cannot thank you enough for everything that you did to help me. It has been a long journey, but I've always known that I have your love and support.

To Sara, as always, goes all of my heart: she, more than anyone, knows what this thesis means to me.

Ch. 1: Introduction

The final decades of the Roman Republic were characterised by the political battles fought between men and factions whose positions were backed up with military force. Many studies have focused upon the influence held by the Roman army during this period, with both the commanders and the men they led receiving extensive analysis. The professional rank-and-file of the army, in particular, have received a great deal of attention. Their motivation for engaging in civil war is often oversimplified by portraying them almost as mercenaries with no loyalty other than to their commander, and no source of income other than their pay and the rewards they might gain from him. For one group of soldiers, however, this explanation will not serve. Between the commander and his troops was a stratum of junior officers from the propertied classes, who gave orders to the troops and organised them, and performed a vital role both in combat and in keeping the Roman military system working. Without them, the army could not have functioned. Who these men were, what roles they performed, and what was their place in Roman society during this period of change, are the subjects of this study.

The junior officers of the Roman army in this period have long needed more attention from scholars. Since Jaakko Suolahti's comprehensive study, *The Junior Officers of the Roman Army in the Republican Period*, published in 1955, no major work has sought to examine in detail the junior officer posts or their holders. These men were both an essential component of the military system and members of influential social groups – young *nobiles*, *equites*, and municipal magnates – a crucial part of the complex relationship between the army and Roman society. This study seeks to understand their origins, roles, and ambitions during the last decades of the Republic and the first years of the Principate, and in the process it brings to the foreground two ways in which I believe modern authors have misconceived the junior officers of the Roman army in this period. Firstly, the junior officer corps of the first century is often portrayed as inexperienced and of low status, and junior officer positions are represented as having been abandoned by the political elite. Such views are challenged in this thesis. Secondly, modern studies often group the pre-civil war period together with the civil war and the Triumviral period, without noting sufficiently that the civil war and the Triumviral period saw a marked change in the

nature of the junior officer posts – if not in their composition, then certainly in the junior officers' roles and their relationship to their commanding officers. The evolution of the junior officer positions over this period receives closer attention here.

The structure of the thesis

After two introductory chapters, the study is divided into two principal sections. The first section comprises chronological chapters (3-5) which highlight the evolution of the junior officer positions – in particular, the numbers, roles, and status of junior officers and the composition of the junior officer corps – during the breakdown of the Republic and the establishment of the Principate. The second section is divided into thematic chapters (6-8) which address the issues of motivation for service, professionalism, perceptions of service, and the role of the municipal elite.

Ch. 1 (Introduction) sets out the subject of study, and reviews recent approaches. It identifies the issues that have become the focus of discussions of junior officers, particularly professionalism and clientship, and the concepts upon which these discussions are founded, particularly those that underpin the influential work of Suolahti. It examines the weaknesses of statistical approaches and the vulnerability of some prosopographical techniques to distortions caused by the available data, and explores the ways in which the surviving sources in which junior officers are recorded have coloured modern perceptions of the body of junior officers as a whole. It then considers relevant issues pertaining to the literary and epigraphic evidence for junior officers and junior officer positions during the period.

Ch. 2 (The development of the junior officer positions, elite service in the Roman army, and the role of *Latini* and *socii* 201 – 92BC) traces the evolution of the junior officer positions down to the Social War. It analyses the importance of the fluctuations in the size of the Roman army during the second century, and assesses the Polybian model of the Roman army, as well as its relevance for the study of the officer corps in the first century. The chapter then defines the various officer positions of the period, and examines their development, as well as the Roman command structure of the period. It discusses the nature of the military tribunate and the difference between elected and appointed military tribunes, the nature of prefectures and the extent to which prefects had clearly defined roles. The chapter assesses the importance of the reforms of the late second century, including the enlistment of the

proletarii and the changes which the military tribunate underwent, in particular the lapse of the service requirement described by Polybius.

Ch. 3 (The Junior Officer Positions 91 – 50BC) focuses upon the junior officer corps of the last decades of the Republic. Like the other two chronological chapters which follow, it is divided into three parts, examining first the number of junior officer positions available, then their roles and functions, and finally their status and the social composition of the junior officer corps. It highlights the important changes brought about by the Social War and the subsequent enfranchisement of Italy, in particular the inclusion of Italian troops within the legions, which trebled the number of legions in existence and thus vastly increased the number of military tribunates available. It considers the changes to the military tribunate brought about by the increase in the number of legates, and discusses the importance of administrative and judicial skills. Finally, it assesses the roles and status of the prefects and the relationship between prefects and other junior officers.

Ch. 4 (The Junior Officer Positions 49 – 31BC) examines the period of the civil wars and the ('Second') Triumvirate. It looks at the dramatic changes to the junior officer positions and their functions in this period, in particular the change in the status of the posts, especially the military tribunate, brought about by a rise in the status of centurions and the desperate need of the many warring commanders for skilled men to lead the troops and fight. It argues that the period also brought about significant changes to the nature of prefectures, fuelled by the need to orgainse the *auxilia*, and saw the increased importance of naval power. It also examines the way in which the loyalties of junior officers were tested, and highlights the importance to commanders of such loyalties.

Ch. 5 (The Junior Officer Positions 30BC – AD14) looks at the junior officer corps of the Augustan period. The chapter emphasises the scale of the reforms which took place within the junior officer corps of this period, as within the Roman army in general. It examines the way in which Augustus responded to the various developments of the civil wars and Triumviral period, and looks at how he sought to restore the status of, in particular, the military tribunate. It also looks at the early development of the equestrian posts that were to become the *militiae* of the later Principate, as well as various innovations that proved to be short-lived, and stresses that even those positions which were to become the basis for much of the command

structure of the imperial army – such as *praefectus cohortis* and *praefectus castrorum* – were still in their early stages of development. It demonstrates the unique nature of the junior officer corps of the Augustan period within the context of the imperial Roman army, and also assesses the social and geographical origins of the men who formed the junior officer corps of the time, examining the ways in which this had developed from the officer corps of the late Republic.

Having assessed the changes in the officer positions over time, this study focuses upon a number of key issues which require thematic analysis. Ch. 6 (Motives for Service as a Junior Officer) first examines the nature of 'professionalism' as it relates to the junior officer corps of our period, and seeks to discover whether or not any of the junior officers of our period can be described as 'professional officers'. It examines the extent to which junior officers can be said to have been 'trained', and looks at the criteria which affected the appointment of an individual as a junior officer. The chapter also examines the potential advantages of taking a junior officer post. It looks at the importance of the links that could be made with commanding officers and others, and the way in which service as a junior officer could be used to promote the interests of one's family. It then examines the political advantages to be gained from holding a junior officer position, and the importance of election to the post of military tribune in particular. It concludes by assessing the economic opportunities available to junior officers, which ranged from receiving pay and booty to conducting business.

Ch. 7 (Perceptions of Service as a Junior Officer) looks at the way in which service as a junior officer was perceived, and the language and iconography used to describe military service both among the Roman social elite and among men from municipal Italy and the provinces. The chapter examines the role of military service among young members of the Roman elite in our period, and examines the nature of a 'military reputation'. After assessing the portrayal of junior officer service within literary sources, the chapter concludes by examining the light that epigraphic and iconographic evidence casts on the use of junior officer positions in self-representation.

Ch. 8 (The Municipal Elite) looks at the social group which contributed the majority of the junior officer corps – the municipal elite of Italy and the provinces. It analyses their increasing prominence within the junior officer corps and their integration into

Roman society. The chapter considers the way in which the junior officer posts conferred status both within Roman society and within local communities.

The Conclusion ties together the results of the analysis in the chronological and thematic chapters.

In addition to the main body of the thesis, Appendix A lists in alphabetical order each individual in the period 91BC – AD14 who is attested as holding, or having probably held, a junior officer post, with references to the relevant evidence and modern discussions. Appendix A also lists those individuals who are considered by one or more authorities to have been junior officers, but who are not considered as certainly or probably junior officers of the period 91BC – AD14 in this thesis, with references to the relevant evidence, modern discussions, and the reason for their exclusion. Individuals who are identified as junior officers, or as probable junior officers, in this period are designated by a number in square brackets before their name (e.g. [142] C. Iulius Caesar). The number corresponds to their place within the alphabetical list of junior officers (Appendix A). Those individuals listed in Appendix A who are not considered to have been officers in our period have no number attached and have their name in italic text (e.g. *M. Bennius M.f. Rufus*). Appendix B is a list of all junior officer post-holding by date, and Appendix C is a list of all junior officer post-holding by post. Appendix D lists those officers who may have been junior officers in our period, but for whom there is insufficient evidence to date their junior officer career with sufficient precision. For more information, see the Introduction to the Appendices.

Modern studies of junior officers in the late Republic and in the Augustan period

Any investigation of these issues must begin with Jaakko Suolahti's *The Junior Officers of the Roman Army in the Republican Period*[1], which is still the standard work in this area and forms the basis of modern analysis of the subject. As we shall see, recent debate on the 'post-Marian' Republican army has largely concentrated on the level of professionalism within the army, or the lack of it; upon the motivations for military service and its links with Roman imperial expansion; upon the links between commanders and their subordinates; and upon the roles and the perspective of the newly-enfranchised Italian elite. In addition, there have been studies which

[1] Suolahti (1955).

focus upon particular posts, or which examine the role and importance of Roman youth within politics and society. The junior officers of the Triumviral and Augustan periods have received more attention, but such attention generally forms part of an analysis of the pre-Claudian or pre-Flavian army, rather than of the evolution of the junior officer positions and the junior officer corps in the transition from Republic to Principate.

While not universally accepted[2], Suolahti's conclusions have been very influential, particularly his argument that young members of the senatorial elite avoided military service in the first century, and that there was a concomitant decline in the importance of the junior officer posts[3]. Moreover, despite the passage of over 50 years, Suolahti's book remains the only systematic study of the junior officers of the Republic or the Augustan period. His work and its conclusions therefore require detailed analysis.

a) Jaakko Suolahti's The Junior Officers of the Roman Army in the Republican Period

Suolahti's work is a comprehensive survey of the junior officer posts and their holders throughout the Republic and the Augustan period. It is based upon a detailed and methodical prosopographical examination of the social background of the junior officers, their geographical origin, and the future political career of the junior officers themselves and the members of their *gentes*. The three central sections of the work deal with the military tribunes, the *duouiri nauales*, and the prefects of the republican army[4]. In each section the role and importance of each office is assessed, and its attested holders are then assigned a chronological period (509 – 219BC, 218 – 134BC, 133 – 82BC, 81 – 49BC, 48 – 30BC, or 29BC – AD14), and broken up into social class according to the *gens* of each (patrician, plebeian, senatorial, and equestrian)[5]. Suolahti then further categorises each individual according to his future political career or that of his *gens* (rising in status, falling in status, or maintaining its status), and the region of Italy that he came from – an assessment based for the most part on the likely linguistic origin of his *nomen*.

[2] Cf. Badian (1997) 11; furthermore, some recent authors make no reference to his work (for example, Cerva (2000), Deniaux (2000)).
[3] Cf. Badian (1959) 90; Harmand (1967) 350; Gruen (1974) 116; Harris (1979) 13; Keppie (1984) 78; De Blois (2005) 168ff.
[4] Military tribunes: Suolahti (1955) 35ff.; *duouiri nauales*: 188ff.; prefects: 198ff.
[5] E.g. Suolahti (1955) 62ff., esp. 69 (Table 2), 73 (Table 3).

The 24 tables compiled by Suolahti, such as "The Distribution of Known Plebeian Military Tribunes on the Basis of the *nomen* into Consular, Lower Senatorial, and Equestrian *gentes* in 509BC – AD14", in a sense form the core of the work. Each table is followed by an analysis of its data, and a discussion of some of the more interesting individuals represented in it. The appendices to the book contain complete lists of all junior officers known to Suolahti and the categories into which he divides them. Therefore, despite the author's occasional suggestions to the contrary[6], his work is a largely statistical study that relies on information about an officer's *gens*, his likely geographical origin, and his future career (if known). Suolahti attaches great weight to the "general trend" of the statistical results, arguing that "chance factors cancel each other out"[7]; these results form the basis of the generalised conclusions which follow each section and which are summarized at the end of the book. While the work is not purely a piece of statistical analysis, Suolahti does make frequent reference to the statistical trends which he identifies in his tables to back up the general assertions he makes in analysing individual histories. An individual who cannot easily be put into one category or another is likely to be put into the category that he is considered most likely to belong to given the data on other officers[8]. There is obviously a significant danger of circularity in such reasoning. Furthermore, when faced with individuals from "noble" *gentes* who do not appear to have enjoyed a successful political career, Suolahti assigns them to a "minor branch" of the *gens* on the grounds that a "noble" youth would only fail to reach the quaestorship as the result of death, signal military incompetence, or criminal conviction[9]. Suolahti also has a tendency, as identified by Badian[10], to be overly willing to identify individuals as officers: thus he accepts that [281] L. Valerius Flaccus was a military tribune in more than one set of campaigns, when there is no sound evidence that supports this[11].

This is not to say that Suolahti holds his assumptions to be absolutely concrete on all

---

[6] E.g. Suolahti (1955) 61, 82, 222.
[7] Suolahti (1955) 171-172.
[8] E.g. Suolahti (1955) 171ff.
[9] For the assigning of unsuccessful youths with a consular *nomen* to a minor branch of the family, see Suolahti (1955) 85, 98, 177-178. For Suolahti's view that a youth from an eminent *gens* was almost sure of political success, see Suolahti (1955) 299.
[10] Badian (1959) 91 n.1. Badian's views appear to have hardened since 1959, and his more recent criticism of Suolahti is very strong, cf. Badian (1997) 11.
[11] That he was a military tribune in 78 – 76BC is clear (Cicero, *Flacc*. 5, 6, 100-101), but the claim that he was also a military tribune when serving under his uncle (Cicero, *Flacc*. 63) relies upon a dubious emendation of the text, for which there is no evidence. Cf. Badian (1959) 91. For Suolahti's analysis, see Suolahti (1955) 73 n.7.

occasions. Within those sections dedicated to detailed analysis of individuals, he acknowledges, for example, that a certain number of military tribunes would be seeking nothing further in their careers than wealth and some adventure[12], and that the selection criteria for choosing individual junior officers might go further than the name of the *gens*[13]. But while Suolahti is prepared to admit exceptions within the body of his analysis, they are not found within his conclusions, and in these sections, which have proved the most influential, his assumptions and 'general trends' are predominant.

Nevertheless, despite the scale of the task, and the thorough way in which he compiles his tables, Suolahti's general conclusions are very straightforward. He argues that the recorded junior officers of the first century were of a very different stamp from those of the second century, with a far greater number of equestrians and sons of junior senators (whose fathers or grandfathers had not held the praetorship or consulship) serving as officers[14], and that the junior officers of the first century were less likely than their second-century counterparts to have a successful political career[15]. Suolahti also concludes, given that the junior civilian magistrates were largely sons of the political elite, that the young members of the political elite avoided military service through preference for a civilian career[16]. Notable exceptions to this, such as the [237] younger Cato or [142] Julius Caesar, he attributes to an unusual degree of traditional sentiment on their part, claiming that such men were, unlike their peers, "supporters of [the] military tradition" of the Republic[17]. In general, he argues that these military traditions – which Harris sees as so important[18] – were merely paid lip-service in the late Republic, as the law courts and the new civilian magistracies, such as the *tresuiri capitales* or *tresuiri monetales*, became the best way to begin a senatorial career[19]. He notes, however, that there is not quite the same change to be observed in the social make-up of the *praefecti*, but attributes this to the higher military importance and social status of the prefectures they held[20]. Suolahti also shows that the junior officers of the first century came from further afield: while the

[12] Suolahti (1955) 171, 210, 231.
[13] Suolahti (1955) 63.
[14] Suolahti (1955) 81 (Table 5), 142 (Table 11).
[15] Cf. Suolahti (1955) 172 (Table 13).
[16] Suolahti (1955) 32, 227, 298.
[17] Suolahti (1955) 144-145, cf. 55-56.
[18] Harris (1979) 11ff.
[19] Suolahti (1955) 23-33, 54, 288-289, 296ff.
[20] Suolahti (1955) 197, 200.

vast majority of junior officers in the second century came from Rome and Latium, the first century saw an influx first from Campania and Etruria, and then from further afield in Italy, although not until the Augustan period do the bulk of junior officers come from outside Rome, Latium, northern Campania and southern Etruria[21].

Suolahti's conclusions rely upon two assumptions that are central to his approach: that the junior officer posts, especially the military tribunate, were held by young men seeking a further career in politics[22]; and that the sole determining factor in a person's election or appointment would be the name of his *gens* – no electorate or general would care to know more, political life being in any case almost completely controlled by patronage[23].

Thus he generally assumes that military tribunes (who might be elected or appointed) and junior *praefecti* (all of whom were appointed) were almost without exception young politicians serving in the army in order to pursue a political career, chosen solely on the basis of their *nomen*. These assumptions underlie his conclusions: if the junior officers of the second century are normally of high political status, but those of the first century of low political status, and if high political status meant assured election or appointment to a post, then the increase in "equestrian" and "lower senatorial" military tribunes and prefects comes about because the sons of the political elite stopped wanting to be junior officers.

The assertion that a general or electorate would know nothing beyond the *nomen* of an individual is not demonstrable in the contexts to which Suolahti applies it. As we shall see[24], it appears that commanders paid close attention to the individuals they appointed as junior officers, even if this attention was as much to the person who was recommending a man as to the applicant's qualifications themselves. If Caesar, in command of a large consular army, was concerned with more than the *nomen* of his junior officers, then commanders who had fewer junior officers to appoint would surely be even more careful in their selections. Moreover, in the only two elections to the military tribunate that we hear of in any detail, the admittedly exceptional cases of

[21] Suolahti (1955) 140ff.
[22] Political ambitions in general: Suolahti (1955) 29ff., 227; the political ambitions of the sons of equestrians: Suolahti (1955) 57 (although Suolahti is not always entirely firm on this point: see Suolahti (1955) 124).
[23] These points are argued repeatedly: Suolahti (1955) 14, 62-63, 65, 90, 171, 208, 299-300. Marius, whose election as military tribune was clearly not conducted on the basis of his name (Sallust, *Iug.* 63.4-5), is admitted as an exception to this rule (Suolahti (1955) 62).
[24] Cf. ch. 6, pp.178-179.

Marius and Caesar, their individual reputations appear to have been well known to the electorate[25]; not all Romans of status, moreover, were able to win election[26]. The *gens* of an individual is therefore extremely unlikely to have been the sole factor in determining whether that individual was chosen for one of these posts, and Suolahti places too much weight upon it.

In addition, the statistical analysis which is the basis of his study is open to challenge. Suolahti's study is an analysis of the names of junior officers preserved in the surviving sources. The nature of these sources significantly weights Suolahti's results. Thus when Suolahti analyses the names of known military tribunes in the period 218 – 134BC, he is relying almost entirely upon the evidence of Livy. This means that of the 102 attested military tribunes in this period, only 10 come from the years 166 – 134BC[27]. To conduct any form of comparative analysis between two periods, the data from each period must be comparable, and a quantitative comparison between periods which does not use similar sources for each is likely to run into difficulties. Suolahti, while acknowledging the "aristocratic bias" of his sources, and especially Livy[28], takes too little regard of this, as we shall see.

Suolahti's work also suffers from insufficient attention to the variations in the number of legions across the various periods he defines. For example, Suolahti assumes that there were on average 20 legions in service each year from 218BC to 48BC[29]. The much more detailed work of Brunt on the number of legions in service in these years shows this estimate to be inappropriate[30]. While Suolahti's estimate is relatively accurate for the period of the Hannibalic war, that was a period of unprecedented demand upon the manpower resources of the Roman state. That Suolahti, using Livy, identifies a preponderance of high-status military tribunes during this period suggests that the evidence of Livy should be used with some care, since this was a time when the army, and therefore the demand for military tribunes, was swollen well beyond its normal capacity. There would not, even ignoring the effects of casualties, have been a sufficient number of senators' sons (let alone those of the sons of consular or praetorian families) to supply the demand for military tribunes. The relative lack of

[25] Caesar: Suetonius, *Caes.* 5; Plutarch, *Caes*. 5. Marius: Sallust, *Iug.* 63.4-5.
[26] Cicero, *Planc.* 52.
[27] Suolahti (1955) 61ff.
[28] Suolahti (1955) 67, 222.
[29] Suolahti (1955) 60.
[30] Brunt (1971) 418 (Table X), 424 (Table XI), 432-433 (Table XIII).

junior officers from lower senatorial and equestrian families in this part of Livy's work cannot, therefore, reflect the actual make-up of the officer corps in the period in question.

For the second century, Suolahti significantly overestimates the number of legions in service, and therefore the number of junior officer positions available. He assumes that there will have been approximately 3,720 military tribunates available in the period 164 – 134BC (at six per legion), of which around 2,976 (80%) were appointed rather than elected; whereas Brunt's calculations suggest that the true figure is more likely to have been around 1,230 military tribunates, of which 486 (40%) were appointed. For the period 80 – 50BC, Suolahti's figures are far closer to Brunt's, with 3,720 military tribunes, of whom 2,976 (80%) were appointed, whereas the true figure is likely to be closer to 4,284 military tribunes, of whom 3,540 (83%) were appointed. The enfranchisement of the Italians trebled the number of military tribunates available, and while Suolahti is aware that this enfranchisement meant that the (former) allies could now compete for these positions[31], he does not seem to have realised the effect that this would necessarily have had on the number of military tribunates available. In addition, the massive increase in the number of legions in service, and the phasing out of citizen cavalry in favour of auxiliary cavalry, would possibly have led to an increase in the number of equestrian prefectures available, although we are not able to calculate the extent of change in their case.

Therefore, while Suolahti assumes that the size of the Roman army remained constant, there was in fact a huge rise in the number of officer posts available each year from the early first century onwards. Moreover, there was a massive increase in the proportion of military tribunes in service who were appointed to the post: elected military tribunes account for approximately 60% of all military tribunes in the period 164 – 134BC but only 17% of all military tribunes in the period 80 – 50BC.

Suolahti's assumption that any change in the social status of recorded military tribunes was the result of a decline in the social status of the office is therefore highly questionable. A dramatic change in the proportions of youths from consular, praetorian, senatorial, and equestrian families serving as junior officers was inevitable, even if the actual numbers of senatorial and consular youths in service

[31] Suolahti (1955) 140ff., esp. 144.

remained roughly the same. There could only be, after all, a finite number of youths from consular and praetorian families available for service; any increase in the size of the officer corps would be met by an increase in the number of young men from less distinguished families. This means that Suolahti's analysis of the *proportionate* make-up of the junior officer posts runs into serious problems. He assumes that, as we see few sons of equestrians and junior senators holding junior officer posts in the second century, but a growing number in the first, they were replacing the sons of the political elite. In fact, they were probably holding newly created posts in an enlarged Roman army. Suolahti does show that the *recorded number* of sons of the political elite serving in the army declined in the first century. However, given the problems of comparing Livy's evidence to Caesar's and Cicero's, on which see below, we cannot even be sure that there was any drop in the number at all for the period 80 – 50BC. Even during the turbulent years between 49 and 31BC, for which we have no recorded young members of the elite holding military tribunates, men such as Cicero's son still served as prefects[32]. Despite the apparent phasing out of compulsory military service, all of the major figures of the late Republic performed military service, and we know that many did so as junior officers[33].

Therefore, Suolahti's conclusions, largely accepted at the time his book was published[34], cannot be allowed to stand unchallenged. An analysis of the junior officer posts in the late Republic which rests upon an analysis of the numbers of individuals from different social groups who held them is fraught with difficulty: there is simply not enough data to allow us to proceed in this way[35]. For the Empire, with a far greater quantity of epigraphic evidence, the situation is somewhat different.

b) Modern work on the junior officers of the Roman army 91BC – AD14 since Suolahti.

Since Suolahti there have been no major works that have concentrated solely on the junior officers of the late Republic or, specifically, the Augustan period. For the late Republic, a few studies have analysed individual posts, such as Deniaux's analysis of

[32] On which, cf. ch. 4, p.114.
[33] Which is certainly not to say that the rest served as ordinary soldiers: on service as a *contubernalis,* cf. ch. 7, pp.195-198.
[34] Boak (1957) 514ff.; Cuff (1957) 147ff.; Will (1957) 236ff.; Storr (1957) 282ff.; and especially Scullard (1957) 138ff. Only Birley (1957) 143, and Watson (1957) 245, found Suolahti's statistical conclusions unreliable.
[35] Cf. Badian, (1959) 90.

the military tribunate[36], or Welch, Badian, Cerva and Verzár-Bass' analyses of the post of *praefectus fabrum*[37]; and a number of authors have examined the early careers of specific individuals, such as Badian's study of Gabinius, the consul of 58BC[38], or presented certain epigraphic evidence mentioning junior officers[39]. In broader studies which have analysed junior officer positions, most have accepted Suolahti's conclusions to some extent[40], generally taking the view that the military standard and importance of the junior officers declined between the second and first centuries, and that young members of the elite no longer coveted such positions, with their places taken by the Italian municipal elite.

However, there have been contrary arguments put forward. Nicolet in particular has stressed the continuing importance of military service to the young members of the elite, as well as the valuable connections that military service could generate[41]. Gabba[42] has argued that the junior officer ranks were populated by a great many former centurions, developing an argument first propounded by Smith[43], who also introduced a distinction between "standing" and "emergency" armies – the former being kept in place to protect and control a province, and the latter being enlisted to fight a specific war. In Smith's analysis, "standing" armies were more likely to be composed of inexperienced military tribunes, while the "emergency" armies were more likely to contain practical, military men[44]. However, Smith's analysis encompasses not just the late Republic, but the civil wars and the Triumviral period as well, and therefore runs together two distinct periods in the development of the junior officer corps. As ch. 4 shows, the civil wars and the Triumviral period marked a significant shift within the junior officer corps, and evidence from that era should not be applied uncritically to the earlier period.

The junior officers of the Augustan era, and to an extent the civil wars and Triumviral period, have received much more attention than those of the period 91 – 50BC. In

[36] Deniaux (2000); cf. also the more general studies of Brizzi (1995) and Frézouls (1995).
[37] Welch (1995); Badian (1997); Cerva (2000), Verzár-Bass (2000).
[38] Badian (1959) 90-94.
[39] Castrén (1983) 93; Demougin (1983) 296; Clinton (2001) 29.
[40] Cf. Harmand (1967) 350-354; Gruen (1974) 116; Garlan (1975) 158-159; De Blois (1987) 13, 17; Brizzi (1995) 15 n.1; Frezouls (1995) 159-160; Rosenstein (2005) 138; *OCD*[3] '*tribuni militum*' (cf. *OCD*[2] '*tribuni militum*').
[41] Nicolet (1969) 132, (1974) 826, (1980) 89; cf. Syme (1939) 70-72; Smith (1958) 64; Gruen (1974) 64, 380ff.
[42] Gabba (1976) 34.
[43] Smith (1958) 64.
[44] Smith (1958) 60-61.

general, this is because the Augustan period (and to a lesser extent the Triumviral period) is often taken as a starting-point for the study of the later Roman army. Thus the numerous and invaluable works of Saddington relating to junior officers generally begin with the officers of the Triumviral period[45], as does Holder's analysis of the commanders of auxiliary units[46], and Dobson's work on *praefecti fabrum*[47]. The same is true of the two works that, along with Saddington, have contributed most to our understanding of the junior officers of the Julio-Claudian period; Devijver's *Prosopographia Militiarum Equestrium*[48] and Demougin's studies of the equestrian order in the Julio-Claudian period[49] – both of which analyse individual junior officers from the Triumviral and Augustan periods in some detail as part of a broader study. The works of Birley, Nicolet, Dobson, Le Glay, Anderson, Davies, Le Bohec, and Webster, and other works of Devijver, have also analysed various aspects of the roles, functions, social make-up, and length of service of the junior officer corps in the Julio-Claudian period[50]. However, with the exception of Nicolet, these works rarely attempt to focus on officers in either the Triumviral or Augustan eras, and therefore the junior officers and junior officer positions of these periods are not specifically analysed.

In addition, there have been a number of important studies of positions other than junior officer positions, such as Pflaum on procurators[51], Sasel on the post of *pro legato*[52], and Dobson on *primipilares*[53]. Studies of other aspects of the Roman legions have provided important contributions to the study of junior officers, such as Keppie's work on veterans[54], Maxfield's work on military decorations[55], and Rosenstein and De Blois on the nature of Roman command and the relationship between commanders

[45] For a full list of Saddington's works used in this thesis, see the bibliography – those that focus in particular on junior officers are Saddington (1980), (1985), (1987), (1988a), (1988b), (1990), (1999) and (2003).
[46] Holder (1980) 72ff., 167ff.
[47] Dobson (1966).
[48] Devijver (1976-2001).
[49] Demougin (1988), (1992).
[50] Birley (1949) 133ff.; Nicolet (1958); Dobson (1964) 413; Le Glay (1972); Devijver (1973), (1974), (1989); Anderson (1984) 8; Davies (1989) 37; Le Bohec (1994) 37-42; Webster (1996) 112-113.
[51] Pflaum (1960-1961).
[52] Sasel (1974).
[53] Dobson (1978), cf. Dobson (1970), (1974), (1982).
[54] Keppie (1973), (1983), (2000b); cf. Brunt (1962); Broadhead (2005).
[55] Maxfield (1981).

and their men[56].

Recent general studies on the history of the Roman army have, of course, significantly contributed to our understanding of the junior officer positions in the period 91BC – AD14. The classic general studies of the Roman army, such as Ritterling's study of individual legions[57], von Domaszewski's Rangordnung[58], and Parker's work on the legions[59], have been updated by numerous authors, such as Keppie and Caginard[60], while the recent collections of articles edited by Le Bohec and by Le Bohec and Wolff have provided much-needed updates to the work of von Domaszewski[61] and Ritterling[62]. In addition, Schmitthenner's work on the Roman army of the Triumviral period provides a much-needed perspective on its unique nature in these years[63]. Valuable insights have also been provided by studies of the Roman army in individual areas, such as Roldán Hervás and Le Roux on Spain[64], and Zucca on Sardinia[65].

The *auxilia*, both the 'permanent' auxiliary alae and cohorts and the *ad hoc* units of allied troops, have received attention. The classic works of Cichorius and Cheesman[66] have been updated for the early Principate by writers such as Holder, Saddington, and Spaul[67], while the Triumviral period has also received attention, with Saddington and Schmitthenner, in particular, analysing the *auxilia* of the period 49 – 31BC[68]. However, the non-legionary forces of the period 91 – 50BC have received comparatively little attention[69]. The period falls between the studies of the pre-Social War period, such as McCall on cavalry[70], or Gabba on Rome's relationship with its Italian allies[71], and studies that focus on the *auxilia* of the imperial era. A number of

[56] Isaac (1995); Rosenstein (2005); De Blois (2005); cf. Schmitthenner (1958) 153ff. The chapter by De Blois is one of a series of works by him which provide valuable insights into the relationships between the junior officer corps, their commanders, and the army they served in: cf. De Blois (1987), (1992), (2000). On this topic, see ch. 3, pp.75-76.
[57] Ritterling, RE 12.1186-1242 s.v. 'legio'.
[58] See von Domaszewski (1908), (1967).
[59] Parker (1928).
[60] Keppie (1984), (1996) (cf. Webster (1996)); Caginard (2005).
[61] E.g. Brizzi (1995); Isaac (1995).
[62] E.g. Keppie (2000b); Morillo Cerdan and Garcia Marcos (2000); Speidel (2000).
[63] Schmitthenner (1958).
[64] Roldán Hervás (1974); Le Roux (1982).
[65] Zucca (1988); cf. also Wrobel (2009), on Roman military command in Raetia in the early Principate.
[66] Cichorius, RE 1.1223-1270 s.v. 'ala', RE 4.231-356 s.v. 'cohors'; Cheesman (1918).
[67] Holder (1980); Saddington (1982); Spaul (1994), (2000).
[68] In this context, Schmitthenner's analysis of the auxiliary forces available during the Triumviral period is especially valuable, e.g. Schmitthenner (1958) 137-139.
[69] Prag (2007) 76.
[70] McCall (2002).
[71] Gabba (1976).

recent works have examined specific aspects of the *auxilia* in this period, such as Yoshimura on the role of patronage in the levying of auxiliary contingents[72], Prag on Sicily[73], and Busquets-Artigas on the use of *auxilia* in the East[74]. However, as Millar notes[75], there is still no systematic study on the use of *auxilia* in this period, nor of the men who commanded them. Studies of auxiliary forces from specific regions have also offered new perspectives, in particular Drinkwater on Gallic cavalry commanders, and Alföldy on auxiliary forces on the northern frontiers[76]. There have been a number of studies looking at the emergence within the Roman elite of those whose communities had been allied or Latin[77], but these have largely concentrated upon their roles within politics or within Caesar's army[78]. The naval forces of the Roman military system in the period 91BC – AD14 have received little recent attention, with only Keppie, Reddé, Saddington, and, to an extent, Spaul, concentrating on junior officers in the Roman fleet.[79]

As well as what might be called "traditional" military history, some studies of the Roman army have used the recent approach in military history of analysing the functions and experiences of members of an army in practice (i.e. looking at what soldiers faced, and what they did in practice, rather than what they were 'meant' to do in theoretical terms), notably Goldsworthy's *The Roman Army at War 100BC – AD300*[80]. Goldsworthy's 'experience-based' approach has proved revealing in the analysis of the roles and functions of 'the general's staff' showing them to be not so much officials with clearly defined functions as a set of individuals with known capacities to be assigned duties as and when required[81]. Although his conclusions require further analysis, particularly regarding the role of military tribunes, this approach, which abandons statistical or prosopographical analysis in favour of consideration of the practical experiences of the participants, has shed light on a

[72] Yoshimura (1961).
[73] Prag (2007).
[74] Busquets-Artigas (2009).
[75] Millar (1995) 242-243.
[76] Drinkwater (1978), (1979); Alföldy (1962), (1968).
[77] E.g. Syme (1939); Nicolet (1967); Wiseman (1971); Gruen (1974) 89-90, 116-7; Lomas (1996) 34ff.
[78] Nicolet (1967) and Ilari (1974) have focused upon the emergence of Italian junior officers, although, while identifying a number of interesting candidates for analysis, they do not fully explore what the impact of having a large number of such men in the junior officer corps might have been.
[79] Keppie (1996b); Reddé (1986); Saddington (1988), (1990), (1991b), (2005b); Spaul (2002).
[80] Goldsworthy (1996).
[81] E.g. Goldsworthy (1996) 121ff., on the roles and duties of a general's staff.

number of poorly understood issues[82].

Much of the modern analysis of the junior officer posts of the pre-Augustan period has come in the context of the wider debate concerning the levels of professionalism within the Roman army, and the relationships between *homines militares* and their commanders. Most works on this topic (before and since Suolahti) have concentrated on the identification of such men, with some authors, such as Syme, Gruen, Gabba, and De Blois[83], arguing that the officer corps of the period was increasingly made up of *homines militares*, men whose military careers were their sole occupation or whose military talents and allegiance to a commander were their route to political success. The evidence, especially for junior officers, does not support this conclusion, and many, in particular Smith, Nicolet, and Garlan[84], have argued that, while a substantial number of such men can be identified, the levels of 'professionalism' within the Roman army remained limited in one respect or another[85]. However, these works tend to concentrate upon legates and upon often somewhat imprecise literary evidence[86], and do not take sufficiently into account the (much larger) junior officer corps, the broad range of social groupings from which its members came, or the ways in which a 'professional' junior officer career might be defined, so we should be particularly cautious about applying their conclusions to junior officers in our period.

A different approach to this issue was developed by Harmand[87]: he argued that junior officers, and especially military tribunes, were increasingly involved in administrative work, both within the army and, where necessary, in provincial government[88], and that the debate on 'professionalism' should focus not just on battlefield roles or strategies, but upon the broader range of functions which junior officers fulfilled. This argument has been developed by Goldsworthy[89], who stresses the importance of leadership and organisational skills above combat experience, as well as the difficulty of handling the enormous logistical problems that confronted the Roman army[90] –

[82] For other examples of this approach see Harmand (1967); Le Bohec (1994); and De Blois (2000).
[83] Syme (1939) 88, 395-396; Gruen (1974) 64, 380ff.; Gabba (1976) 35ff.; De Blois (1987) 14-16, 18-21.
[84] Smith (1958) 59-64; Nicolet (1974) 847; Garlan (1975) 158.
[85] The topic is analysed in ch. 6, pp.175ff.
[86] Cf. ch. 6, p.168.
[87] Harmand (1967) 355ff.
[88] Harmand (1967) 355.
[89] Goldsworthy (1996) 169. See also Sasel (1974) 467ff.; Knapp (1981) 137-140; and esp. Saddington (1987).
[90] Goldsworthy (1996) 287-295.

precisely the skills which Roman aristocrats needed to develop in order to become successful magistrates.

The motivations and ambitions of junior officers have, of course, been studied before, and form a key part of one of our concepts of Roman imperialism and expansion. In *War and Imperialism in Republican Rome*, Harris argues that the expansion of the empire was the result of an internal dynamic within Roman society that ran through all sections of that society but especially the elite, and the young elite in particular[91]. His argument is that the pursuit of *gloria* and *laus* by the politically ambitious elite, coupled with a desire for glory and the economic benefits of victory among the poor, meant that Rome actively sought out war after war, constantly striving to enhance its position. Harris' argument rests on a structural analysis of Roman society from the end of the Second Punic War to the death of Sulla, and depends in part upon the assumption that military success was the best, and more-or-less the only, route to political success – especially for the young. Harris argued that "warfare bulked large among the formative adolescent and adult experiences of the young aristocrat … Success in war was by far the most glorious kind of achievement by which he could demonstrate his prowess, and there were strong imperatives that urged him to pursue this success"[92].

The debate inspired by Harris has not tended to concentrate upon this particular aspect of his work. Contributions by North[93], Patterson[94], and Rich[95] have for the most part passed over questions about the role of the junior officer positions in Harris' model. Where they do approach the question of military service, the focus has been upon issues such as recruitment among the *proletarii*, and the military burden placed upon the Italian allies[96]. Recent studies of economic expansion have also examined the role played by Italian merchants, paying close attention to the links between Roman and Italian *negotiatores* in the second century, and to the importance of the actions of ordinary soldiers, but they have generally not considered the role played by the junior

[91] Harris (1979) 10ff., (1984a) 23.
[92] Harris (1979) 10-11.
[93] North (1981).
[94] Patterson (1993).
[95] Rich (1997); cf. Sherwin-White's (1980) rebuttal of Harris, which does not touch upon the issue of military service and participation, and Harris' expansion of his own work, which deals with the importance of the army in general, but not with the junior officers (Harris (1984) 14-15, 89-101).
[96] Patterson (1993) 47; Rich (1997) 96-97.

officers[97].

Attention has been given to the role of the Italians within the Roman army, particularly in the period immediately before and after the Social War. However, little attention has been given to the military roles of the commanders of each allied contingent before the Social War, and more interest has generally been shown in the military burden placed upon each community[98].

In addition to work concerned with military and political matters, there has been a growth in the study of youth as a phenomenon, analysing the role of young individuals and their society's perception of them[99]. However, with the exception of Kleijwegt, there has been little analysis in such works of the junior officer career. Eyben, for example, plays down the importance of the junior officer positions, and of military life in general, to the young elite, preferring instead to see youth as a fallow period in the development of a political career[100]. It is important, however, to assess the role of military service, and the junior officer positions, to young members of the elite in our period. Ch. 6 considers the way in which young men might be trained for junior officer positions, and ch. 7 examines the way in which military service was perceived and represented.

The evidence for junior officers in the Roman army, 91BC – AD14

The bulk of the evidence upon which an analysis of junior officer positions before 31BC depends is literary. There are a certain number of inscriptions of interest from the late second and early first centuries[101], but the majority of relevant inscriptions date from the late Triumviral and Augustan periods. Relevant iconographic and archaeological evidence, while offering valuable insights into the self-perception of junior officers in particular, is even more limited[102]. For the junior officers of the first century up to the Augustan period, it is the speeches and letters of Cicero, the narrative accounts of Caesar, Josephus, Appian, and Dio, and the biographies of

[97] Toynbee (1965) vol.2; Badian (1972); Harris (1989); Gruen (1984) 1.288ff.; Lomas (1996) 51-52.
[98] E.g. Brunt (1971) (e.g. 677-686) and Gabba (1976) do not directly discuss the service of members of the Italian elite as junior officers or as unit commanders, although Toynbee (1965) 425-426 and Keaveney (1987) 14 have given some attention to this issue.
[99] E.g. Bertman (1976); Kleijwegt (1991); Rawson (1991), (1997); Eyben (1993).
[100] Eyben (1993) 4ff.
[101] Cf., for example, the evidence for [200] C. Octauius Graecinus (CIL 14.3629 (Tibur, Regio 1, Italia)); [96] L. Cornelius L.f. Vot(uria) (CIL 6.40910 (Roma)); [149] P. Iunius P.f. (I. de Délos 4.1.1856 (Delos)); and especially the inscription recording the *consilium* of Pompeius Strabo in 89BC, on which see below.
[102] On the iconographic evidence, cf. ch. 7, pp.213-221.

Plutarch, which provide most of our information, with additional material coming from other contemporary and later authors. For the Augustan period, our literary evidence is relatively sparse, although Velleius and Tacitus, as well as Suetonius and Augustus himself, are important.

These literary sources have their limitations. Narrative accounts of campaigns and battles rarely contain the level of detail required to identify individual junior officers[103]. In fact more junior officers are known from the letters and speeches of Cicero – where their military position is generally mentioned only in passing – than from Appian. Furthermore, given that many junior officers commanded relatively small detachments or garrisons, these roles receive less attention than we would like[104]. The *auxilia*, too, receive scant attention in literary sources, and this attention is mostly focused upon the cavalry, with the result that our literary evidence for command structures and officer positions within the auxiliary infantry is also extremely slight[105]. Even where auxiliary troops are mentioned, different units of troops are often grouped together, and confusion as to their size and purpose is also frequent[106]. It is perhaps the case, as Gilliver argues, that this lack of information has led to an underestimation of the importance of auxiliary forces in the Roman military system[107].

For the second century it is the accounts of Polybius and of Livy which provide the bulk of our evidence, which has greatly influenced the ideas about the late republican junior officer corps which predominate in many modern authors. In particular, book 6 of Polybius, which provides a detailed analysis of the Roman army and, especially, of the activities of the military tribunes, has dominated our perception of the military tribunate. However, while Polybius was a particularly conscientious military historian[108], his account should not be taken as a definitive reference for the activities of the junior officers in the late Republic, for several reasons. For one thing, it describes a Roman army which was different from that of the first century: an army of propertied citizens, one organised around the maniple, and one which campaigned, in

[103] Cf. Gowing (1992) 209-210; as Welch points out ((1998) 87), Caesar is something of an exception to the rule.
[104] Cf. ch. 4, p.103 on garrison commanders and the high incidence of their reporting in that period.
[105] Cf. Saddington (1070) 89-90; Schmitthenner (1958) 16, 138.
[106] Cf. Saddington (1982) 48; Keaveney (2003) 232.
[107] Gilliver (1996) 54ff.
[108] Cf. Polybius 12.25; Marsden (1973) 267ff.; Gowing (1992) 209.

general, during the summer[109]. Furthermore, Polybius' account should not be taken as describing the Roman army throughout the second century. While Polybius gives detailed information on the selection and required experience of the military tribunes[110], the evidence of Livy suggests that these things changed a number of times during the early second century, and may well have changed afterwards[111]. Polybius' account is not, therefore, necessarily a definitive description of the second-century Roman army, but a snapshot of its organisation and activities at the point in time when he wrote, and this must be borne in mind when considering his evidence[112]. Moreover, while Polybius describes the roles of the *praefecti socium*, and explicitly describes them as πραίφεκτοι[113], he does not go into detail about the roles and functions of any other prefects whose duties and status in fact varied widely, as we shall see.

However, while Polybius' evidence has played a significant part in shaping our interpretation of the junior officer corps, the evidence of Livy has been even more influential. The latter surviving books of Livy (21-45), dealing with the period from the beginning of the Second Punic War to the end of the war with Perseus, show little of the roles of auxiliary commanders and present an image of the military tribunate as an extremely important position, occupied by men of the highest political and social status. It is from Livy that we learn of *consulares* serving as military tribunes[114], as well as military tribunes engaging in extremely high-profile roles on the battlefield[115]. This evidence is sometimes contrasted, for instance by Suolahti[116], with the evidence of Cicero and Caesar, where military tribunes are often equestrians, and are engaged in far less important military duties. This contrast underpins the view that the military tribunate, and the junior officer posts in general, suffered from a dramatic decline in status between the second and first centuries. However, this contrast should not be taken at face value: as we shall see, Livy normally mentions individuals within a military context (i.e. that so-and-so led this or that detachment[117]) and normally when their actions were made conspicuous by their valiant success, miserable failure, or

[109] For details, see ch. 2, pp.46-48.
[110] Polybius 6.19.
[111] Livy 42.31.5; cf. 42.35.4.
[112] Cf. Bell (1965) on cohorts.
[113] Polybius 6.26.5.
[114] E.g. Livy 42.49.9, 43.5.14. For a discussion of this evidence, see ch. 2, pp.66-67.
[115] For a review of this evidence, see Suolahti (1955) 49ff.
[116] E.g. Suolahti (1955) 303.
[117] E.g. Livy 25.19.9-3, 39.7.6.

death, and then only because their names and the memories of their actions were still preserved at Rome in Livy's time. Thus the military tribunes mentioned by Livy tend to be members of the political and social elite, and in general only those whose influence or competence gave them positions of significant authority. On the other hand, Cicero tends to mention individuals in a non-military context (that so-and-so has returned from his post, or wishes to take up a post[118]), and Caesar often mentions junior officers who performed comparatively minor roles[119]. This means that Cicero and Caesar are far more likely to have mentioned individuals of lower rank and status than Livy, and we would thus expect, even without a change in the social status of military tribunes or a change in the ethos of the young elite in the Roman army, that the writings of Cicero (and, to a lesser extent, those of Caesar) would produce a greater number of non-senatorial and less politically significant individuals than Livy[120].

Moreover, Livy's accounts of the late third and early second centuries present what is probably a misleading picture of the composition of the junior officer corps. The Roman army expanded considerably to meet the needs of the Hannibalic wars, and while the army of the early second century was smaller, it was nevertheless far greater in size than that of the mid-third century or that of the mid- to late-second century[121]. The army which Livy describes is likely, therefore, to have contained a larger than normal number of junior officers and, given that there could only be a finite number of individuals from high-status families, many of the junior officers in service would probably have come from families and backgrounds of a lower status than was usual before. In addition, Livy's account of the junior officers of the early second century describes military and social pressures upon the junior officer corps that were not present in such a form in the first century: indeed, the rapid decline in the number of legions after the Third Macedonian War would have brought about a completely different set of pressures, and Livy's evidence for the Macedonian wars cannot be seen as typical even for the second century. We can see this in Livy's account of the changing requirements for the selection of military tribunes from 171 to 169BC[122], when there was some debate as to who should serve as a military tribune, with the

[118] E.g. Cicero, *ad Fam.* 7.17.
[119] E.g. [303] C. Volcatius Tullus (Caesar, *B.G.* 6.29.4).
[120] Cf. Nicolet (1969) 139.
[121] See ch. 2, pp.43-44.
[122] Cf. ch. 2, pp.64-65.

Senate in charge of the appointment of all military tribunes for some years. In addition, many of the duties and responsibilities of military tribunes described by Livy, such as the commanding of whole legions, find no echo in Polybius' account of the more routine duties of the military tribunate.

Furthermore, Livy's evidence needs to be contextualised. As we shall see, Livy was writing at a time when the junior officer corps had just been re-established and reorganised. The civil wars and the Triumviral period saw a dramatic change in the status and allegiance of the junior officers. We must consider the possibility that Livy's depiction of the high status of the military tribunate, as well as the willingness of even ex-consuls to serve as junior officers, was partly intended to provide a counterpoint to the problems of the civil wars and the Triumviral and early Augustan periods. Livy's high-status, and socially important, military tribunes stand in sharp contrast to those of the Triumviral period, epitomised by [202] Ofillius in 36BC[123]. It is tempting to see this contrast in other places as well: Livy's famous account of the 'noble' centurion Spurius Ligustinus[124], whose speech in 171BC inspired a rebellious assembly of soldiers to obedience, is in marked contrast to Appian's account of the fate of the centurion Nonius, who attempted to quell a similar protest in 41BC by reminding the assembly of the loyalty they owed to Octavian[125]. Ligustinus was selected as *primipilus* of the first legion after the chastened crowd withdrew their protest, but Nonius was lynched. Of course, Appian's account of Nonius' death may be playing upon an account, perhaps even Livy's account, of the noble stand taken by Ligustinus, but if we suppose, as is likely, that Livy had read or heard of the incident himself, then Nonius' death may actually have influenced Livy's portrayal of Ligustinus' noble defiance. In any case, as we shall see, the junior officers and centurions of the civil wars and the Triumviral period were often rebellious, and reference to a specific incident is not required for Livy's portrayal of Ligustinus to represent an idealised counterpoint to the disloyal soldiers of this era[126]. While we cannot, of course, place too much weight on the contrast between these more recent junior officers, whose roles and influence Augustus had some difficulties reforming, and the military tribunes of Livy's account, the possibility that Livy's account was

[123] Appian, *B.C.* 5.128; cf. Dio 49.13.
[124] Livy 42.34; cf. Cadiou (2002) 76ff.
[125] Appian, *B.C.* 5.2.16.
[126] Cf. Schmitthenner (1958) 165.

coloured by his own experiences and perception, as well as the political issues of his day, should be remembered.

The evidence for junior officers in the first century is dominated by the writings of Cicero and Caesar, whose work provides the names of almost half the junior officers of the period attested in literary sources. Caesar's writings, along with those of Hirtius and the authors of the Alexandrian, African and Spanish wars, provide an often detailed picture of the workings of the Roman junior officer corps[127]. However, it is worth remembering that these works were, primarily, intended for immediate consumption, and we should therefore be wary of Caesar's motives for singling out any individual for praise, or for describing any particular incident in detail[128]. Cicero's writings, especially his correspondence with Trebatius and Atticus, are of particular interest, as they provide us with an insight into many of the motivations of junior officers and the perceptions of the junior officer corps. However, Cicero's letters present their own problems of interpretation, and while they often provide an interesting snapshot of a small facet of life as a junior officer, as well as bringing to our attention individuals about whom we would otherwise know nothing, many of his most interesting remarks are asides to the main body of the letter[129], and it is often difficult to contextualise his comments. The evidence of Plutarch is also valuable, although it is often fragmentary, partly as a result of the biographical form of the relevant works, and we certainly cannot argue from his silence on a particular point: that Plutarch's biography of Marius makes no mention of his military tribunate, described in detail by Sallust[130], is a salutary warning. Both Appian and Dio write in some detail of the civil wars and the Triumviral period, and after 43BC, their narratives provide the bulk of our literary evidence for the activities of the junior officer corps. The influence of Asinius Pollio, to whom Appian and Dio, as well as Plutarch, owed much of their evidence, appears to have been especially important[131]. Appian's analysis of the period 49 – 31BC, in particular, contains a greater than usual degree of attention to the technical details and minor actions of campaigns, which

[127] Cf. Welch (1998) 87ff.
[128] Cf. Welch (1998) 98ff.
[129] See, for example, the discussion of Cicero, *ad Fam.* 5.20.4 in ch. 3, p.84.
[130] Sallust, *Iug.* 63; cf. Jones (1961) 52ff.
[131] Gowing (1992) 34, 37, 40; cf. Millar (1964) 57; Saddington (1970) 117; Harrington (1978) 160ff.; Pelling (1998) 27.

provides a valuable insight into the actions of junior officers[132]. As Saddington argues, accounts of civil war appear to contain more military detail than external conflicts or peacetime organisation[133]. Dio, of course, is an important source for the Augustan period as well, as are Velleius and Tacitus, both of whom had practical experience of the Roman army – and Velleius himself served as a junior officer in the Augustan period, and was familiar with technical language[134].

Moreover, as Saddington and Bell have argued, authors who wrote in Greek such as Polybius, Josephus, Plutarch, Appian, and Dio were all familiar with technical military details[135] – Polybius, Josephus and Dio, of course, had direct experience of the Roman army[136]. In fact, the weakest major source for this study in respect of technical terminology is a Roman author, namely Suetonius[137]. In general, where ancient authors appear to slip up over technicalities, this is generally to do with military positions or tactics that were no longer in existence at the time the author wrote[138]. Fortunately for our purposes, the 'post-Marian' Roman legion had acquired a form that would have been more-or-less recognisable to imperial authors, and thus terms such as "tribunus militum" and "praefectus" appear to have been generally understood[139], even by authors who occasionally used archaic or less technical language[140].

Despite the importance of the writings of Velleius, Tacitus and Dio, it is epigraphy that provides the bulk of our evidence from the later Triumviral period onwards. The relative wealth of epigraphic evidence introduces a different set of challenges, among them, perhaps, that of avoiding overconfidence. While epigraphic evidence provides

---

[132] Gowing (1992) 210.
[133] Saddington (1982) 44.
[134] E.g.Velleius 2.52.4; cf. Saddington (2003) 24. On Velleius' military service, see Velleius 2.101.2-3, 104.3; cf. 111.3-4; cf. Saddington (2003); [290] C. Velleius Paterculus.
[135] Bell (1965) 406; Saddington (1970) 123ff. It should be noted, however, that even those authors with direct experience of the Roman army occasionally use non-specific language to describe individuals who may have been junior officers. Josephus, for example, describes *Fabius* as a "στρατηγός" (*B.J.* 1.236), while Dio's description of [152] M. Iunius Silanus as "στρατίαρχος" is equally imprecise (Broughton (1951-1986) 2.353, 3.115; Thomasson (1972) 73-75; Saddington (1992) 269). In addition, as Hillard notes ((1987) 23), the revelation of character in battle was generally more important to Plutarch than detailed accounts of military affairs.
[136] Cf. Harrington (1978) 162;
[137] Saddington (1970) 116-117; Ducos (1995) 50; cf. the possibly anachronistic use of the formula *praefectus alae* in Suetonius, *Tib.* 30, 41.
[138] Cf. Bell (1965) 406ff.; Holder (1980) 5; as well as, for example, Dio 55.28.2 on the equestrian-ranked commanders of Sardinia (cf. Thomasson (1972) 73-75; Saddington (1992) 269).
[139] Cf. Devijver (1973) 549ff.; Saddington (1982) 27ff.
[140] Saddington (1995) 53.

us with information about a great number of equestrian careers, we should not forget that we still know of only a tiny proportion, perhaps one or two percent, of the junior officers from the Augustan period. It is therefore unwise to argue, for example, that *tribuni militum a populo* could not achieve senatorial rank on the grounds that we do not have any certain examples of this[141]. It should be noted, in addition, that surviving epigraphic evidence depends on publication and often on excavation: the large number of officers known from Pompeii or, further afield, from Alexandreia Troas, for instance, should not necessarily be taken as an indication that these towns produced an especially large number of such officers[142]. Specific issues relating to individual inscriptions, where relevant, are discussed in the alphabetical list of officers in Appendix A. However, it is worth considering here two general issues concerning the epigraphic evidence: the dating of inscriptions, and the significance of the order of the posts named in them.

A number of authors, most notably Demougin, are relatively confident in dating inscriptions recording junior officers to the Augustan period on stylistic grounds. Such grounds typically include the absence of unit identification or cognomen (that is, the description of a post as "tr(ibunus) mil(itum)" as opposed to "tr(ibunus) mil(itum) leg(ionis) II" or "tr(ibunus) mil(itum) leg(ionis) II August(ae)"), as well as the use of certain terms, such as "arbitratu"[143]. However, there are a significant number of officers who are datable to the Tiberian and even Claudian periods whose inscriptions contain the same stylistic traits[144], and there are many inscriptions from the Augustan era that identify the unit in which an individual served and some that also give a unit cognomen, despite the fact that most units had not yet acquired one[145]. Other stylistic indications of an inscription's date, such as letter-forms, orthography, and the nature of the support, are, similarly, rarely sufficiently precise to allow an inscription to be dated to our period on such evidence alone, although such evidence can provide a

---

[141] Nicolet (1957) 36, on [162] C. Lucilius C.f. Benignus Ninnianus; cf. Wiseman (1971) 239; Buonocore (1987) 112-113; Demougin (1992) 207.
[142] On Alexandreia Troas, cf. ch. 5, p.163. For the group of junior officers known from Interamna Nahars, see *[- - -] Aufidi[us - - -]* (CIL 11.4183a (Interamna Nahars, Regio 6, Italia)).
[143] Demougin (1992) 320; 71.
[144] Beyond the examples discussed in the Appendix, note, for example, [. Gli]tius T.f. Stel(latina) Barbarus (CIL 5.6969 (Augusta Taurinorum, Regio 11)); Sex. Caecilius Sex.f. Sab(atina) Senecio (CIL 5.4058 = EDH HD010742 (Mantua, Regio 10)); C. Oetius L.f. Ouf(entina) Rixa (Inscr.Aqu. 1.497 = IEAquil. 194 = AE 1956, 15 = AE 1986, 242 = EDH HD017844 (Aquileia, Regio 10)).
[145] E.g. [267] [?L. Tillius] C.f. Cor(nelia) (17OS Pompeii, De Caro & Ambrosio (1983) (Pompeii, Regio 1)); [57] L. Blatius L.f. Serg(ia) Ventinus (CIL 2.1176 (Hispalis, Baetica, Hispania)).

useful supplement to other dating criteria[146]. Moreover, as has been shown by Holder and Saddington[147], stylistic clues make it hard to date an inscription even when a study of relevant styles is confined to a specific region and to a specific type of inscription, which of course cannot be the case with the study of the corpus of inscriptions concerning junior officers in the period 91BC – AD14. While it is correct, for example, to say that the absence of unit identification or cognomen is an indication of an early date[148], this is not sufficient in itself to date an inscription to the pre-Tiberian period. While a number of the junior officers dated in this fashion must, of course, have served before Tiberius' reign, it is not possible to separate them from later officers whose inscriptions display similar stylistic traits. The catalogue of junior officers on which this thesis is based includes only those officers who can be certainly or probably dated to the period 91BC – AD14 and therefore excludes officers who are only datable by means of such stylistic criteria to (for example) the pre-Gaian or pre-Claudian period[149].

Another problem presented by the epigraphic evidence concerns the order of posts within an individual's cursus. Without an understanding of the principles which lay behind this order, it would be difficult to establish a relative seniority of positions, or to tell whether an individual held his junior officer positions, or other parts of his equestrian career, before or after his municipal career.

In establishing the reasons that lay behind the ordering of posts on an inscription, it is important to note, as Saddington shows[150], that an individual's cursus is generally divided into three distinct parts (although there were, as we shall see, exceptions to this rule): the municipal cursus; the 'public' cursus (generally, for our period, composed of equestrian positions, but which might also include any senior or senatorial posts that were held); and 'honorific' posts (such as priesthoods and other religious functions, patron status, or honorary municipal prefectures).

This does not mean that an individual's career was necessarily divided neatly into,

---

[146] E.g. Menella (1991) 421 on [279] [?L. Va]leri[us] L.f. Cor(nelia); Mouritsen (1990) 101 on [78] L. Cellius L.f. Men(enia); cf. also [244] [- - -] Sabidin[ius - - -] and *[- - -] Sont[i]us [- - -] Ter(etina) Cimber*.
[147] Holder (1980) 144ff.; Saddington (1973) 538ff.
[148] Cf. Saddington (1973) 538; Holder (1980) 144; Demougin (1992) 71-72.
[149] The officers who have been excluded from attribution to this period on the grounds that there is not sufficient evidence to date them as certainly or probably earlier than the reign of Tiberius can be found listed in Appendix D (with bibliographical details in Appendix A).
[150] Cf. Saddington (1996a) 168.

say, a municipal career followed by an equestrian one. This can be seen, as Saddington has shown, in a number of examples where more than one inscription is known for an individual[151]. In two sets of inscriptions recording *tribuni militum a populo* from Pompeii, municipal posts that were held following equestrian posts have been added to the earlier 'municipal' section of the cursus[152]. [136] M. Holconius Rufus' cursus is given as "d(uum)u(iro) i(ure) d(icundo) IIII quinq(uennali) / trib(uno) mil(itum) a populo Augusti sacerdoti" in CIL 10.837, but as "IIu(iro) i(ure) d(icundo) quinquiens / iter(um) quinq(uennali) trib(uno) mil(itum) a p(opulo) / flamini Aug(usti) patr(ono) colo(niae) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum)" in CIL 10.838. In AE 1898, 143, the cursus of [164] M. Lucretius Decidianus Rufus is given as "IIuir iter(um) quinq(uennalis) trib(unus) milit(um) a populo praefect(us) fabr(um)", while in CIL 10.788 his cursus is given as "d(uum)u(iro) III quinq(uennali) / pontif(ici) trib(uno) militum / a populo praef(ecto) fabr(um)"[153].

The fact that posts within a cursus were placed into groups can be seen in other inscriptions relating to other junior officers from our period: [246] T. Satanus T.f. Sabinus held at least three of his five duovirates after holding the post of *praefectus fabrum*[154], and [179] L. Marcius Optatus was probably an aedile at Tarraco before his military career, and afterwards held the first duovirate at the new colony of Iluro[155]. This can also be seen in other inscriptions relating to junior officers from the early Principate[156]. Decius Saturninus'[157] cursus is known from three inscriptions that show that he held a number of priesthoods in Rome, a military career which included the military tribunate and two spells as a *praefectus fabrum*, and honorary prefectures and local magistracies in Aquinum[158]. Saddington's analysis shows that these posts were not held sequentially, but instead, as above, have been placed into groups[159]. The

[151] Saddington (1996a) 158ff.
[152] Cf. Saddington (1996a) 160.
[153] The cursus at CIL 10.789 is given in the same order: "IIuir(o) III quinq(uennali) / pontif(ici) trib(uno) mil(itum) a populo / praef(ecto) fabr(um)".
[154] CIL 9.5191 = CIL 1(2) 1911 = ILLRP 529 = AE 1991, 609 = AE 2000, 468 = AE 2003, +582; cf. CIL 9.5195 = CIL 1(2) 1912 = AE 2000, 478 (Asculum, Regio 5, Italia).
[155] CIL 2.4616 = ILS 6948 = Fabre et al. (1984) (IRC 1.101) 147-150 no. 101 (Iluro, Hispania Tarraconensis); cf. Fabre et al. (1984-2002) V.23-24; cf. Curchin (1990) 211; Demougin (1992) 60-61; Saddington (1996a) 158. See also AE 2001, 1918 = AE 2003, +1014 and AE 1913, 235 = AE 1922, +78 = AE 1922, +79 = AE 2001, 1919 = ILS 9502 (Antiocha, Pisidia) relating to the career of [69] C. Caristanius C.f. Ser(gia) Fronto Caesianus Iulius.
[156] For further examples from the later Julio-Claudian period, cf. Saddington (1996a) 163ff.
[157] Cf. *Q. Decius Q.f. M.n. Saturninus*.
[158] CIL 10.5393 = ILS 6286; CIL 10.5394; CIL 10.5392 (Aquinum, Regio 1, Italia).
[159] Saddington (1996a) 162; cf. Demougin (1992) 230.

cursus of Arrius Salanus[160] states that he was "praef(ecto) quinq(uennali) Ti. Caesaris, praef(ecto) quinq(uennali) Neronis et Drus[i] Caesarum designato, tub(icini) sac(rorum) p(opuli) R(omani), aed(ili) III auguri interregi, trib(uno) milit(um) legion(is) III August(ae), leg(ionis) X Geminae, praef(ecto) equit(um) praef(ecto) castror(um) praef(ecto) fabr(um)". As Saddington points out[161], if he died while *praefectus quinquennalis designatus* (an honorific position), then he must have held both his military and municipal career before he was so designated.

Given, therefore, that positions were placed into groups within the cursus, rather than simply listed sequentially, two central questions need to be addressed – the ordering of posts within these groups, and the ordering of the groups themselves.

One feature of inscriptions from the pre-Claudian era is that positions within the three divisions are almost always given in (essentially) chronological order, with earlier posts or offices preceding later ones. This can be seen most clearly in the municipal section of the cursus, where, for example, the duovirate always precedes the quinquennial duovirate in the Augustan period. Despite the lack of a clear hierarchy for the junior officer positions in this period (the military tribunate, for example, appears both before and after the post of *praefectus equitum*[162]), the same ordering can also be seen in the 'public' section of the cursus: the primipilate always precedes the equestrian junior officer posts in the Augustan period; and those posts which we know to have been senior positions, such as procuratorships or the post of *pro legato*, are always placed after the junior officer positions.

The situation is complicated, however, by multiple iterations of the same post. As the examples above show, the iteration of a municipal office is generally indicated by a number (or text) placed after the first mention of that office, and we cannot assume, in a municipal cursus, that multiple iterations of the same post were held consecutively. However, it seems that the situation may have been different for junior officer positions. Evidence for this comes from the cursus of [115] C. Fabricius C.f. Ani(ensi) Tuscus. His cursus first states that he was an infantry prefect in the East and then held the military tribunate in Egypt eight times "trib(uno) mil(itum) leg(ionis) III / Cyr(enaicae) VIII". The next post in his cursus is that of "tribunus dilectus" in

[160] CIL 10.6101 = ILS 6285 (Formiae, Regio 1, Italia); cf. *[?L.] Arrius Salanus*.
[161] Saddington (1996a) 164; cf. Dobson (1978) 174-175; Le Bohec (1989) 135; Demougin (1992) 230.
[162] On the lack of a clear hierarchy for the Augustan junior officer positions, see ch. 5, pp.153ff.

Rome, and a number of prefectures ("praef(ecto) fabr(um) IIII praef(ecto) equit(um) / alae praet(oriae) IIII") follow this; the inscription also records that he was decorated by Germanicus[163]. Given that he was decorated by Germanicus, and that his role in the *dilectus* is generally dated to either AD6 or AD9/10[164], the latter part of his military service almost certainly took place in Pannonia and Germany. Although we should not assume that he was a junior officer for 18 consecutive years (the total length of his junior officer career) without a break between posts, the nature of his military service suggests that he held all of his military tribunates before he was a *prefectus equitum*: it would be surprising if, having served in the northern provinces as a cavalry commander, he was reposted to Egypt as a military tribune. Further support for this comes from an inscription recording two Aufidii[165], father and son, whose posts are explicitly recorded as being held for a number of years ("tr(ibuno) mil(itum) in Hispania / leg(ionis) IIII an(nis) V" and "tribuno mil(itum) Alexandr(ia) ad Aegypt(um) leg(ionis) XXII ann(is) VIIII" respectively), suggesting, perhaps, that each served for the relevant number of years in succession. This is also suggested by the literary evidence of the late Republic, where men who held a junior officer position more than once appear to have served under the same commander for consecutive years[166].

However, the cursus of Arrius Salanus lists military tribunates in two different legions – one in Africa (Legio III Augusta) and one in Spain (Legio X Gemina) – which are followed by three prefectures (*praefectus equitum*, *praefectus castrorum*, *praefectus fabrum*). Given that the relative status of equestrian military posts, and the order in which they were held, were yet to be established[167], we cannot be certain that his military tribunates (which were held in different parts of the Empire, unlike those of Fabricius Tuscus) were held sequentially with no intervening prefecture. Therefore, while it is likely that his equestrian cursus is in direct chronological order, the possibility that iterated posts were not held sequentially must be borne in mind when analysing men who repeatedly held a single post[168]. However, as noted above,

[163] AE 1973, 501 = AE 1975, 806 = AE 1978,790 = Ricl (1997) (IK-53) 34 (Alexandreia Troas, Asia).
[164] Brunt (1974) 161, 182; Demougin (1992) 190.
[165] CIL 3.399 (Pergamum, Asia); cf. [48] T. Aufidius T.f. Ani(ensi) Balbus, [49] T. Aufidius T.f. Ani(ensi) Spinter.
[166] Cf. ch. 3, pp.72-73.
[167] Cf. ch. 5, pp.153ff.
[168] See, for example, *[?L.] C[orn]elius C.f. Bocchus (1)* for examples of multiple iteration of a single position which may, by this logic, not have been held sequentially.

indications of iterated posts are comparatively rare in our period, and therefore in the great majority of cases we can be confident that junior officer positions are listed on an individual's cursus in the order in which they were held.

The reasoning behind the order of the 'groups' within the cursus (municipal cursus, 'public' cursus, and honours) is difficult to determine. It is worth noting, however, that where we have multiple examples of a cursus, the order in which these groups are listed is almost always consistent – in only one case (that of M. Holconius Rufus, on which see below) does the order differ. Of the 81 inscriptions that provide evidence for non-senatorial junior officers in our period[169], and that are sufficiently complete, 27 have no municipal cursus, 28 place the equestrian cursus before the municipal cursus, and 27 put the municipal cursus first. The fact that one third of these officers held no municipal posts suggests that junior officers from a municipal background did not have to hold municipal office before holding a junior officer position[170]. This does not, of course, mean that such men did not ever intend to hold municipal office. Many, such as [157] Lerius Flaccus (a military tribune in Legio XIX) and [192] L. Nasidienus Agrippa (buried in a military cemetery), would have died in service[171].

Evidence that the groups are ordered chronologically comes from the fact that among *tribuni militum a populo* who held both equestrian and municipal positions, the municipal cursus comes first in 10 cases, and the equestrian cursus first in only three. Given that the post appears to have been created to encourage members of the municipal elite (who are often likely to have held municipal office already) to hold the military tribunate[172], this is a further indication that the groups are generally given in chronological order. Further evidence to support this is the fact that among junior officers who were former *primipili* and who held municipal office or received

[169] Excluding M. Holconius Rufus.
[170] For the implications of this, particularly regarding the age at which most junior officers held their posts, cf. ch. 8, pp.237ff.
[171] Lerius Flaccus: CIL 11.5218 = Sensi and Sensi (1986) 65 no. 19 (Fulginae, Regio 6, Italy); L. Nasidienus Agrippa: CIL 13.8270 (Colonia Agrippinensium, Germania Inferior); cf. La Baume (1973) 337; Dobson (1979) 265; Demougin (1992) 157. See also [306] L. Volusenus L.f. Clu(stumina) Clemens (CIL 11.6011 = ILS 2691 = AE 1985, 375 = AE 1988, 925 (Sestinum, Regio 6, Italia)), who was from a prominent family in Sestinum but held no local offices: he died in Gaul after a distinguished military and procuratorial career before having the chance to retire and hold local office in his home town (Pflaum (1982) 120; Firpo (1985) 21ff.; Fitz (1987) 256; Demougin (1992) 205-206)).
[172] Cf. ch. 8, pp.234-237.

municipal honours, the military cursus is always placed first[173].

Morover, of the 19 inscriptions that list municipal honours (such as priesthoods or membership of a *collegium*), 15 place the municipal honours last in the cursus[174]. As Saddington suggests, it is likely that municipal honours, such as priesthoods, would generally be held after military service (or simply by older men)[175]. The fact that municipal honours generally come at the end of the cursus may therefore be an indication that the three groups are generally given in chronological order.

Of course, as we have seen, this does not mean that we should assume that a man had completed his municipal career before holding any of his junior officer positions. More likely, as with iterated municipal posts, the first group listed in the cursus is probably determined by the first post or office held by an individual: i.e. if he held a municipal office before his 'public' career, then his municipal career is placed first.

In addition, there do not appear to have been any regulations concerning the order of text in an inscription (in fact, the re-cut inscription to [279] [?L. Va]leri[us] L.f. Cor(nelia)[176] shows that those who erected a monument might leave off a junior officer career entirely). As Keppie notes, it is likely that the local audience, at least the contemporary audience, would have been aware of the general shape of an individual's career[177]. It is significant, therefore, that in only one case from our period does the ordering of groups within the cursus differ between inscriptions. This case is the inscription from the base of Holconius Rufus' statue from near the Stabian baths in Pompeii. The statue depicted him wearing decorated armour in the style of the 'Prima Porta Augustus'[178], and on such a conspicuous 'military' monument, we can easily see why his military tribunate is listed before his municipal career (as we have seen, his municipal career is given first in the two other inscriptions which give his cursus).

---

[173] In the Augustan period, [80] L. Cirpinius T.f. Vel(ina), [118] L. Firmius L.f., [24] [- - -]us T.f. Teret(ina), [51] Sex. Aulienus Sex.f. Ani(ensi), and [214] [S]ex. Pedius Sex.f. Ar[n(ensi)] Lusianus Hirrutus, to whom might be added both of the promoted *primipili* who belong to either the late Augustan or early Tiberian periods, [292] M. Vergilius M.f. Teret(ina) Gallus Lusius and [301] A. Virgius L.f. Marsus.

[174] For example, the inscription recording the career of [24] [- - -]us T.f. Teret(ina), a former *primipilus*, places his membership of a veterans' organisation, the *conlegium honoris,* after his military cursus (on the *conlegium honoris*, cf. Pflaum (1978) 196; Christol and Demougin (1982) 147-148; Devijver (1976-2001) 4.1821).

[175] Saddington (1996a) 168.

[176] AE 1991, 708 (Parma, Regio 8, Italia) ; cf. Menella (1991) 421.

[177] Keppie (2000a) 252-253.

[178] CIL 10.830 = ILS 6361b (Pompeii, Regio 1); Cf. ch. 7, pp.220-221.

In addition to Holconius Rufus, a few inscriptions place honours at the start of the inscription which we would expect (given the above logic) to appear at the end. [296] Q. Veturius Q.f. Pom(ptina) Pexsus was almost certainly a member of the *collegium uirtutis* after holding the posts of military tribune and *praefectus fabrum*, although his local priesthood and membership of the *collegium* appear first on the inscription[179]. The inscription recording [269] [L.] Ti[t]inius L.f. Aem(ilia) Sulpicianus[180] places a single municipal honour, that he was "praefecto quinq(uennali) / T. Statili Tauri", at the end of his cursus, whereas other municipal honours appear at the start. In addition, the cursus of [40] C. Aqutius (?Aclutius) L.f. Teret(ina) Gallus places his important municipal prefectures, which included responsibility for fortifying the town, before his junior officer career, although he was probably a junior officer first[181]. This suggests that parts of an individual's career which were of special local significance are more likely to be 'out of sequence' than the municipal magistracies or equestrian positions. However, such examples are sufficiently rare to prevent us being able to properly assess the phenomenon. Moreover, it is worth noting that the overall patterns noted above suggest that, perhaps, the order of posts within the inscription was not generally of especial significance. The text of the inscription was only one part of a complete monument: the size of different parts of the text[182], the statuary, and the iconography[183] could be used to emphasise different elements within a career, thus diluting the importance of the relative positioning of different parts of the cursus.

There are, of course, a handful of inscriptions which are exceptions to the rule about the grouping of parts of the cursus. In the cursus of [181] [- - -] Tro(mentina) Maximus[184], for example, his equestrian career appears to interrupt his municipal career, while the municipal career of [230] T. Pomponius T.f. Pol(lia) Petra may be a

[179] CIL 11.3205 = ILS 4948 = AE 2003, +29 (Nepet, Regio 7, Italia); cf. Demougin (1992) 170; cf. Devijver (1976-2001) 2.859; Dobson (1966) 70 n.43; for a further possible example, cf. *[?L.] Arrius Salanus* (CIL 10.6101 = ILS 6285 (Formiae, Regio 1, Italia)), whose high-status honorary municipal prefectures appear before his municipal and equestrian career.
[180] CIL 3.605 = ILS 2678 (Dyrrachium, Macedonia); Saddington (1996a) 165-166.
[181] CIL 10.4876 = ILS 2227 = AE 1984, 369 (Venafrum, Regio 1, Italia); Devijver and Van 'T Dack (1982-1983) 168-169; Keppie (1983) 26-28, 107, (2000a) 253; Demougin (1992) 35.
[182] E.g. the inscription recording the career of the *tribunus militum a populo* [88] A. Clodius A.f. Men(enia) Flaccus (CIL 10.1074d = ILS 5053 = Sabbatini Tumolesi (1980) no.1 = AE 2003, +312), where his military tribunate is given in larger text, and on its own line.
[183] Cf. ch. 7, pp.213-214.
[184] CIL 9.2648 = ILS 2228 (Aesernia, Regio 4, Italia); cf. Saddington (1996a) 167.

further example of this[185]. From probably the Tiberian period, the municipal career of *Ti. Iulius C.f. Fab(ia) Viator* comes between his first junior officer post (*subpraefectus cohortis*), and his second (*praefectus cohortis*)[186]. In addition, one junior officer's cursus inscription from the period is given in reverse chronological order[187]. However, this inscription describes a mainly senatorial career, and other senatorial careers are found in reverse chronological order in this period[188]. This suggests that a different set of conventions may have existed for the senatorial cursus. Possibly the structured nature of the senatorial cursus – individuals did not hold the praetorship before the quaestorship, for example, but might hold the military tribunate before or after they held the position of *praefectus fabrum* – meant that it would be clear to the intended audience in what order an individual's posts had been held. This would have allowed those setting up the inscription more freedom, while still providing a clear description of that person's career.

However, these exceptions are rare, and while we must be alert to the possibility that not all inscriptions fit the patterns we have identified, they are uncommon enough to allow us to treat the order of the majority of careers known through epigraphic data with some confidence. There are, however, two groups of junior officers known to us through the texts of decrees for whom a separate, but related, problem exists – the names of individuals, some of whom were junior officers, found in the recorded lists of the members of two *consilia* who were present when a commander issued a decree. One of these decrees is known from epigraphic evidence, a bronze inscription recording a grant of citizenship to a *turma* of Spanish cavalry made by Pompeius Strabo near Asculum in late 89BC. The second is a decree of Cornelius Lentulus Crus, granting exemption from military service to Jews, that is preserved (in three versions) in Book 14 of Josephus' *Antiquitates Iudaicae*.

Both decrees contain a list of named members of the commander's *consilia,* but only two individuals, [254] C. Seruilius Brocchus and [249] C. Sentius, are explicitly named as junior officers in these texts, both as military tribunes in the record of the *consilium* of Lentulus Crus. However, Cichorius argues that the sequence of

[185] CIL 11.969 (Regium Lepidum, Regio 8, Italia); Saddington (1996a) 167. For further examples of officers not from our period, see Saddington (1996a) 167ff.
[186] ILS 2703.
[187] [208] Sex. Palpellius P.f. Vel(ina) Hister (CIL 5.35 = ILS 946 = Inscr.It. 10.1.66 (Pola, Regio 10, Italia)).
[188] E.g. P. Cornelius P. f. Scipio (CIL 6.41050 = AE 1992, 186 = AE 1994, 144 (Roma)).

individuals listed in both the inscription and in Josephus follows an order of precedence[189]. This order of precedence has been used to designate a number of individuals in the two *consilia* as junior officers, despite the lack of any direct evidence. The reasons behind this must therefore be considered.

The inscription recording the consilium of Pompeius Strabo runs as follows[190]:

[C]n. Pompeius Sex. [f. imperator] uirtutis caussa / equites Hispanos ceiues [Romanos fecit in castr]eis apud Asculum a(nte) d(iem) XIV K(alendas) Dec(embres) / ex lege Iulia. in consilio [fuerunt] / L. Gellius L. f. Tro(mentina) Cn. Octauius Q. f. [- *room for name of tribe* - M. Caecilius . f. - *room for name of tribe* - Ser. Sulpi]cius C. f. Ani(ensi) L. Iunius L. f. Gal(eria) Q. Minuci(us) / M. f. Ter(etina) P. Attius P. f. Ouf(entina) M. Malolei(us) M. [f. - *room for name of tribe and for the next individual's entire entry* - M. Ae]mili(us) Q. f. Pal(atina) Cn. Corneli(us) Cn. f. Pal(atina) T. Anni(us) T. f. / Ouf(entina) M. Aureli(us) M. f. Vol(tinia) L. Volumni(us) L. f. Ani(ensi) L. [- *room for nomen, filiation, and tribe, followed by the next individual's praenomen, nomen, and father's praenomen* -] f. Suc(cusana) T. Pompei(us) T. f. Cor(nelia) C. Rabeiri(us) C. f. Gal(eria) / D. Aebuti(us) D. f. Cor(nelia) M. Teiedi(us) M. f. Pol(lia) C. Fundili(us) C. f. Q[ui(rina)] M. [M]aia[ni(us)?] M. [f. Se]r(gia)? T. Acili(us) T. f. Vel(ina) Cn. Oppi(us) Cn. f. Vel(ina) Q. Petilli(us) L. f. Vel(ina) / L. Terenti(us) A. f. Vel(ina) T. Terenti(us) A. f. Vel(ina) L. Vetti(us) L. f. Vel(ina) C. Fornasidi(us) C. f. Pol(lia) Cn. Pompei(us) Cn. f. Clu(stumina) Sex. Pompei(us) S<e=F>x. f. Clu(stumina) / M. <H=R>ostili(us) M. f. Vel(ina) L. A<e=F>buti(us) L. f. Men(enia) Q. Hirtule<i=L>(us) L. f. S<e=F>r(gia) L. Iuni(us) Q. f. Lem(onia) Q. Rosidi(us) Q. f. Qui(rina) C. Tarquiti(us) L. f. Fal(erna) Q. Marci(us) / L. f. Pap(iria) L. Opeimi(us) Q. f. Hor(atia) L. Instei(us) L. f. Fal(erna) T. Noni(us) T. f. Vel(ina) L. Noni(us) T. f. Vel(ina) C. Herius C. f. Clu(stumina) L. Ponti(us) T. f. Qui(rina) M. Lucani(us) M. f. / Hor(atia) L. Sergi(us) L. f. Tro(mentina) P. Pedani(us) P. f. A<e=B>m(ilia) C. Laetori(us) C. f. Vel(ina) A. Fului(us) A. f. Tro(mentina) Q. Ampudi(us) Q. f. Aim(ilia) L. Minuci(us) L. f. Vel(ina) / Ti. Veturi(us) T. f. Vel(ina) Cn. Busseni(us) Cn. f. Ste(llatina) T.

[189] Cichorius (1922) 134ff. This argument has since been developed and elaborated on by Criniti (1970).

[190] The text here largely follows Criniti (1970) 16-26 for the opening section, the list of Roman names, and the closing section (beginning "Cn. Pompeius Sex. f. imperator"). For the names of the Spanish cavalrymen beginning "Turma Salluitana", as Rawson ((1974) 65) suggests, the text here follows Dessau's edition in ILS 8888.

Petroni(us) P. f. Fab(ia) M'. Otacili(us) M'. f. Pol(lia) L. Pullienus L. f. Men(enia) M'. Aebuti(us) M'. f. Pol(lia) P. Saluienus / L. f. Mai(cia) L. Otacili(us) L. f. Pup(inia) // Turma Salluitana // Sanibelser Adingibas f. / Illurtibas Bilustibas f. / Estopeles Ordennas f. / T<o=C>rsinno Austinco f. / Bagarensis / Cacususin Chadar f. / [- - -]licenses / [- - -] Sosimilus f. / [- - -]irsecel f. / [- - -]elgaun f. / [- - -]nespaiser f. // Ilerdenses / <Q=O>. Otacilius Suisetarten f. / Cn. Cornelius Nesille f. / P. <F=E>abius Enasagin f. / Begensis / Turtumelis Atanscer f. / Segienses / Sosinadem Sosinasae f. / Sosimilus Sosinasae f. / Urgidar Luspanar f. / Gurtarno Biurno f. / Elandus Enneges f. // Agirnes Bennabels f. / Nalbeaden Agerdo f. / Arranes Arbiscar f. / Umargibas Luspang<i=V>b(as) f. / Ennegens<e=I>s / Beles Umarbeles f. / Turinnus Adimels f. / Ordumeles Burdo f. / Libenses / Bastugitas Adime<l=I>s f. / Umarillun Ta<r=B>bantu f. / Suconsenses / Belennes Albennes f. / Atullo Tautindals f. / Illuersensis / Balciadin Balcibil(os?) f. // Cn. Pompeius Sex. f. imperator / uirtutis caussa turmam / Salluitanam donauit in / castreis apud Asculum / cornuculo et patella torque / armilla p(h)alereis et f<r=A>umen<t=I>um / duplex.

It is worth noting that there are two decrees listed here, the first a grant of citizenship, the second the award of military *dona*. The absence of a *consilium* for the second decree is easily explained by the fact that this was a routine action for a Roman commander – whereas the grant of citizenship to an entire *turma* was not[191] – indeed, the presence of the *consilium* may well have been a legal requirement[192]. As Criniti notes, the inscription is probably a Republican text – the original bronze inscription placed on the Capitoline Hill, and while there are a number of scribal errors on the bronze, the majority of the text is relatively secure[193].

Cichorius' argument, later elaborated on by Criniti, is based in part on a passage in Caesar's *Civil Wars*[194]: "Caesar, ubi luxit, omnes senatores senatorumque liberos, tribunos militum equitesque Romanos ad se produci iubet. Erant quinquaginta; ordinis senatorii L. Domitius, P. Lentulus Spinther, L. Caecilius Rufus, Sex. Quintilius Varus quaestor, L. Rubrius; praeterea filius Domiti aliique complures adulescentes et magnus numerus equitum Romanorum et decurionum, quos ex municipiis Domitius euocauerat." Cichorius parallels this list with the list given by Josephus at *A.J.* 14.238,

[191] Cf. Criniti (1970) 35.
[192] C.f. Lintott (1993) 50-52; Bruand (1998) 12.
[193] Cf. Criniti (1970) 10-12.
[194] Caesar, *B.C.* 1.23.

which begins with T. Ampius Balbus, *legatus pro praetore*, who is then followed by a number of individuals, the majority of whom appear to be equestrians, and two of whom are named as military tribunes. We have evidence from Polybius that a commander's *consilium* included *primipili*[195], and therefore they are added to Caesar's categories to give a list of the types of individuals who would have been present in Pompeius Strabo's *consilium*: legates, the quaestor, members of the senatorial ordo, military tribunes, equestrians, and *primipili*[196].

Cichorius then makes a logical assumption, one that appears to be supported by the lists given in Josephus and the groups of individuals given by Caesar, namely that individuals are named in order of status[197]. This means that the first five of the individuals in the *consilium* of Pompeius Strabo would be *legati* (assuming five legates per commander[198]) followed by a quaestor. The first five of the 59 individuals in the list – allowing the restoration of the name of M. Caecilius in the gap – do appear to have been of senatorial rank[199], and the sixth (designated as a quaestor), Q. Minucius, could well be Q. Minucius Thermus, who was a *monetalis* in the 90s BC, and *legatus pro praetore* in 86BC[200]. Given that Pompeius Strabo probably had four legions under his command, the final four individuals in the list are designated as *primipili*[201].

This then leaves the problem of assigning rank and status to the remaining 49 individuals in the list. Following the order of precedence established in Caesar, *B.C.* 1.23, Cichorius assumes that there is a list of military tribunes followed by a list of equestrians. Given that two high status individuals, Pompeius Magnus and L. Sergius Catilina, appear well down this list of 49 individuals, while a number of equestrians appear in the early part of the list, it is assumed that the sons of senators were grouped with the equestrians[202]. In addition, the alphabetically ordered group of men from the Velina tribe (therefore probably Picenes) that begins on line 7 with T. Acilius T.f. is taken to be the start of the list of equestrians[203]. This leaves 16 individuals, from [45]

[195] Polybius 6.24, cf. Mommsen (1887-1888) 1.316.
[196] Cichorius (1922) 134; Criniti (1970) 77.
[197] For a fuller exposition of this argument, cf. Criniti (1970) 78.
[198] Appian, *B.C.* 1.40.179ff.; cf. Cichorius (1922) 139ff.; Criniti (1975) 78-79.
[199] Cf. Cichorius (1922) 138ff.; Criniti (1970) 78-79, 93-101.
[200] RE 66; Cichorius (1922) 143; Criniti (1970) 101.
[201] Cf. Criniti (1970) 81-82.
[202] Cichorius (1922) 155ff.; Criniti (1970) 80.
[203] Cichorius (1922) 155ff.; Criniti (1970) 80-82, 123ff.

P. Attius to [168] M. Maianius, who are designated as military tribunes. Cichorius argues that there may be some form of internal order to the list of military tribunes, with those of senatorial families perhaps listed before those for whom no senatorial ancestry can be discerned[204]. While Strabo's army would have contained at least 24 military tribunes (assuming that there were six for each of four legions), the remaining eight military tribunes are assumed to have been serving with other parts of Strabo's army[205].

This argument is logical, and provides a reasonable explanation for the structure of part of the list. It does not, however, answer all of the problems which it raises. For example, it does not provide a rationale for the order of the rest of the equestrians, who are not listed in order of age, senatorial origin, alphabetical order, or tribe (with the exception of the group of men from the Velina tribe)[206]. The most plausible suggestion is that if the list of equestrians has an order, it is by the date of enlistment[207], although it may well be that it is not ordered at all[208].

The inclusion of Pompeius Magnus and Sergius Catilina among the equestrians highlights a difference between the inscribed list and the group called to attend upon Caesar in 49BC, where the sons of senators are separated from the equestrians. This is not in itself a significant problem: Caesar's group was not a formal *consilium*, nor, whatever the general impression Caesar is trying to convey in the passage, is that what he claims it to be. However, it demonstrates that care should be taken in using the passage from Caesar as evidence for the composition and ordering of Pompeius Strabo's *consilium*.

The proposed list excludes (or does not name) any prefects, including a prefect in charge of the Spanish cavalrymen who were being enfranchised. While we would not expect to see *praefecti socium* during this stage of the Social War[209], the complete absence of *praefecti* from the proposed list is problematic. We might also expect one or more *praefecti fabrum* in the *consilium* of Pompeius Strabo (as, indeed, Suolahti

[204] Cichorius (1922) 145-154; Criniti (1970) 103-123; cf. Suolahti (1955) 338.
[205] Given that Pompeius Strabo's was a consular army, it is likely that these military tribunes were elected. On the activities of Pompeius Strabo's army, cf. Criniti (1970) 79-80.
[206] Criniti (1970) 82-83.
[207] Cichorius (1922) 156ff.; Criniti (1970) 81; Rawson (1974) 64.
[208] This, as Criniti notes, is perhaps the most likely conclusion (Criniti (1970) 92).
[209] Criniti (1970) 80 n. 50.

proposes for Lentulus Crus' *consilium*[210]). Caesar's list may not include prefects, but Domitius' forces contained no cavalry or auxiliaries, and Domitius may not have had any *praefecti fabrum*[211].

Cichorius' method of identifying individuals is sometimes applied overconfidently[212]. This makes assumptions about the ordering of certain parts of the list, in particular the ordering of the military tribunes, uncertain. Moreover, other groupings are theoretically possible: it is conceivable that the six men from the tribe Velina were military tribunes (this would bring the total number of military tribunes to 22), and thus they would no longer provide Cichorius' point of division between the military tribunes and equestrians, and it is also possible that the military tribunes are mixed with the equestrians in the rest of the list. I believe, however, that Cichorius makes a strong case for his ordering of the list, and I therefore accept as probably correct his identification of 16 of the individuals in this list as military tribunes.

In comparison to the text of Pompeius Strabo's *consilium*, the two lists of individuals given by Josephus[213] are extremely problematic. The two lists are, as Forni and Ben Zeev argue, two copies of the same decree – another version, without the names of the members of the *consilium*, can be found at Josephus *A.J.* 14.234[214]. The decree itself, which granted exemption from military service for Jews, probably Jews who were Roman citizens[215], appears to have been copied, abridged, and recopied (with a number of scribal errors – a corruption of the date of the first copy in particular), to the point where Josephus believed that he had three separate decrees. None of the

---

[210] Suolahti (1958) 153, 155-156; cf. T. Ampius Menander.
[211] Cf. Caesar, *B.C.* 1.16: Domitius' force consisted of 20 cohorts of hastily levied citizen infantry. It is more likely, however, that Caesar simply does not name Domitius' *praefecti fabrum* explicitly, and that he (or they) would have been included among the equestrians.
[212] Cf. Mattingly (1975) 262ff.
[213] Josephus, *A.J.* 14.229: Τίτος Ἄμπιος Τίτου υἱὸς Βάλβος Ὁρατία πρεσβευτής, Τίτος Τόνγιος Τίτου υἱὸς Κροστομίνα, Κόιντος Καίσιος Κοΐντου, Τίτος Πομπήιος Τίτου Λογγῖνος, Γάιος Σερουίλιος Γαΐου υἱὸς Τηρητίνα Βράκκος χιλίαρχος, Πόπλιος Κλούσιος Ποπλίου Ἐτωρία [Γάλλος], Γάιος Σέντιος Γαΐου υἱὸς, [Γάιος Πομπήιος Γαΐου υἱὸς?] Σαβατίνα; *A.J.* 14.238-240: Τίτος Ἄμπιος Τίτου υἱὸς Βάλβος Ὁρατία πρεσβευτής, Τίτος Τόνγιος Κροστομίνα, Κόιντος Καίσιος Κοΐντου, Τίτος Πήιος Τίτου υἱὸς Κορνηλία Λογγῖνος, Γάιος Σερουίλιος Γαΐου Τηρητείνα Βρόκχος χιλίαρχος, Πόπλιος Κλούσιος Ποπλίου υἱὸς Ἐτωρία Γάλλος, Γάιος Τεύτιος Γαΐου Αἰμιλία χιλίαρχος, Σέξστος Ἀτίλιος Σέξστου υἱὸς Αἰμιλία Σέσρανος, Γάιος Πομπήιος Γαΐου υἱὸς Σαβατίνα, Τίτος Ἄμπιος Τίτου Μένανδρος, Πόπλιος Σερουίλιος Ποπλίου υἱὸς Στράβων, Λεύκιος Πάκκιος Λευκίου Κολλίνα Καπίτων, Αὖλος Φούριος Αὔλου υἱὸς Τέρτιος, Ἄππιος Μηνᾶς.
[214] Forni (1982) 154-155; Ben Zeev (1998) 150-152, 158ff., 190-191; cf. the original argument of Juster ((1914) 143), and also Syme (1964a) 161-162; Smallwood (1976) 127. On the organisation and collection of the documents in Josephus, *Antiquitates Iudaicae* 14, see Eilers (2003) 2ff.
[215] On the purpose of the decree, which is not directly relevant to this discussion, cf. Ben Zeev (1998) 150-154, 158-160.

copies contains all of the evidence found in the other two, although the third copy, at *A.J.* 14.236ff., is the fullest.

The discrepancies between the two lists of names are partly small omissions such as filiation, voting tribe, or cognomen[216]. However there are a number of individuals mentioned in the second list (*A.J.* 14.236ff.) whose names are missing from the first (*A.J.* 14.229, which contains a lacuna)[217], and one name, that of [249] C. Sentius, is entirely corrupt in the second list[218]. Moreover, despite Suolahti's suggestion that Lentulus Crus' *consilium*, convened at a time of crisis, was likely to be small[219], there is no evidence that we have a full list of the members of the *consilium*: given the size of the *consilium* of Pompeius Strabo, and the size of the body in Caesar, *B.C.* 1.23 (part of a makeshift force convened in the same year as Lentulus Crus' *consilium*), this would be a dangerous assumption to make. The numerous scribal errors, which accumulated to the point where Josephus was unable to discern that the two lists represented the same document, create a significant degree of doubt as to the lists' reliability[220].

Despite this, Suolahti argues that Cichorius' methodology can be applied to a new, combined, list of the names found in the two passages[221]. The list begins with T. Ampius Balbus, who is named as a legate by Josephus, followed by T. Tongius (identified by Suolahti as a legate) and Q. Raesius (identified by Suolahti as a legate or a quaestor). There follows a list of eight names identified by Suolahti as possible junior officers, beginning with T. Pompeius T.f. Cornelia Longinus. Two of these eight, [254] C. Seruilius C.f. Teretina Brocchus and [249] C. Sentius C.(f.) Aemilia, are named by Josephus as military tribunes (the term used on each occasion is "χιλίαρχος"). This in itself is curious, as no such titles are given to any individuals in the *consilium* of Pompeius Strabo (nor are they found in equivalent documents, such as the *senatus consultum de Oropiorum et publicanorum controuersiis*[222]).

---

[216] Cf. Suolahti (1958) 154; Forni (1982) 158-159; Ben Zeev (1998) 154ff., 188.
[217] For a reconstruction of the text, see Ben Zeev (1998) 154ff.
[218] On the identity of [249] C. Sentius C.(f.) Aemilia, cf. Forni (1982) 163; Ben Zeev (1998) 156; cf. Syme (1964a) 161; contra, Suolahti (1958) 153.
[219] Suolathi (1958) 155.
[220] As Suolahti partially concedes; cf. Suolahti (1958) 154, for an even sterner criticism (which, in the light of Ben Zeev's analysis, is not entirely applicable to these documents); cf. Moehring (1975) 150-158.
[221] Suolathi (1958) 153.
[222] RDGE 23 = RGE 70; cf. Sherk (1969) 133ff.

Suolahti's hypothesis would provide the names of three, and possibly four, additional military tribunes: T. Pompeius T.f. Cornelia Longinus, P. Clusius P.f. Veturia Gallus, Sex. Atilius Sex.f. Aemilia Serranus, and C. Pompeius C.f. Sabatina, along with a *praefectus fabrum*, T. Ampius T.(l.) Menander[223], and a possible prefect, P. Seruilius P.f. Strabo. With the exception of Ampius Menander, who was probably a freedman of T. Ampius Balbus[224], these identifications rely almost entirely upon Cichorius' methodology[225], and have found acceptance in the scholarly literature[226].

However, Suolahti's application of Cichorius' methodology to such badly damaged lists is fraught with difficulty. While it may seem logical that P. Clusius Gallus, named between C. Seruilius Brocchus and C. Sentius (who are explicitly named as military tribunes by Josephus), was also a military tribune, the presence of officer positions beside some names cannot safely be assumed to imply officer positions for any other individuals.[227] In this thesis, therefore, only those individuals explicitly named as junior officers in these passages of Josephus are considered to have been junior officers.

Despite these problems, the epigraphic evidence provides us with a number of opportunities which literary evidence does not. Epigraphic evidence, for example, generally concerns individuals of a lower social status than literary evidence, which generally focuses upon the highest levels of the Roman elite. Moreover, literary evidence rarely allows us to examine an individual's entire career. We know nothing of, for example, [204] M. Orfius beyond a single mention in one of Cicero's letters[228], or of [303] Volcatius Tullus bar the account provided by Caesar[229], although literary evidence often provides us with more detail than epigraphic evidence about what an individual did while a junior officer. In addition, epigraphic evidence generally allows for a greater degree of certainty about the post an individual held than the literary evidence. As we have seen, while the majority of the literary sources for our period were familiar with military terminology, this was not always employed. In a number

[223] T. Ampius T.(f.) Menander in Suolahti ((1955) 343, (1958) 167).
[224] Cicero, *ad Fam.* 13.70.
[225] Suolahti's argument that, as a freedman, he would not have been present unless he had been made a *praefectus fabrum*, adds weight to the identification (cf. Suolahti (1958) 167ff.).
[226] Cf. Ben Zeev (1998) 155ff.
[227] Suolahti (1955) 340, (1958) 153.
[228] Cicero, *ad Q.f.* 2.14.2.
[229] Caesar, *B.G.* 6.29.4.

of cases, for example, that of [186] L. [Minucius] Basilus in 88BC[230] or [102] Faustus Cornelius Sulla in 63BC[231], a literary source allows us to identify a man as a junior officer, but does not allow us to discover which post he held.

In general, however, the evidence for junior officers in our period is not as poor as might be expected. Despite the relatively cautious approach to the identification of junior officers adopted in this thesis, over 300 individual junior officers can be confidently ascribed to our period. While, of course, this represents only a fraction of the total officers who must have been in service, it nevertheless represents a considerable body of evidence from which to examine the junior officers, and the junior officer positions, of our period.

[230] Plutarch, *Sul.* 9.5-6.
[231] Josephus, *A.J.* 14.69; cf. *A.J.* 73, *B.J.* 1.149.

Ch. 2: The Development of the Junior Officer Positions and Elite Service in the Roman Army 201 – 92 BC

The Roman army of the first century BC was the result of a long and sometimes haphazard evolution which had seen it grow from a small force of citizen soldiers to the engine of a Mediterranean superpower. To discuss that evolution in full is beyond the scope of this chapter. Instead, I seek here to discuss the development of the junior officer positions of the Roman army from the end of the Hannibalic War to the Social War. In doing this, four different factors must be considered: firstly, the size of the junior officer corps (how many officer positions of each kind were available in any given year, and how this changed over time); secondly, the roles and functions of the junior officer corps within the command structure of the legion and in relation to auxiliary forces, and the type of skills that these activities required; thirdly, the command of non-Roman troops, the *Latini* and *socii* as well as non-Italian forces, by non-Roman commanders; and finally, the status of each junior officer position.

The number of junior officer positions available

The number of legions in service can, of course, be estimated. The period between 201 and 168BC saw an average of approximately nine legions in service each year. The period between 167 and 92BC, however, saw a significant fall in the number of legions in service, with an average of approximately six legions serving each year. There were, of course, significant fluctuations in the number of legions in service from year to year as the military situation demanded: the wars against Jugurtha, for example, meant that two more legions per year were required in those years[1].

We learn from Polybius that there were six military tribunes per legion[2]. From the above figures, the average number of military tribunes in service can be calculated. A total of approximately 4,758 military tribunates were available between 201 and 92BC, an average of 42 in any given year, of whom 2,640 (55%) would have been

[1] Figures from Brunt (1971) 418 (Table X), 424 (Table XI), 432-433 (Table XIII). All figures given are rounded to the nearest integer. It should be pointed out that these figures rely on certain assumptions being made about the number of legions in service in any one year. There are, of course, a number of controversies surrounding precisely how many legions were in service in some provinces during certain conflicts (e.g. Brunt (1971) 424 (Table XI)); in all cases, the conclusions of Brunt have been followed. However, while the precise figures given here may be open to debate, they would not have changed significantly had somewhat contrary conclusions to those of Brunt been adopted at every stage.

[2] Polybius 6.19. On his account, see further below.

elected. However, it must be remembered that the fluctuations in the number of legions in service during the second century, especially the high number of legions in service during the period 201 – 168BC, make it unwise to place too much weight upon the average number of positions available during the entire period. It should be noted that the approximate number of military tribunates annually available between 167 and 92BC (36) was significantly lower than the number available between 201 and 168BC (54).

Calculating the number of prefectures available for any given period during the Republic is extremely difficult. For the Principate we can estimate with some confidence the numbers of military *praefecti* in service each year[3]; for the Republic, however, we cannot do this. There was, it seems, no limit on the number of prefectures available, and we have no clear evidence about how many there actually were[4]; and without an indication of the number of auxiliary units in service, it is not possible to tell how many prefects would be required to command them[5].

For the period 201 – 92BC, we can divide junior officers who were prefects into six kinds: cavalry prefects (in permanent command of a unit of allied cavalry); naval prefects (in charge of a fleet or squadron of ships)[6]; *praefecti socium*, in charge of units of *socii* and *Latini*; prefects given another specific role or task (often to take charge of a vexillation), described here as 'military prefects'; military prefects who were garrison commanders; and *praefecti fabrum*.

The roles assigned to these prefects will be discussed below. Only with the *praefecti socium* can we estimate how many positions were available, but even here there is a problem: Polybius records that 12 were appointed, but it is not clear if this means twelve for each consular army of two legions or six for each consular army of two legions[7]. Of the recorded prefects, however, the majority are naval and cavalry

[3] Devijver (1973) 552.
[4] Evidence from the first century BC exemplifies the scale of the problem. The five prefectures created by Pompey for each of his Spanish provinces were merely nominal prefectures, intended to allow individuals in Rome to avoid jury service, and thus provide no real guide as to how many prefects – let alone military prefects - were actually in service in either province; Cicero, *ad Att.* 5.4.3, 7.1; cf. 11.1 (on similar prefectures offered by Cicero, nominally for Cilicia).
[5] Cf. Millar (1995) 242-243; Goldsworthy (1996) 18-22; Prag (2007) 76.
[6] In the second century, there were also, for a time, *duumuiri nauales*, but none is attested after 178BC (see Suolahti (1955) 188-197).
[7] Polybius 6.26.5. In the former case (cf. Polybius 6.34.4), that would mean six for each *ala* (legion-equivalent), corresponding to the six military tribunes for each legion (e.g. Keppie (1984) 23); in the latter, three for each *ala* (e.g. Suolahti (1955) 200; Walbank (1957-1979) ad loc.).

prefects. This is, perhaps, to be expected given that their roles were of a considerably higher status than the other prefectures, and we would therefore expect them to feature disproportionately in our sources. There were probably more military prefects and garrison commanders in service than the total number of cavalry and naval prefects, but not, perhaps, as many in service as there were *praefecti socium*. Given the speculative nature of these estimates, as well as the scanty nature of our sources, it is only possible to estimate that for the period 201 – 92BC there were more prefects in service than military tribunes, the majority being *praefecti socium*.

The roles and functions of the junior officer positions

The command structure of the Roman army was, as many modern authors have noted, relatively flat and remarkably flexible[8]. From the post-Hannibalic war period onwards, each Roman force (which might contain several legions and *auxilia*) was led by a single commander, who was either a magistrate or, more commonly, a pro-magistrate, along with a quaestor as his deputy, part of whose responsibility was to oversee the army's finances[9].

During the course of the second century there was a gradual proliferation of experienced, high-status senatorial legates below the commander[10]. The military tribunes lost many of their important roles: it was now *legati* that took part in embassies and led large detachments of troops (which by this time could mean the command of several legions and *auxilia*)[11]. Legates did not, however, have pre-assigned duties: their roles were decided by the commander as he saw fit.

Below the legates were the junior officers: the prefects and military tribunes. The way in which the normal roles of each of the junior officers fitted into the command structure is described below[12]. However it is important to note that in addition to their normal duties, a junior officer could be assigned any *ad hoc* role or command. Military tribunes, for example, could be assigned to command *auxilia*[13], while

[8] Gelzer (1968) 126; Gruen (1974) 114; Greenhalgh (1981) 88; Keppie (1984) 24; Goldsworthy (1996) 132; Meier (1996) 260.
[9] On the role of the commander, see Lintott (1993) 50ff.; Goldsworthy (1996) 116ff.
[10] Cf. Keppie (1984) 24.
[11] On the role and importance of *legati*, see Suolahti (1955) 198ff.; Smith (1958) 111; Keppie (1984) 39-40; de Blois (1987) 14ff.; Goldsworthy (1996) 141.
[12] On the normal roles of prefects (other than *praefecti socium*, on whom see below), see ch. 3, p.78ff.
[13] E.g. Sallust, *Iug*. 46.

prefects could be put in command of legionary troops[14] and, indeed, other junior officers[15]. Junior officers could also take the place of a legate, or even a quaestor, if necessary[16]. Therefore, a commander was free to create much of his officer command structure as he saw fit[17], a freedom that would have been enhanced by the fact that, as we shall see[18], the scope of many prefectures was also a matter for the commander to decide.

The command of naval forces was somewhat different, in that some naval prefects were directly appointed by the Senate and acted under their own *imperium*, although as a result, these men should not be seen as junior officers[19]. Most legates or prefects still served under a commander and (as we shall see) naval prefects could serve under a legate or in pairs[20]. The ship captains – who were rarely Romans – were generally in command of their own ships. This can be seen in an incident from 49BC, where Marcius Rufus, who was a quaestor, had to give orders directly to the ship captains after the naval prefect, [120] Flamma, had fled[21].

As a result of the detailed description of the Roman army in the sixth book of Polybius, we have a picture of the roles and duties of the military tribunes during the middle of the second century, as well as an idea of how they fitted into the military structure of the Roman army, at least into that of the 'manipular legion'. The military tribunate was an old and long established post even by the start of the First Punic War, one with its origins in the regal period. Military tribunes had traditionally commanded armies in the absence of the consul, aided in the conduct of the levy, and trained the troops, and the post was of sufficient importance that, when the consulate was briefly suspended, the senior magistrates of the state took the title of "military tribune with consular imperium"[22]. The relatively high status of military tribunes in the army, and their role, is described in detail by Polybius[23], and their important role

[14] E.g. Caesar, *B.G.* 6.36ff.
[15] E.g. Caesar, *B.G.* 3.14.2; cf. [149] D. Iunius Brutus Albinus.
[16] Caesar, *B.C.* 3.52.4; cf. [128] Fuluius Postumus.
[17] Cf. Goldsworthy (1996) 124.
[18] Cf. ch. 3, p.78.
[19] E.g. *M. Plautius Hypseaeus* (Valerius Maximus 4.6.3).
[20] E.g. Appian, *Mith.* 17; cf. [188] Minucius Rufus (1), [234] C. Popilius (1).
[21] Caesar, *B.C.* 2.43; Appian, *B.C.* 2.46; cf. [120] [?Flaminius] Flamma.
[22] For a review of the early role and functions of the military tribunate, see Suolahti (1955) 43ff.; La Rosa (1994) 15ff.
[23] Polybius 6.19ff.

in military life and in combat is regularly shown by events in Livy[24]. Each legion had six military tribunes assigned to it, and by the end of the third century 24 were elected annually in total, six to be assigned by lot to each of the four consular legions that made up the regular strength of the Roman army[25]; for each additional legion, six military tribunes were selected by that legion's commander. In Polybius' time, fourteen of the elected military tribunes had to have performed five years' active service and ten had to have performed ten years' active service[26]. We do not know whether there was a minimum service requirement for military tribunes appointed by generals. Despite their many duties, military tribunes were attached to sub-divisions of the legion only temporarily – generally for the purposes of laying out the camp and assigning guard duty (a role which, after the re-organisation of the legion into cohorts, may well have lapsed)[27]. It is worth noting that there was not, until the Augustan period, a legionary legate (or equivalent) who was responsible for the command of each individual legion. While a legate might be given command of a legion, it seems that the military tribunes might normally be directly responsible to the commander, or to the legate – and occasionally prefect – in charge of a detachment[28]. In general, military tribunes shared their duties between them. Polybius reports that for supervising duties in the field the military tribunes divided themselves into pairs, with each pair performing those duties for a period of two months, after which another pair would take over. The other four military tribunes were at the disposal of their commander and formed part of the general staff[29]. However, it is unlikely that this specific practice survived into the first century BC: it was designed to function while the Roman army was only in service for the summer months, which does not fit the more 'professional' army of the post-Marian period. Moreover, Plutarch records that in 67BC military tribunes were entitled to two months of leave during their term of office, something which Polybius' account of their roles would not seem to allow[30]. Yet regardless of the precise way in which their duties were subdivided, the military

[24] E.g. Livy 28.24.5.
[25] Livy 27.36.14.
[26] Polybius 6.19.1
[27] Polybius 6.33, 34; cf. Suolahti (1955) 43ff.; Smith (1958) 59ff. On the fact that military tribunes were not permanently attached to cohorts, see Breeze (1969) 55; cf. Goldsworthy (1996) 15.
[28] Keppie (1984) 72. On the difficulties this arrangement might pose for a commander, cf. Goldsworthy (1996) 35-36. On the command structure within the legion below the military tribunate, see Goldsworthy (1996) 23ff.
[29] Polybius 6.34.3; Livy 40.41.
[30] Plutarch, *Cato min.* 10.1-2.

tribunes appear to have functioned not as individual officers, but as a college throughout our period: there is no evidence that suggests that military tribunes had different roles or functions within the legion, or that they were permanently assigned individual duties beyond those listed above. The evidence of Livy, which describes L. Atius as "tribunus primus secundae legionis"[31], might suggest that there was a hierarchy within the military tribunate, but in the absence of any other evidence of this it is more natural to take "tribunus primus" as referring to his seniority, or to his order in the poll in which he was elected[32].

The period of office for the elected military tribunes ran, in theory, from January 1st for twelve months[33], but the appointed military tribunes were attached in the first place to the commander, not to the army, and, unlike centurions, their offices may have lapsed when the commander left his province or when their successors arrived. Evidence from the first century BC certainly suggests this: the military tribunes of Appius Claudius Pulcher in 53BC had gone home by the time that Cicero took over the army in Cilicia[34]. And appointed military tribunes, in the first century at least, could be dismissed from the army[35].

Before the military reforms at the end of the second century, military tribunes were appointed to their legions at the start of the *dilectus* and before the legions themselves had been formed[36]; from this point they helped to conduct the levy and organise the troops[37], although at some point before the mid-first century (possibly during the military reforms of the late second century and the enlisting of the *proletarii*) the duty of raising the men for the legions was taken over by *conquisitores*[38]. After the levy it was the military tribunes who took the military oath, first oversaw the taking of it by the troops[39], and then assigned the non-officer roles within the legion (centurions,

[31] Livy 41.3.
[32] Cf. Plutarch, *Iul.* 5.1.
[33] Cicero, *Verr.* 1.30, *ad Att.* 13.33.3; Polybius 6.19.1; Plutarch, *Cato Min.* 8.4-5; Sallust, *B.J.* 63.4; cf. Lintott (1999) 140.
[34] See Cicero, *ad Fam.* 15.4.2; Digest 29.1.30; cf. Harmand (1967) 354.
[35] Caesar, *B.Afr*. 54.
[36] Polybius 6.19.8.
[37] Livy 26.15.6 (Fulvius orders military tribunes and *praefecti socium* to select a picked force of two thousand cavalry to escort him to Rome, 211BC); 42.35.2 (Spurius Ligustinus appointed by the military tribunes as *primipilus* of the first legion as a reward for his speech, 171BC).
[38] Cicero, *pro Mil*. 67, *ad Att*. 7.21.1. *Conquisitores* were also used in crises during and after the Hannibalic war: Livy 25.5.6 (211BC), 41.5.4 (179BC).
[39] Polybius 6.21.1; cf. Caesar, *B.C.* 3.13.4.

signallers, etc.)[40]. Later evidence suggests that they oversaw the training of the recruits, although this is doubted by Suolahti, as it would normally have been the role of the centurions[41] – possibly they were responsible for ensuring that the centurions had trained the men properly. They chose the site for the camp[42], supervised its construction and organised the troops when they arrived within it[43], and were responsible for the watch being kept and the wakefulness of the sentries[44]; they were also responsible for receiving the watchword of the day from the commander, at which time, says Appian, it was customary to give the commander the list of troops available for service that day[45]. While the payment of the troops and other financial matters were the responsibility of the quaestor, the military tribunes looked after most of the other matters relating to the lives of their soldiers. In camp the military tribunes had an administrative role, looking to the health and rights of the troops[46]; they could also recommend good men to the commander for reward[47]. Later evidence also suggests that they were responsible for the welfare of the troops, for keeping a record of the service history and character of each soldier and, when the soldiers had served their time, for discharging them[48]. They had the right to punish offences as well, and could substitute barley for wheat (a traditional degradation), keep back pay, fine, hold in pledge, degrade or transfer, flog or give extra duties[49]. During the imperial period, these powers were clearly open to abuse, and Hadrian, seeking to prevent favouritism within the army, prohibited a military tribune from accepting presents from his soldiers[50].

These roles, and responsibilities, appear to have been only slightly affected by the two major changes to the Roman legion during the first century BC – the development of the cohort as the tactical unit of organisation[51], and the professionalism and training of

[40] Cicero, *in Pis.* 88; Pliny, *Ep*. 6.25.3.
[41] Suolahti (1955) 46; cf. Digest 49.16.12.2; SHA, *Max.* 6; Vegetius 2.12.
[42] Caesar, *B.G*. 2.17.1; Polybius 6.33.7-12.
[43] This, and the selection of the location of the camp, was taken over by the *castrorum metator* in the late Republic (Cicero, *Phil.* 11.12.), and was later the job of the *praefectus castrorum*: Vegetius 2.10; Tacitus, *Hist.* 2.89.2.
[44] Livy 28.24.8; Polybius 6.33.7-12, 6.35-6.
[45] Appian, *B.C.* 5.200.
[46] Health: Livy 8.36.6; rights: Livy 40.41.8 (180 BC).
[47] Livy 28.24.10; cf. Digest 49.16.2-3.
[48] Appian *B.C.* 5.192; Digest 49.16.2, 12; cf. Appian, *B.C*. 3.43; Tacitus, *Ann*. 1.37, 42; Vegetius 1.20.
[49] Caesar, *B.Afr.* 54; Dio 49.38.4; Livy 40.41.11; Polybius 6.37.8-10, 38.3-4; Valerius Maximus 2.7.9, 15.
[50] SHA, *Hadr.* 10.6.
[51] Cf. Bell (1965) 404ff.; Cadiou (2001) 167ff.; Caginard (2005).

the rank and file that resulted from the 'Marian reforms' and the enlistment of the *proletarii*[52]. As military tribunes were not permanently attached to subdivisions of the legion, the development of the cohort as the key tactical unit did not affect many of their duties, nor their place within the command hierarchy[53]. Military tribunes do not appear to have had a designated role in combat within the manipular legion, nor within the cohort-based legion, and their combat responsibilities, in both cases, were probably assigned by the commander as the situation required. And while the change in the way in which legions were levied affected, of course, the role of the tribunes in the *dilectus*[54], the enlistment of the *proletarii* and the 'professional' training of Rome's soldiers do not appear to have had a direct effect upon the normal role and functions of the military tribunes as overseers of discipline or as guardians of the men's welfare.

While we have a reasonably detailed picture of the role of the military tribunate, our evidence for the roles of military prefects is more limited, and we have to rely upon more disparate sources of information. The situation is complicated further by the fact that prefectures, with the exception of the role of *praefectus socium* and possibly that of *praefectus fabrum*, seem not yet to have evolved into the relatively well understood, and terminologically distinct, prefectures of the Principate, such as *praefectus equitum* or *praefectus cohortis*. While prefects were in charge of units of cavalry or ships, they appear to have been often known as *praefecti*, rather than specifically as *praefecti equitum* or *praefecti classis*, and this probably reflects the fact that their roles had not standardised to the extent that they required separate titles, although it may also reflect the inadequacies of literary evidence. While the terms *praefectus equitum* and *praefectus classis* are commonly used in modern literature to describe prefects in the second and early first centuries BC, the individuals in question probably did not, in fact, hold posts with those names, and careful attention needs to be paid to the language used to describe their prefectures.

[52] Cf. Rich (1983) 287ff.; Keppie (1986) 42ff.; Caginard (2005).
[53] Breeze (1969) 55; cf. Goldsworthy (1996) 15.
[54] They may, however, have retained some responsibility for the raising of troops, as [115] C. Fabricius C.f. Ani(ensi) Tuscus was *tribunus dilectus* in the Augustan period. It is possible, however, that this represents the re-establishment of the historic role of the military tribunate as a temporary measure in response to a manpower crisis.

The earliest attested epigraphic use of the term *praefectus* in what appears to be a military context is in the *lex agraria* generally attributed to C. Gracchus[55], which reads "[---] praefectus milesue in prouinciam er[it…]". As Crawford suggests[56], this section lists those exempted from the benefits implied in the rest of the clause, which concerns land distribution in the provinces. However, it does not specifically state that the *praefecti* involved are military, and a civilian *praefectus*, perhaps one appointed by the governor to control a certain aspect of the running of the province (on which see below), might equally be the type of person referred to here. The next epigraphic use of the term *praefectus* in a possibly military context comes from the inscription from Samothrace of 101-100BC describing C. Fannius and L. Tullius [Cicero] each as "praef(ectus)", in contrast to two other Romans each named only as "eq(ues)"[57]. However, as before, it is not clear that they held a military command. The text does suggest, however, that the title of *praefectus* was an official one which could be given by *imperatores* in the provinces.

The literary evidence for *praefecti* is potentially confusing. *Praefecti socium* are well attested, and are referred to explicitly in Livy as such[58], and Polybius glosses the ἄρχοντες in charge of the allied contingents as πραίφεκτοι[59]. In both cases, it is clear that there was a well-defined post held by individuals who were known as *praefecti socium*. However, with the exception of the post of *praefectus fabrum*[60], the same is not true for other prefects. The term *praefectus* itself is used as a military title explicitly by Sallust and by Orosius, presumably drawing on Livy. In Sallust, the legate M. Petreius is described as "homo militaris" on the grounds that "amplius annos triginta tribunus aut praefectus aut legatus aut praetor cum magna gloria in exercitu fuerat"[61]. Orosius lists the hierarchy of the officers at the siege of Praeneste in much the same way as Sallust, albeit in descending order: "legatos, quaestores, praefectos et tribunos"[62]. Caesar refers to the young Crassus as addressing the

[55] *Lex agraria* l.55 in Crawford (1996) 113ff. esp. 119.
[56] Crawford (1996) 171.
[57] AE 2001, 1741a (Samothracia, Thracia); Clinton (2001) 27-28.
[58] E.g. Livy 23.7.3, 24.40.8, 27.24.3; cf. Suolahti (1955) 200 nn.3-5.
[59] Polybius 6.26.5.
[60] On *praefecti fabrum*, see ch. 3, pp.84-86.
[61] Sallust, *Cat.* 59.6.
[62] Orosius 5.21.10.

"equitum praefectos", but the individuals referred to were almost certainly native commanders of Gallic cavalry, not Roman officers[63].

The evidence of Cicero shows how widely the term *praefectus* could be used. In one letter to Atticus, Cicero discusses what post was held in the second century by one Tuditanus: "But you will be able to learn from Antiochus in which year he was a quaestor or a military tribune. If he was neither, you will have to find out if he was one of the *praefecti* or the *contubernales*, if he was even in that war at all"[64]. When reporting his accounts to Mescinius Rufus, Cicero writes that he has already submitted details of payments to his military tribunes, prefects and *contubernales*[65], and quotes one of his prefects as referring to the "cibaria praefecti"[66]. He also boasts that due to his conduct and that of his legates, tribunes, and *praefecti*, not the smallest coin has been wasted in his governorship[67], and generously forbears from going into detail on the misdeeds of the prefects, staff and legates of his predecessor Ap. Claudius[68]. The letter concerning Tuditanus clearly suggests that *praefecti* were officers in the army. The other examples, however, could conceivably refer to *praefecti* who did not hold a military command.

Moreover, even leaving aside the evidence from Cicero that prefectures were given to people as favours to avoid jury service in Rome[69], Cicero's correspondence with Atticus regarding Brutus' agents in Cilicia suggests that even prefectures that were taken up did not necessarily imply command over troops. Before leaving for Cilicia, Cicero had informed Atticus of a firm rule he was setting for himself – that no prefectures were to be given to *negotiatores* operating in his province, although he did not mind giving prefectures to those operating outside of his province[70]. It seems,

---

[63] Caesar, *B.G.* 3.26.1. On this use of the term *praefectus equitum*, see below.
[64] Cicero, *ad Att.* 13.33.3: "sed tu de Antiocho scire poteris. uide etiam, quo anno quaestor aut tribunus mil. fuerit; si neutrum †cadet† in praefectis an in contubernalibus fuerit, modo fuerit in eo bello": Shackleton-Bailey, however, thinks that the second sentence refers to Sp. Mummius. The separation between the quaestors and military tribunes on the one hand, and the prefects and contubernales on the other, is easy to understand. The former held elected positions, and therefore might well be listed separately from the latter, who did not.
[65] Cicero, *ad Fam*. 5.20.7: "a me et tribunos militaris et praefectos et contubernalis dumtaxat meos delatos esse".
[66] Cicero, *ad Att.* 6.3.6.
[67] Cicero, *ad Att.* 5.17.2.
[68] Cicero, *ad Att.* 6.1.2: "de illius praefectis, comitibus, legatis etiam".
[69] Cicero, *ad Att.* 5.4.3, 7.1 (on the five nominal praefectures created by Pompey for each of his provinces in Spain), 11.1 (on those Cicero intends to create, nominally for his governorship of Cilicia).
[70] Cicero, *ad Att.* 6.1.4: "quas per te Bruto promiseram praefecturas, M. Scaptio, L. Gauio, qui in regno rem Bruti procurabant, detuli; nec enim in prouincia mea negotiabantur".

however, that he received a number of requests for such an office, refusing Pompeius and Torquatus, who requested *praefecturae* for their friends or agents[71]. However, in refusing to grant a prefecture to [248] M. Scaptius (a different M. Scaptius from the one to whom he *did* grant first a military tribunate and then a prefecture, but like him an agent of M. Brutus[72]), Cicero remarks that Ap. Claudius had done so, and that as a prefect he had used cavalry to force the city of Salamis in Cyprus into agreeing the terms of a loan deal. The three passages describing these events all contain the same ambiguity:

> fuerat enim praefectus Appio, et quidem habuerat turmas equitum…litteras misi ut equites ex insula statim decederent (He had been made *praefectus* to Appius [Claudius] and moreover was given some units of cavalry…[upon finding out] I sent orders for the cavalry to leave the island immediately.) [73]

> Appius noster turmas aliquot equitum dederat huic Scaptio per quas Salaminos coerceret, et eundem habuerat praefectum. (Our friend Appius had given some cavalry units to this Scaptius to coerce the Salaminians, and had also made him a *praefectus*.)[74].

> erat enim praefectus Appi Scaptius et habebat turmas ab Appio (Scaptius was one of Appius' *praefecti* and was given units of cavalry by Appius.)[75].

In all three passages there is no explicit connection between Scaptius' being made a *praefectus* and his being in command of cavalry: the two things are treated as separate. Therefore, the fact that Scaptius was a *praefectus* clearly did not mean that he was, *ex officio*, a military commander in control of a body of troops. It is also striking that, despite Ap. Claudius' leaving the province, and thus Scaptius' no longer being a *praefectus*, the cavalry he had taken to Salamis were still being used by him for the purpose of intimidation.

---

[71] Cicero, *ad Att.* 5.21.10, 6.1.6; 6.1.4.
[72] Cf. [248] M. Scaptius (1); *M. Scaptius (2)*.
[73] Cicero, *ad Att.* 6.1.6.
[74] Cicero, *ad Att.* 5.21.10.
[75] Cicero, *ad Att.* 6.2.8.

These letters do, however, demonstrate that *praefecti* were appointed by a governor or commander, served under him, were part of his *cohors*, and were dependent upon him for their authority. This is confirmed by a letter written by Cicero to Caesar, requesting that he allow *C. Trebatius Testa* to join his *cohors*: "for him I do not ask for a military tribunate, nor a prefecture, nor any specified role: I seek only your goodwill and liberality, although if it pleases you also to adorn him with these marks of a little glory, I would not stand in the way"[76].

In fact, most prefects in the late Republic are not called "praefectus" in literary sources. Instead, any number of phrases are used to describe people given commands: [35] Antonius Hybrida is described as "nactus de exercitu Sullano equitum turmas" ("placed at the head of cavalry units in Sulla's army")[77]; of [44] Q. Atrius it is said that L. Caesar "praesidio nauibus…praefecit" ("made him the commander of the troops guarding the fleet")[78]; of [64] P. Caelius that he was "ab Octauio consule praepositus" ("placed in command [of Placentia] by the consul Octavius")[79]; of [149] D. Iunius Brutus Albinus that Caesar "classi Gallicisque nauibus praefecit" ("placed him in command of the fleet and the Gallic ships")[80]; *M. Plautius*, who was probably not a junior officer, was responsible for bringing a fleet of allied ships to Rome "cum imperio senatus"[81], which shows that some naval commanders acted under senatorial authority, rather than under a specific commander, although this was rare[82]; [263] Tarquitius Priscus, in charge of 2,000 cavalry, is described simply as being ordered to go to set an ambush "cum duobus milibus equitum"[83]; of [303] Volcatius Tullus it is said that Caesar "ei loco praesidioque…praefecit"[84]; [261] L. Staberius was in command at Apollonia, and is described as "qui ibi praeerat"[85]. This probably reflects the fact that, unlike the prefectures of the Principate, the responsibilities that might be

[76] Cicero, *ad Fam.* 7.5.3: "huic ego neque tribunatum neque praefecturam neque ullius benefici certum nomen peto; beneuolentiam tuam et liberalitatem peto, neque impedio quo minus, si tibi ita placuerit, etiam hisce eum ornes gloriolae insignibus".
[77] Asconius 84.13-14 C.
[78] Caesar, *B.G.* 5.9.1.
[79] Valerius Maximus 4.7.5.
[80] Caesar, *B.G.* 3.11.5.
[81] Valerius Maximus 4.6.3.
[82] A parallel would be *Sex. Pompeius*, designated "praefectus classis et orae maritimae ex s(enatus) c(onsulto)" (BMCRR 2.560ff. = RRC 520).
[83] Frontinus, *Strat.* 2.5.31.
[84] Caesar, *B.G.* 6.29.4.
[85] Caesar, *B.C.* 3.12. Similar language is used of a number of garrison commanders, for example [196] Octacilius Crassus "qui Lissi praeerat" (Caesar, *B.C.* 3.28-29). See Appendix C for further examples (the abbreviation used is MP(GC)).

given to a prefect, including a cavalry prefect or a naval prefect, varied widely, and the simple designation of, for example, *praefectus equitum* would have provided an inadequate description of the responsibility of a given position.

Moreover, many prefects should not be considered as junior officers. As Cicero's descriptions of the prefecture given to [248] M. Scaptius show, appointment as a prefect did not make an individual a junior officer, and many prefects were, in fact, civilian prefects, such as Sex. Caesius or Q. Volusius[86], who do not appear to have commanded Roman troops. Civilian *praefecti* are also found in Italy in a number of contexts, mostly in connection with building projects or land distribution[87], and prefects also fulfilled important functions within municipal administration[88]. However, some prefects held roles which, although possibly involving troops, should not be considered as junior officer positions – those responsible for such things as organising the corn supply in a province[89] or, during the Triumviral period, minting coin[90], and, more importantly, the prefects in charge of cities or areas within peaceful provinces. The appointment of prefects to govern a town or region, sometimes with a garrison, was a normal part of Roman provincial government[91]. These prefects are sometimes referred to in modern literature as *praefecti oppidi* or *praefecti praesidii*. However, the majority of these prefects were appointed to positions of primarily civilian responsibility, and such Roman troops or local forces as they may have had under their command had civilian security as their primary responsibility. Their positions are similar to those identified by Saddington as "military praefecti with administrative functions"[92], although the distinction between a military and a civilian *praefectus* may well be a modern one – both were positions held by equestrians under the authority of the provincial governor. However, because their duties were primarily related to the governing of provinces that were at relative peace, a distinction is made in this thesis between these prefects and those garrison commanders who were placed in command of cities or regions that might be expected to be attacked, or were in

[86] Cf. the entries for *Sex. Caesius* and *Q. Volusius* in Appendix A.
[87] Cf. *CIL* 1^2 398, 1544, 1720, 1759, 2294.
[88] Cf. Crawford (1996) on the *lex Coloniae Iuliae Genetiuae* (e.g. XCV, XCVI at 406-407) and *lex de Gallia Cisalpina* (e.g. Col. I, l.40 at 465).
[89] Cf. C. Fufius Citus, put in charge of the corn supply in Gaul by Julius Caesar (*B.G.* 7.3.1); cf. Suolahti (1955) 199.
[90] Cf. Grant (1946) 52-54; Broughton (1951-1986) 2.404.
[91] Tibiletti (1953) 64ff.; Nicolet (1966) 703-704; Brunt (1983) 55; Ñaco del Hoyo (2009); cf. Alföldy (1974) 62-63; Wightman (1976) 81.
[92] Saddington (1987).

provinces where major campaigns were being waged, and who may therefore more properly be considered as junior officers in command of troops[93]. Moreover, not every role, or every job, within the army was a prefecture, even if the man who performed it was equestrian in rank. We can see this distinction in Cicero's request for a place on Caesar's staff for Trebatius ("for him I do not ask for a military tribunate, nor a prefecture, nor any certain role"[94]), and an example of the latter is the role ascribed to the father of the historian Pompeius Trogus: "he served under Caesar, and was responsible for writing letters and handling embassies, and had care of his signet ring"[95].

Military prefects, therefore, fall into one of the six categories outlined above: prefects in charge of cavalry or naval forces, *praefecti socium*, military prefects who held an *ad hoc* post to which none of the above categories or who were in charge of a garrison, and *praefecti fabrum*. However, as noted above, the majority of these prefects held the title *praefectus* rather than a more specific title, and it is the nature of their commands that is used here to subdivide them (see the introduction to the Appendix for the categories employed).

Indeed, the posts of *praefectus classis* and *praefectus oppidi* are rarely, if ever, explicitly attested in the late Republic, either in epigraphic or in literary sources.[96] The post of *praefectus equitum* is not found in epigraphic sources either, although it is found in literary sources. However, the majority of the literary sources use the term of non-Romans, either of enemy cavalry commanders, or of leaders of allied cavalry units[97]. The latter fact is not, in itself, surprising, as the citizen cavalry was, as Polybius recounts, commanded by *decuriones*[98]. However, it is important to note that the term was not yet generally applied to Roman citizens in charge of individual units of allied cavalry – the reasons for this are discussed below[99] – and we should not

[93] Cf. Robert and Robert, BE 1954 pp.150-151; Nicolet (1966) 703-704; Ñaco del Hoyo (2009).
[94] Cicero, *ad Fam.* 7.5.3: "huic ego neque tribunatum neque praefecturam neque ullius benefici certum nomen peto".
[95] Justin 43.5.12: "sub C. Caesare militasse epistularumque ac legationum, simul et annuli curam habuisse"; on the commander's staff, see Lintott (1993) 51-52.
[96] Cf. *TLL* "praeficio". T. Turpilius Silanus is referred to by Sallust as a *praefectus oppidi* at Vaga in 108BC (Sallust, *Iug.* 66.4; cf. Plutarch, *Mar.* 8.1-2; Appian, *Num*. 3), but he was the commander of a militarily significant garrison, with military tribunes under his command (Sallust, *Iug.* 66), and not the largely civilian governor of a town, as is often envisaged by the modern use of the term *praefectus oppidi*; on Turpilius Silanus, cf. ch. 3, pp.84-85.
[97] E.g. Livy 22.51.2, 31.11.7; cf. further examples in *TLL* "praeficio".
[98] Polybius 6.25.
[99] Cf. ch. 4, p.107ff.

assume that [263] Tarquitius Priscus or [35] Antonius Hybrida were necessarily known as *praefecti equitum*, even though they commanded cavalry.

A junior officer who served as a prefect was therefore, as Suolahti indicates, an equestrian, belonging to the retinue of the general, who was charged with a temporary but important task and given military resources in order to accomplish it[100]. However, the types of prefectures described above were not "already established to such an extent that they were to develop into permanent posts"[101]. Instead, with the exception of *praefecti socium*, whose roles appear to have been relatively standard across armies, the role of a prefect was whatever his commander decided it would be. A good example of such a role is provided by an account of a foraging party given by Caesar[102]. The foraging party consisted of five cohorts from one legion under the command of a military tribune, and 300 men from other legions who had been convalescing in the camp, who (because they were not part of any one legion) were placed under the command of a prefect, [275] C. Trebonius. As the foraging party was attacked, Trebonius led his 300 experienced troops to safety, while the five cohorts of new soldiers under the military tribune acted independently, and suffered heavy losses. This is an interesting demonstration of the distinction between the military tribune in command of men from his legion, and the prefect in charge of an *ad hoc* party of soldiers from a number of legions. Thus prefects were often placed in independent command, and in that way had a chance to show their leadership, organisational and, if given a military role, military skills.

Given the nature of the evidence, which is predominantly from the late Republic, the duties and roles of the various prefectures will be discussed further in the next chapter. One prefecture, however, disappeared with the Social War: the post of *praefectus socium*, which is the most clearly attested type of prefecture in the Republic, and, perhaps because of the relative status of the position and of the men who held it, one whose role is among the least well known. Polybius records that these prefects distributed the allied contingents (to one *ala* or another, and to the *extraordinarii*), and that they were responsible for managing the allied contingents[103]. It is, however, unclear how the responsibilities of the *praefecti socium* were divided

[100] Suolahti (1955) 199.
[101] Suolahti (1955) 199.
[102] Caesar, *B.G.* 6.36ff.
[103] Polybius 6.26.5.

among them (see above). It may be that their role was analogous to that of the military tribunate, but we have no evidence at all that this was the case. It is likely, however, that like military tribunes they normally 'reported' directly to their commander. Moreover, military tribunes were fundamentally part of the Roman legion, and their role as the guardians of the troops' wellbeing and their rights somewhat parallels that of the *tribuni plebis*, while *praefecti socium*, Roman citizens commanding a number of allied contingents each with their own commander, were to an extent distant from the troops they commanded. Given that their role more closely paralleled that of the prefects commanding *auxilia externa* (since they too were in command of a contingent of allied troops who were not a direct part of the legionary command structure), it is likely that they performed many of the same duties, in particular overseeing the native commanders whose role it was to see to the administration and military leadership of their own contingents.

The command of non-Roman troops by native commanders, 201 – 92BC

As noted above, our knowledge for the *auxilia* in general is extremely scanty, and this is especially true of our knowledge of the command structures of auxiliary units[104]. For the period before the Social War, however, we do have some insight into the command of *socii* and *Latini*. While the allied and Latin contingents in the Roman army had a status above that of auxiliary provincial troops (and those from 'friendly' states), they were still not treated as equals to the Roman troops. They did not always receive the same levels of booty[105], although they had ways of protesting when they did not[106]; they had harsher duties – it was their task to build the ramparts and fortifications of the camp; they were subject to harsher discipline; and there are some who consider that allies and Latins were given harder and more dangerous missions than Roman citizens, and that they were discharged later[107].

While members of the non-Roman elites of Italy could not serve as officers in the Roman army, even as *praefecti socium*, they did act as officers to their own contingents. Polybius tells us that allied and Latin cities in Italy were ordered to provide a certain number of troops on a certain day (according to the terms of the

[104] Cf. Prag (2007) 76.
[105] Livy 42.4.4; Velleius 2.15.2; Eutropius 4.12.2; *ILS* 20-22, 6131; cf. Sherwin-White (1973) 107; Keaveney (1987) 15 n.27.
[106] Such as following the *triumphator*'s chariot in stony silence (see Livy 41.12.78).
[107] Toynbee (1965) vol.2 133-135, 170; Keaveney (1987) 14; cf. Gilliver (1996) 54ff.

formula togatorum[108]), but left to the cities the raising of these troops, and the administration of the oath to them. Each allied contingent would join together with other contingents to form the auxiliary unit attached to a particular legion[109], which was placed under the command of the *praefecti socium*, and each city chose a commander and a paymaster[110] for its contingent, thereby appointing analogues of the commander (consul or praetor) and the quaestor sent out with a Roman legionary army. Livy names one particular commander of an allied unit, M. Ancius, formerly scribe and then praetor at Praeneste[111].

This system of levying and command is implied by a passage in Cicero's Verrine orations that accuses Verres of corruptly profiting from the levying of troops. The implications of the system which Verres adopted are discussed below[112], but Cicero's passage is notable here for what he suggests was normal behaviour: "Sumptum omnem in classem frumento stipendio ceterisque rebus suo quaeque nauarcho ciuitas semper dare solebat. Is neque ut accusaretur a nautis committere audebat, et ciuibus suis rationes referre debebat, et in illo omni negotio non modo labore sed etiam periculo suo uersabatur. Erat hoc, ut dico, factitatum semper, nec solum in Sicilia sed in omnibus prouinciis, etiam in sociorum et Latinorum stipendio ac sumptu, tum cum illorum auxiliis uti solebamus"[113]. A similar system is implied by Cicero in the *pro Fonteio*, where the defeated Gauls were required by Fonteius to provide "magnos equitatus ad ea bella quae tum in toto orbe terrarum a populo Romano gerebantur, magnas pecunias ad eorum stipendium"[114]. As Millar and Prag emphasise[115], this passage implies strongly that this was the normal way in which auxiliary forces, not merely ships, were raised. The passage fits well with Polybius' account of the way in

[108] On the *formula togatorum*, see Toynbee (1965) 2.424-425; Lomas (1996) 39; Mouritsen (1998) 104.
[109] The numbers of contingents joined together to make a "wing" (*ala*), the name given to the Italian *auxilia* when combined into one unit in the field, generally because they were placed on the flanks, could vary: cf. Suolahti (1955) 200.
[110] Polybius 6.21.4-5.
[111] Livy 23.19.17: "ceteri incolumes Praeneste cum praetore suo M. Anicio – scriba is antea fuerat – redierunt".
[112] Cf. ch. 4, pp.109-111.
[113] "All expenditure on the fleet, for grain, pay, and everything else, each city has always entrusted to its own navarch, as a matter of habit. The navarch did not dare do anything that would lead to the sailors accusing him, had to submit his accounts to his fellow citizens, and all of the work and danger of the business [the maintenance and supply of his troops] was his. This was done, as I say, repeatedly and always, not only in Sicily but in all the provinces, and likewise for the pay and expenses of the allies and Latins at the time when we were accustomed to employ *auxilia* from them." Cicero, *Verr.* 5.60 (translation of the first and third sentences from Prag (2007) 79).
[114] Cicero, *Font.* 13; cf. Millar (1995) 242.
[115] Millar (1995) 243, Prag (2007) 80, 97.

which the contingents of *socii* and *Latini* were levied and organised: the levying, management, pay and supply of auxiliary forces was a matter for the communities from which those forces were levied. Parallel evidence for this system of command comes from Sallust's description of Jugurtha's role in Scipio Aemilianus' army. Jugurtha was placed in charge of the Numidians sent to Numantia by Micipsa, was in close attendance on the commander and his staff, took part in counsels, was given independent tasks[116], and made many acquaintances with the Roman elite in Scipio Aemilianus' army. In addition to the literary evidence, a number of inscriptions from the Eastern Mediterranean suggest a similar picture, with allied contingents, led by the own commanders, acting under senior Roman commanders: SEG 44.867 and BE 1963, 220 (= TAM 5.1.528) record contingents from Bargylia and Lydia respectively, acting under the command of a legate, Q. Seruilius Caepio, in the early 120s BC[117]. A similar inscription, probably from 86/85BC, was set up at Chaeroneia in honour of one "Ἀμάτοκ]ος Τ[ήρου υἱ]ὸς Θρᾷξ, χιλίαρ/χος ἱππέ[ων" who served under Sulla[118]. This term translates as "tribunus equitum", but no such post existed within the Roman army, and it is likely that this is an example of allied communities aping Roman military terminology, perhaps paralleled by inscriptions from Sicily naming (native) military tribunes[119].

As with the Italian *socii* and *Latini*, therefore, the recruitment, internal organisation and command of auxiliary troops at a tactical level was the responsibility of the community from whom the troops were levied: the integration of these troops into the Roman military system took place at a level above that of individual units: to adopt a modern military analogy, individual units were commanded by their own 'colonels', while the prefects and legates who commanded them were 'generals', who would oversee the movement and deployment of the forces under their command, but who were not normally responsible for the internal running of the units[120], and who reported directly to the commander himself or to one of his legates. The independence given to native commanders, as well as the rank of the man commanding them, probably varied greatly. High-status and trusted native commanders of significant

[116] Sallust, *B.J.* 7; cf. Earl (1961) 62. On the use of Numidian auxiliary forces, cf. Hamdoune (1999) 41ff.
[117] For further examples of this, see Prag (2007) 84.
[118] Holleaux (1919) 321 l.2-3, cf. 328; cf. Prag (2007) 84-85; Busquets-Artigas (2009) 70.
[119] IG 14.282, 355; CIL 10.7258 (cf. adnot.); cf. Prag (2007) 84.
[120] Cf. Prag (2007) 83.

forces, such as Jugurtha, might be given more responsibility than the commanders of smaller units, while the commander of a relatively small force (e.g. a legate such as Seruilius Caepio, above) might give orders to native commanders himself, and relatively large armies, such as those of Pompeius and Caesar, might require a number of legates and prefects to manage their auxiliary forces. As we shall see, it is probably revealing that most recorded Roman cavalry commands of the period before the 50s BC involved large groups of cavalry (thousands rather than hundreds). This command system meant that Roman commanders did not have to concern themselves with the management of troops whose languages and customs might be very different from their own (they would only have to work with a small number of high-ranking native commanders), and, as we shall see, it also helped to ensure the loyalty and support of those native commanders, and, through them, of their troops[121].

In addition, it is important to recognise the close links between the Roman elite who travelled with the army – officers and *contubernales*[122] – and the non-Roman elites who campaigned with them. We can see this in the close relationships that Jugurtha developed with members of the Roman elite, who tried to involve themselves in Numidian politics, presumably eyeing up the benefits of a close relationship with such a powerful man[123]. Making allowances for the fact that Jugurtha was a member of a foreign royal family – and thus a valuable friend to make, and one who could profitably be exploited – it is presumably the case that the commanders and paymasters of even small communities might enjoy similar relations with the Roman elite while serving with the army.

However, while there could only be a few men from each community who served as commanders or paymasters of allied and Latin units, the elite of Italy were not separated from the Roman elite in the army. The *extraordinarii*, picked men who accompanied the commander on the march and encamped next to the tents of the elite *contubernales* in camp[124], were composed of one fifth of the Italian infantry and one third of the Italian cavalry, selected by the *praefecti socium*, and, presumably, would have included those members of the Italian elite in service at the time, thereby further encouraging personal relationships between members of the Italian and Roman elites.

[121] Cf. ch. 8, pp.246ff.
[122] On *contubernales*, cf. ch. 7, pp.195-198.
[123] Sallust, *B.J.* 8.1.
[124] Polybius 6.31.

The status of junior officers and the composition of the junior officer corps

The military tribunate of the early second century was an important position within the Roman legion, and one with considerable status. Military tribunes had many opportunities for showing their mettle to their commanders: on occasion some were given command of entire legions[125], and military tribunes often played an important role upon the battlefield, however, throughout the second century such roles were increasingly performed by legates. In addition to these changes, the service requirement for military tribunes was ignored or phased out, and military tribunes became, in general, less experienced[126]. Exactly when the service requirement disappeared is unclear: the earliest reference to a military tribune without five years' active service is to the orator Hortensius, who in the 90s BC became a military tribune in his second year of military service[127] (although Scipio Africanus was not yet twenty when he served as a military tribune at Cannae, the service requirement may not have been in place at that time[128]). It is likely, however, that the change can be attributed to Rutilius Rufus, the consul of 105BC, who was responsible for a number of military reforms. Festus[129] attributes to him a law concerning the appointed military tribunes, and, as Nicolet[130] argues, if a formal change in the service requirement did take place, then it should probably be placed here. Given the important military reforms of the late second century BC, this may have been a suitable time for the service requirement to be re-assessed. However, it is worth noting that we do not know the contents of Rufus' bill, and while a change in the service requirement could have formed part of an overall reform of the military tribunate, it could simply have concerned the appointed military tribunate.

It has long been believed that there were two distinct types of military tribunes (elected, sometimes called *tribuni militum a populo* or *comitiati*[131], and appointed, sometimes referred to as *rufuli* – according to Festus, because of Rutilius Rufus'

[125] Polybius 6.19.8, 14.3.5, 18.26.2; Livy 22.49.16, 40.35.4, 42.35.4, 42.49.9, 43.5.1, 44.1.2.
[126] E.g. Caesar, *B.G.* 1.39.2, *B.Afr.* 28.2.
[127] Cicero, *Brut.* 229, 304 (see above). It is worth noting, however, that we do not know if Hortensius was elected or appointed, and there is no evidence that the service requirement applied to appointed military tribunes.
[128] Livy 22.53. On the military service requirement in the late Republic, see ch. 7, pp.201ff.
[129] Festus 316-7 L.
[130] Nicolet (1969) 135.
[131] E.g. Devijver (1989) 432.

law[132]: "de quorum iure quod Rutilius Rufus legem tulerit"). However, it is not possible to identify a clear distinction between the two posts, and there is no apparent difference in their roles or responsibilities. In fact, the distinction may not have existed at all, except in the limited legal sense that elected military tribunes were subject to certain laws, such as the Gracchan *lex repetundarum*, whereas appointed military tribunes were not, at least in the second century BC. While Mommsen[133] and Suolahti[134] have attempted to identify a formal distinction between the two types of military tribune beyond the way in which they obtained their posts, this is not apparent in the sources. There does appear to have been an informal distinction between the two posts. As noted above, Festus records that appointed military tribunes were called *rufuli*, after the consul Rutilius Rufus, and the same passage, although highly mutilated, suggests that another, unrecorded, phrase existed for elected military tribunes: "…hi qui populi suffragi…"[135]. Pseudo-Asconius also records that appointed military tribunes were named *rufuli*, and adds that elected military tribunes were known as *comitiati*: "tribunorum militarium duo genera: primum eorum qui rufuli dicuntur: hi in exercitu creari solent; alii sunt comitiati, qui Romae comitiis designantur"[136]. However, the only other occurrence of either term is in Livy, who uses *rufuli* in connection with the first election of military tribunes[137] "cum eo anno primum placuisset tribunos militum ad legiones suffragio fieri – nam antea, sicut nunc quos Rufulos uocant, imperatores ipsi faciebant". The description in Livy, as well as the rarity of the usage of the terms, suggests that the terms *comitiati* and *rufuli* were not technical in nature, but shorthand descriptions such as nicknames, and the fact that they do not appear in other authors suggests that the distinction was not generally an important one. It should also be remembered that, until the creation of permanent legions (and the end of the annual consular levy of four legions

[132] Festus 316-7 L; Livy 7.4; Ps.-Asconius 216 Stangl; cf. Mommsen (1887-1888) 434.
[133] Mommsen (1887-1888) 2.576-578.
[134] Suolahti (1955) 39. Suolahti does, however, concede that there appears to have been no formal distinction between the two types of military tribunate except within the *lex repetundarum*: "[W]e might conclude that they [the elected military tribunes] were held in higher estimation than the others though their duties and rank were equal" (Suolahti (1955) 42).
[135] Festus 316 L.
[136] Ps.-Asconius 216 Stangl on Cicero, *Verr.* 1.30: "There are two origins for military tribunes: the first, who are called 'Rufuli', are usually chosen as military tribunes in the army. The others are 'comitiati', who are chosen at the assemblies in Rome." Ps.-Asconius 216 Stangl on Cicero, *Verr.* 1.30.
[137] Livy 7.4: "since that was the first year that the people elected [military] tribunes for the legions: for previously they had been chosen by the commanders themselves, as is the case with those we they now call 'Rufuli'."

numbered I-IV, probably last attested under Pansa in 43BC[138]), it would be immediately obvious to all concerned whether a military tribune had been elected or not: if he served in the first four consular legions, he had been elected, if not, he had been appointed. Therefore while it is likely that the military tribunes of the first four legions, who were after all, serving under the highest-ranked magistrate or promagistrate, were of slightly higher status than their appointed colleagues, the difference between the does not appear to have been significant enough to require a formal distinction.

Our evidence for the use of the phrase *tribunus militum a populo* in the Republican period is weak. The phrase is used of republican military tribunes of this period only in Sallust and Frontinus. Its use in the Augustan period, as Nicolet convincingly argues[139], should be associated with Augustus' invitation to *municipia* to recommend men for service as junior officers[140]. Sallust uses the phrase only in describing Marius' election to the military tribunate, and his wording ("ubi…tribunatum militarem a populo petit"[141]) could equally mean "when he sought the military tribunate from the people" as "when he sought the post of *tribunus militum a populo*". Frontinus' use of the phrase to describe M. Porcius Cato in 191BC has the same ambiguity[142].

Moreover, the phrase *tribunus militum a populo* is conspicuously absent from Republican legal texts. The Gracchan *lex repetundarum* instead refers to anyone who has been "tribunus militum legionibus IIII primis aliqua earum" (a military tribune of any one of the first four legions)[143], a nearly identical phrase to that used by Cicero in his description of the *lex Cornelia de sicariis et ueneficis*: "tribunis militum legionibus quattuor primis"[144], and to the description by Livy of a law concerning the selection of military tribunes for an especially large army during the Second Punic War: "…primis quattuor legionibus populus tribunos creauit: in ceteras consules miserunt"[145]. Elsewhere, Livy uses similar terminology, and never the phrase *tribunus*

[138] Schmitthenner (1958) 31-32.
[139] Nicolet (1967) 29ff.
[140] On the Augustan post of *tribunus militum a populo*, see ch. 5, pp.153-155; ch. 8, pp.234-237.
[141] Sallust, *B.J.* 63.4.
[142] Frontinus, *Strat*. 2.4.4.
[143] *Lex repetundarum* l.2 in Crawford (1996).
[144] Cicero, *Cluen.* 148; cf. Lintott (1999) 138 n.74.
[145] Livy, 27.36.14: "the people elected [military] tribunes for the first four legions; for the others, they were chosen by the consuls".

militum a populo. In 171BC, during the Macedonian war, a new method for selecting military tribunes was adopted, temporarily abolishing election:

> "in tribunis militum nouatum eo anno propter Macedonicum bellum, quod consules ex senatus consulto ad populum tulerunt, ne tribuni militum eo anno suffragiis crearentur, sed consulum praetorumque in iis faciendis iudicium arbitriumque esset."[146]

Two years later, when the situation was reversed and all military tribunes were elected for that year "Quattuor praeterea legiones scribi iussae, quae, si quo opus esset, educerentur. Tribunos iis, non permissum ut consules facerent: populus creauit"[147]. In the following year Livy reports that "senatus decreuit, ut in octo legiones parem numerum tribunorum consules et populus crearent; creari autem neminem eo anno placere, nisi qui honorem gessisset"[148]. In Livy's accounts and in the *lex repetundarum* there is no suggestion that elected military tribunes had a separate title from that of appointed military tribunes, only that the methods of their selection were different. In fact, the lack of a distinctive title in the *lex repetundarum* and in the fragment of the *lex Cornelia de sicariis et veneficis*, which resort to a rather circuitous phrase, would suggest that none was available. However, as the distinction is important in other respects, the two types will be referred to as the "elected" and "appointed" military tribunes in this thesis.

In fact, the changes to the selection methods for the years 171, 169 and 168BC suggest that the methods for the creation of military tribunes may not have been as fixed as Polybius' account suggests[149]. It is possible, moreover, that with more and more experienced men acting as *legati* there was a concern about possibly inexperienced military tribunes being sent to an important war, and the Senate wished to keep a close eye on who was sent. As the rules on the length of military service that had to be undertaken prior to holding the military tribunate are only found in

[146]Livy 42.31.5: "In respect of the military tribunes, there was an innovation that year because of the Macedonian War, in that the consuls, following a decree of the Senate, proposed a law that no military tribunes should be elected that year, but that the consuls and the praetors should use their discretion and judgement in appointing them".
[147] Livy 43.12.7: "Four extra legions were ordered to be created, to be sent if there was a need. It was not permitted that the consuls choose the [military] tribunes for them: they were elected by the people".
[148] Livy 44.21.2: "The Senate decreed that the consuls and people should select an equal number of [military] tribunes for the eight legions [to be raised that year], but that no-one should be chosen that year unless he had held office".
[149] Polybius 6.19.

Polybius[150], whose writings date from the period after these events, it may therefore be suggested that the rule concerning the length of prior military service was created only between the Macedonian war and the time at which Polybius wrote[151]. Suolahti's suggestion that it may have been contained in the *lex Villia annalis* of 180BC[152], while interesting, does not explain why the Senate felt it necessary to stipulate that only men who had performed a magistracy should be considered for the military tribunate in 169BC. In addition, Polybius states that during a period of emergency, no man could be considered for *political* office of any kind until he had completed ten years of military service[153]. This is not a measure regulating the selection of military tribunes, and it is not directly connected with the rules governing the appointment and election of military tribunes, but is reported in the context of a description of the lengths of various types of military service at normal times, and in an emergency. It is therefore a measure which was designed to ensure that talented young aristocrats did not leave the army to take up political office[154], and, in fact, echoes the senatorial ruling in 171BC, during a period of crisis, that prevented anyone who had not been elected to a magistracy from becoming military tribune. It seems likely that the Senate's decision of 171BC fits more closely with the kind of emergency ruling Polybius describes than with the *lex Villia annalis*, which, if it had contained laws concerning the election of military tribunes, was being set aside by the senate, something we might expect Livy to have remarked upon if it had been passed just nine years earlier.

Known military tribunes for the second century BC are generally young men in their twenties, and those who had not yet entered the Senate, but senatorial and even consular military tribunes are known: L. Terentius Massiliota, praetor in 187BC, returned in 180BC from three years service as a military tribune in Spain under Q. Fulvius Flaccus[155]; in 171BC, two ex-consuls, C. Claudius and Q. Mucius, accompanied Licinius as military tribunes[156]; in 170BC L. Cassius Longinus, the consul of 171BC who had first served as a military tribune in 178BC, began a three-

[150] Polybius 6.19.2.
[151] It should be remembered that Livy's writings covering the years following 167BC have only survived in a highly abbreviated form.
[152] Suolahti (1955) 45.
[153] Polybius 6.19.5.
[154] Military service (ten years for cavalry, sixteen for infantry) normally had to be completed before the age of 46 (Polybius 6.19.2).
[155] Livy 40.35.5.
[156] Livy 42.49.9.

year stint as a military tribune[157]; and in 169BC M. Popillius Laenas, the consul of 173BC, served in Macedonia as a military tribune[158]. However, it should be emphasised that these examples come from within a relatively short time-span, and at a time when the way in which tribunes were selected and appointed was being changed in such a way as to favour older and more experienced men in order to meet particular military crises (particularly the war in Macedonia), and it might be wise to view these men as exceptions rather than the rule. Moreover, these examples also date from a period when there were more legions in service than was normally the case, especially in relation to the later second century. It is worth remembering that although Livy's evidence from this period shows the military tribunate to be an extremely high status post, this is also a time when a significant number of military tribunes from lower status backgrounds would have been needed in order to fill the posts available.

In contrast to military tribunes, prefects had, generally, fewer administrative duties. All prefects were appointed by the commander, there was no fixed term of office[159], and, unlike the military tribunate, there were few fixed duties either. The prefects of the second century would, however, have constituted part of the 'general's staff' envisaged by Goldsworthy: a group of experienced and trusted elite officers of at least equestrian rank who were able to perform duties as and when required to do so by their commander[160].

As with their roles, the status of prefects is difficult to gauge precisely. It is certainly clear that the military tribunate, with its fixed duties and fixed term of office, was less desirable as a post than the higher ranking prefectures, such as a naval or cavalry prefecture, although the attraction of winning election as a military tribune must have appealed to many[161]. From the evidence collected by Suolahti, individuals known as naval or equestrian prefects tend to be of higher social status than military tribunes[162] (although it is possible that the commanders of citizen cavalry, the *decuriones,* were

[157] Livy 43.5.1.
[158] Livy 44.1.2.
[159] Suolahti (1955) 198ff.
[160] Goldsworthy (1996) 123.
[161] On the political benefits that might be accrued simply from standing for election to the military tribunate, cf. ch. 6, pp.185-188.
[162] Suolahti (1955) 211.

more or less equivalent in status[163]), and the posts entailed a great deal of individual responsibility and freedom. Moreover, we do know of individuals who became equestrian prefects, naval commanders and garrison commanders after serving as military tribunes, whereas, in the period after 91BC, the reverse is not the case. Given this, it is logical to assume that some prefectures were of higher status than the military tribunate. On the other hand, it is likely that the post of *praefectus socium* was of a lower status than the military tribunate, as individuals are rarely mentioned and those attested tend to be from a lower social background than military tribunes[164]. The same is true of some other kinds of prefect. Cicero describes his uncle's service in Cilicia with M. Antonius in a single line: "cum Antonio in Ciliciam profectus una decesserat"[165], and fails to mention that, as a recent inscription shows, L. Tullius served as a prefect[166].

However, as with later periods, it is important to note that all individuals who are known to have served as junior officers appear to have been of at least equestrian rank. We should also note that service as a *contubernalis*[167], as well as junior officer service, appears to have been a normal part of the education and development of members of the Roman elite. While there are, as we shall see, debates as to the level of elite participation within military life in the first century, the 'military ethos' of Roman elite youth in the second century was particularly strong[168]. Therefore, a high proportion of young men from the highest levels of Roman society would probably have spent a considerable amount of time serving as, or with, the junior officers of the period. This, combined with the fact that a number of junior officers in the period were of senatorial, even of consular, rank, would necessarily have meant that the junior officer positions of the second century were positions of no small importance within broader Roman society.

[163] Cf. their equivalent roles and privileges involving the selection and overseeing of guard duties in Polybius 6.35-6.
[164] Cf. Suolahti (1955) 270ff.
[165] Cicero, *de Orat.* 2.2.
[166] AE 2001, 1741a (Samothracia, Thracia); cf. Clinton (2001) 27-28; see ch. 7, p.212.
[167] On *contubernales,* cf. ch. 7, pp.196-198.
[168] Harris (1979) 10ff., (1984a) 23; cf. Rosenstein (2005) 133ff.

Ch. 3: The Junior Officer Positions 91 – 50BC

The rise of immensely powerful generals and politicians, who came to stand above the political system itself, has generally been seen as a central component of the instability that rocked, and eventually toppled, the Republic. Such men would, of course, have been unable to act as they did without the support of the legions under their command, who expected to be rewarded with booty, money, and land. The destabilising consequences of this relationship between generals and their troops have brought the army of the post-Marian reforms to centre-stage in the political history of the Roman Republic.[1]

It is widely considered that Sulla's march on Rome in 88BC, the first by a Roman commander for centuries, was possible because the army that he commanded was unlike the armies of old. The Marian reforms are seen as the final staging post in the transition from an army of citizen-farmers, who had a livelihood awaiting their return from military service, to an army of poor, landless men who were dependent upon their general for the future rewards they might gain, and were thus tied to his fate. In addition, the extent and duration of the commands given to generals in the late Republic (to Pompeius and Caesar in particular) are held responsible for the new attitudes of the men: kept together for extended campaigns, they developed strong group identities, and became intimately associated with the man who commanded them over many seasons[2].

This period did, of course, see large-scale deployment of Roman troops involved in prolonged wars. But this in itself was nothing new: from the third century onwards Rome was, with the exception of a few years in the 120s BC, always committed to foreign wars. The scale of the campaigns and the conquests they brought were not altogether new either, since the early second century had seen a similar increase in Roman territory. Moreover, the extended commands given to generals, lasting beyond a single year, were not an innovation: similar commands had been given to the Scipiones, to Marius, and to others. While these commands were not initially designated as commands lasting for more than one year, troops, officers and generals were nevertheless in service together for extended periods of time, especially in

[1] See above all Brunt (1962).
[2] Cf. De Blois (2000) 17.

Spain. What had changed, however, were the economic position and social origin of the troops, and the possibilities that were open to ambitious commanders. Following the enlistment of the *proletarii*, Roman citizen troops were increasingly recruited from poorer social groups. Moreover, following the Social War, the citizen population included the former *Latini* and Italian *socii*, who became part of the tight-knit legionary structure. Sulla, by marching upon Rome, had demonstrated what was possible if a commander was ambitious and ruthless enough. His appeal to his troops at Nola in 88BC[3] was a grave and desperate risk but, once taken, it showed to other commanders – and to their opponents – what could be achieved. Thereafter, Roman generals, especially those who might find themselves in political trouble in Rome, knew that by fostering a close relationship with their troops they would have some insurance against the dangers of political defeat. It is against this background that the junior officer positions of the late Republic must be analysed.

The number of officer positions available

From an approximate average of seven per year in the period 201 – 92BC, the number of legions in service rose substantially in the period 91 – 50BC. There were, however, significant fluctuations in the number of legions in service from year to year[4]. During the Social War about 20 legions were mobilised, although the figures, as Brunt shows, are confused by the fact that many of the troops levied may not have been assigned to legions but grouped into cohorts of, perhaps, 500 men[5]. The civil wars that followed saw perhaps fifty legions in the field, although each legionary force contained fewer soldiers, as the newly enfranchised former *Latini* and Italian *socii* were Roman citizens, and therefore legionaries, rather than auxiliaries attached to Roman legions. The allies had, in the late second century, perhaps contributed roughly two units to every unit of Roman soldiers[6], so that each Roman legion was accompanied by units of allied troops twice its size. When the allies were enfranchised, these units of allied troops became part of the Roman army. The number of military tribunates available trebled with the trebling of the number of legions, while the number of prefects,

[3] Plutarch, *Sull.* 8.4, 9.3. Appian gives the location as Capua (*B.C.* 1.56).
[4] Figures from Brunt (1971) 432-433 (Table XIII), 435-445, 449 (Table XIV).
[5] Brunt (1971) 436. Brunt suggests that the figure of 100,000 for the total strength of the Roman forces may include (loyal) allied troops.
[6] The exact proportion is difficult to assess, and the allies had probably contributed proportionately fewer troops during the first half of the second century. For these calculations, see Brunt (1971) 681ff.; Linderski (1984) 146.

following the abolition of the post of *praefectus socium*, would have fallen sharply. However, even if we leave aside this 'artificial' increase in the number of legions, the number of troops in service grew. The number of legions in the field throughout the 70s BC was very high, especially by comparison with the late second century. The revolt of Aemilius Lepidus (cos. 78BC) and the continuing resistance of Sertorian forces in Spain (until 71BC), along with the Mithridatic war and the revolt of Spartacus, meant that from 77 to 70BC there were again between 23 and 40 legions in the field each year, even more if the five legions taken by Perperna to join Sertorius in Spain are taken into account. These numbers are significantly higher than those of the 60s and 50s BC, when the Roman army had a stable strength of between 15 and 25 legions (with the exception of the period of the Catilinarian revolt, which put a further five or six legions into the field for its duration). It is clear that, for the period 80 – 50BC, at least, there were on average approximately 23 legions in service each year.

The average number of military tribunates available in this period can therefore be estimated at 138 per year, assuming six for each legion. However, there is some uncertainty about the latter figure: while our only explicit source for the late Republic, Polybius, states that there were six military tribunes per legion, this may have changed by the first century. Writing about the defeat of Triarius at Zela in 67BC, both Plutarch and Appian state explicitly that 24 military tribunes (both use the technical term χιλίαρχοι) were killed, along with 150 centurions and 7,000 men, Appian adding that "so great a number of officers [the more general term ἡγεμόνες is used here] had seldom fallen in any single Roman defeat"[7]. This presents a problem, as on the evidence of both authors only three legions, and thus a theoretical maximum of 18 military tribunes, fought in the battle, therefore suggesting that the number of military tribunes in each legion had changed. However, it is possible, as Brunt suggests, to resolve the problem by presuming that there was a fourth legion at the battle, with the legion left behind by Lucullus in Pontus being the most likely candidate[8]. In the absence of any further evidence, we shall here assume that in this period also there were six military tribunes for each legion in service in the Roman army. Although an ingenious solution, there is no evidence to support Brizzi's

[7] Appian, *Mith*. 13.89; Plutarch, *Luc*. 35.1.
[8] Brunt (1971) 454-455; cf. Harmand (1967) 341ff.

suggestion that there were 10 military tribunes, one for each cohort, in the legion[9].

Of course, many men would have held more than one military tribunate: during the Principate, it was common for equestrian officers to hold their posts for 2-3 years, and some republican military tribunes are known to have served for longer, such as Sertorius (military tribune from 97 to 93BC)[10]. Given that each of those men who are recorded as holding more than one military tribunate in this period appears to have held all his tribunates in the same army[11], it is likely that many men who were chosen by a commander, or, if elected to a military tribunate, were reappointed by a commander, would retain that post for the duration of their commander's tenure – unless promoted – and would then leave: Cicero's army in Cilicia, for instance, was without military tribunes, those in service with Ap. Claudius Pulcher having left with their commander, and Cicero had already appointed his own military tribunes[12]. However, not all military tribunes served for more than one year: [142] Caesar and the [237] younger Cato, both elected military tribunes, do not appear to have remained in service as military tribunes in the following year, although they were prominent and ambitious young men with many opportunities, and it may well be that those without their advantages would be more likely to wish to stay in their post. Moreover, of the 348 military tribunes counted by Suolahti for the period 509BC – AD14, fewer than 51 (15%) are recorded as having served for a second year, over half of whom are known from Livy or served as military tribunes in the crisis of the Social War[13]. This illustrates, of course, more the paucity of our evidence than the pattern of office-holding. Epigraphic evidence from the republican period suggests that young men from prominent families might serve for more than a year as military tribune. Of the two men known from cursus inscriptions who held military tribunates in the period 91 – 50BC, both held the post more than once, and both were men of considerable status: [197] C. Octauius, Augustus' father and later proconsul[14], and [282] M. Valerius Messalla Niger, a man from a prominent family who was later

[9] Brizzi (1995) 16-17.
[10] Broughton (1951-1986) 2.7-8, 10, 12, 13, 15.
[11] Cf. [304] C. (Visellius) Varro; [217] Petronius; [127] Q. Fufidius Q.f.; [283] L. Valerius Flaccus; and possibly [160] P. Ligarius.
[12] Cicero, *ad Fam.* 15.4.2.
[13] See Suolahti (1955) 61 (Table 1).
[14] CIL 6.41023 = CIL 6.1311 = CIL 1, p.199 = CIL 5.*753.2 = Inscr.It. 13.3.75 = ILS 47 = AE 1949, 4 = EDH HD027489 (Roma),

censor[15]. We do not, of course, know whether either of these men served for consecutive years or held two separate tribunates, but the former is more likely. It is worth noting, however, that the inscription recording the cursus of C. Octauius also records that of Iulius Caesar, the dictator's father and later proconsul, and tells us that he held the military tribunate only once[16]. Literary evidence does not always help us to understand how long military tribunes remained in service: [281] L. Valerius Flaccus, for example, may have served for three years, two years, or just for one – Cicero's description of his military tribunate is somewhat ambiguous ("fuit P. Seruilio imperatore in Cilicia tribunus militum"[17]). Our lack of evidence therefore makes it difficult to estimate how many individual military tribunes there were throughout the period. The issue is further complicated by the fact that, as can be seen in the 'handover' between Ap. Claudius and Cicero in Cilicia, individual commanders would probably have appointed their own junior officers, and most commanders only held their promagistracies for a short time. As a result, it is likely that most military tribunes held their post for one or two years, and a few for longer.

Assessing the numbers of military prefects in service, as noted above[18], is difficult. Comparisons with the Principate are not helpful – we cannot, as we perhaps can for the period 49 – 31BC, estimate the number of auxiliary prefects by examining the size of auxiliary forces, as there is no indication that prefects were in charge of individual cohorts or *alae*, and there does not yet appear to have been a standard size of auxiliary unit. However, it is possible to compare the numbers of recorded prefects to the numbers of recorded military tribunes. We know of 57 prefectures for the period, and 56 military tribunates[19], a ratio of essentially 1:1. However, this ratio may be highly misleading, because it results from the haphazard survival of our very limited sources of evidence for this period. For example, no fewer than 16 military tribunes are

[15] CIL 6.3826 = CIL 6.31618 = Inscr.It. 13.3.77 = ILS 46 = AE 2000, +132 (Roma); cf. [282] M. Valerius M.f. M.n. Messalla (Niger).
[16] Probably in the last years of the second century, cf. Broughton (1951-1986) 3.104-105, Suolahti (1955) 317, 405.
[17] Cicero, *Flacc.* 6 (interpreted here as three years; cf. [281] L. Valerius Flaccus). For other examples of this ambiguity, cf. Cicero, *Verr*. 2.1.71 (cf. [302] C. (Visellius) Varro); Cicero, *Planc.* 28 (cf. [221] Cn. Plancius); Caesar, *B.Afr.* 64 (cf. [159] P. Ligarius).
[18] Ch. 2, pp.44-45.
[19] The numbers here include positions that were probably, although not certainly held. Note also that this is the total of known prefectures and military tribunates, rather than of holders of these positions: thus, for example, Valerius Flaccus' three military tribunates are counted separately (cf. L. Valerius Flaccus). It excludes, however, the four individuals described by Caesar as "praefectos tribunosque militum" (Caesar, *B.G*. 3.7.2-4; cf. [259] T. Silius). Where it is uncertain what position an individual held, the one judged to be the most likely (as indicated in Appendix A) has been selected here.

probably to be identified from the inscription recording the *consilium* of Pompeius Strabo. As for numbers of prefects, many of the prefectures mentioned, such as naval prefectures, were of higher status. Moreover, the men who held these posts, especially naval prefectures, were often the highest-ranking officers 'on the spot': they are therefore much more likely to have been mentioned in literary sources. This can be seen in the number of individual prefectures mentioned: 18 were cavalry prefectures (5 uncertain), 7 naval prefectures, 6 military prefectures which were garrison commands (1 uncertain), 12 otherwise uncategorised military prefectures (7 uncertain), and 13 *praefecturae fabrum* (2 uncertain)[20]. There would have been comparatively few naval prefects in the period, and yet naval prefectures comprise nearly one in seven of all known prefectures. In addition, the number of recorded *praefecti fabrum* may be disproportionately high: a commander might have more than one, at least in the 40s BC[21], but it is highly unlikely that there were more than twice as many *praefecturae fabrum* as garrison commands. The high number of garrison commands known from the civil war between Pompeius and Caesar, for example, suggests that the practice was common in that period[22], and yet men holding such positions are rarely found in the literary evidence relating to the period 91 – 50BC. As a result, it is difficult to do more than estimate that the number of military prefects in service and the number of military tribunes in service were of a similar order of magnitude, and suggest that, given the abolition of the post of *praefectus socium*, there may have been fewer prefects in service than military tribunes.

The roles and functions of the junior officer positions

By the first century the military tribunate as described by Polybius had changed significantly. The proliferation of older, more experienced, and higher status senatorial legates meant that the military tribunes lost many of their important roles. It was now *legati* that took part in embassies and led large detachments of troops (which by this time could mean the command of several legions)[23]. However, some military tribunes, such as the [237] younger Cato and possibly [130] A. Gabinius, did command legions, and, while this was clearly exceptional[24], it shows that talented

[20] On this division of prefectures, see below.
[21] Cf. ch. 4, pp.103-104.
[22] Cf. ch. 4, p.103.
[23] On the role and importance of *legati*, see Suolahti (1955) 198ff.; Smith (1958) 111; Keppie (1984) 39-40; De Blois (1987) 14ff.; and Goldsworthy (1996) 141.
[24] Cato: Plutarch, *Cato Min*. 18; [130] A. Gabinius: Plutarch, *Sull*. 16ff. Horace's statement that he

military tribunes could be assigned important tasks, and could use the military tribunate to show their ability and to win *gloria* and *laus*. Despite the growing importance of *legati*, military tribunes retained many of their traditional duties. They could still take part in combat, often commanding detachments[25], and their casualty rates could be high: apparently all of the military tribunes were killed in battle at Zela[26], and Caesar lost 32 military tribunes and centurions in one engagement[27]. While centurions had most of the responsibility for commanding the men on the battlefield[28], military tribunes still had an important role in providing leadership and in maintaining morale[29]. While a strong social distinction still existed between the two groups, in military terms the centurions and the military tribunes formed what De Blois calls the "military middle cadre" of the Roman legion[30].

Moreover, the junior officers were a crucial link between the commander and his troops, who frequently looked to them for leadership. This link, highlighted by De Blois[31], was crucial in maintaining the allegiance of the troops. The military tribunes in particular, who officially represented the interests of the soldiers, could act as their representatives, carrying legitimate grievances to the commander[32], or as their emissaries to ask for forgiveness: Caesar's troops more than once went to their military tribunes and centurions for advice as to how to appease Caesar after he had shown his displeasure[33]. Plutarch reports that Lucullus' military tribunes appealed to him on behalf of his men, who were cold and tired[34], and that the appeal had an effect: Lucullus had wanted to invade further into Armenia, but turned back[35]. Moreover, as

---

commanded a legion ("mihi pareret legio Romana tribuno", Horace, *Sat*. 1.6.48) need not be taken as a statement that he held an exceptionally important military command – it probably refers to his role overseeing the day-to-day running of the legion (cf. Fraenkel (1957) 11).

[25] E.g. Caesar, *B.G*. 2.26.1; Appian, *B.C.* 1.68 (cf. [82] Ap. Claudius); Appian, *Mith*. 51 (cf. [186] L. [Minucius] Basilus; Caesar, *B.G.* 5.15.5 (cf. [155] Q. Laberius Durus); Cicero, *ad Att.* 5.20.4 (cf. [161] Sex. Lucilius); Plutarch, *Sull*. 17.6ff. (cf. [130] A. Gabinius). A number of men who were probably military tribunes are also recorded in battle, cf. Sallust, *Hist*. 1.135M (cf. [62] Q. Caecilius Metellus Celer); Josephus, *A.J.* 14.69 (cf. [102] Faustus Cornelius Sulla); cf. Caesar, *B.G. 5.37*; Goldsworthy (1996) 123-124. On the use of military tribunes to command *ad hoc* detachments, see below.

[26] Appian, *Mith*. 13.89; Plutarch, *Luc*. 35.1; see above for discussion.

[27] Caesar, *B.C*. 3.71.

[28] Goldsworthy (1996) 15.

[29] Caesar, *B.G.* 3.39.1.

[30] De Blois (2000) 14.

[31] De Blois (2000) 14ff.

[32] E.g. Appian, *Mith*. 59; Velleius 2.20.4; cf. De Blois (2000) 24.

[33] Caesar, *B.G*. 1.41.1, 6.39.2.

[34] Plutarch, *Luc*. 32.3.

[35] Plutarch, *Luc.* 32-4; Dio 36.15-18; cf. [90] P. Clodius Pulcher.

De Blois points out[36], military tribunes represented the commander to his troops. A speech from a commander to his troops could be misinterpreted, and it would often be up to the junior officers to clarify what had actually been said. When, as a result of a gesture during a speech, Caesar's troops thought that he had promised to make them all equestrians, it was the military tribunes who explained what had actually happened[37]. The process could work the other way, and Caesar sounded out his junior officers about the views and morale of his troops[38]. With their frequent contact with the troops, and their social rank and contact with the commanding officer and the other officers, the military tribunes played a vital role in communications between the commander, the other officers, and the men. This process continued to be important well into the Principate, as is highlighted by Onasander's description of the way in which orders should be given: "the General should communicate his orders to his higher officers, and they should repeat them to the officers next below them, who in turn pass them to their subordinates, and so on to the lowest"[39].

The duties of a military tribune could be onerous[40]. Cicero's friend *C. Trebatius Testa*, who hesitated about accepting his post from Caesar, was offered immunity from its traditional duties[41]. Military tribunes had always had an important role within the camp – seeing to the well-being of the troops, representing their interests, and maintaining discipline[42] – and these duties were preserved in the late Republic. The detail provided by imperial sources suggests that military tribunes' administrative skills would be as valuable as their tactical ones, and that they were responsible for keeping a record of the service history and character of each soldier and, when he had served his time, for discharging him[43]. Military tribunes would have had to keep in close contact with their legion, and would have had an important role in the day-to-day running of the army. In order to perform their tasks, they were assigned a personal staff to handle the necessary 'paperwork'[44], which suggests that their administrative burden was indeed considerable. This would, no doubt, have made a

[36] De Blois (2000) 15.
[37] Suetonius, *Iul.* 33.
[38] Dio 38.35.3, 38.47.1; cf. De Blois (2000) 25; see also A. Gabinius' assurance to Sulla that the men under his command were ready for a difficult mission (Plutarch, *Sull*. 17.6ff; cf. [130] A. Gabinius).
[39] Onasander, *Strat*. 25.2 (translation from Goldsworthy ((1996) 132-133).
[40] Although, perhaps, some military tribunes did more work than others: cf. Plutarch, *Cato min*. 9.3-4.
[41] Cicero, *ad Fam.* 7.8.
[42] Polybius 6.21ff.; Plutarch, *Cato min.* 9.3-4.
[43] Digest 49.16.2. See also Tacitus, *Ann*. 1.37, 42; Vegetius 1.20; Appian, *B.C*. 3.43.
[44] Cicero, *ad Fam*. 5.20.7.

prefecture, or simply being a *contubernalis*, far more attractive to anyone who was not enthused by such tasks.

A good example of the kind of men that the post required is provided by Trebatius, a young and promising lawyer, who did accept service under Caesar in Gaul. Cicero recommended Trebatius to Caesar in glowing terms, but hardly for his military ability: "there is no one better, more honest or more modest. In addition, he is the best civil lawyer around, has a superb memory, and is a man of deep learning"[45]. While the forms of praise here echo those found in similar letters of recommendation written by Cicero – generally of a non-military nature[46] – there is no suggestion here, or in any source, that Trebatius had any military experience before joining Caesar. Moreover, Cicero actually jests with Trebatius about this, joking that Trebatius was far more at home in the courts than in the camp: "you are not usually called in to make a forced entry!...Avoid the Treveri, they are real executioners. Better if they were moneyers [*tresuiri monetales* and not *tresuiri capitales*]!"[47]. Cicero's joke seems at odds with his recommendation that Trebatius accept a post as a military tribune, until we remember that Trebatius' abilities as an administrator and as a lawyer would not have gone to waste, and that such abilities may have been as important as military experience. While the conventions of the letter of recommendation may have dictated the qualities with which Trebatius was recommended to Caesar – although in this section of such a formalised letter there appears to have been some degree of freedom[48] – such qualities would still have been useful. Generals in the Roman army needed administrators as well as soldiers, and with the legal and judicial responsibilities that came with commanding a province, the advice of a skilled lawyer might be invaluable[49]. As the *legati* took on the more important military roles, it is likely that administrative skills became increasingly important for military tribunes[50].

There is, however, no evidence to suggest that any new administrative duties had been added to the military tribunate, and it may be that in the writings of Cicero, and in the

---

[45] Cicero*, ad Fam*. 7.5.3: "probiorem hominem, meliorem uirum, pudentiorem esse neminem; accedit etiam, quod familiam ducit in iure ciuili singulari memoria, summa scientia."
[46] E.g. Cicero, *ad Fam.* 13.6; cf. Cotton (1981a) 20-21, (1985) 330ff; Bowman and Thomas (1983) 105ff.; Deniaux (1993) 45, (2000) 225ff.
[47] Cicero, *ad Fam.* 7.13.2: "et tu soles ad uim faciundam adhiberi...Treuiros uites censeo. audio capitalis esse. mallem 'aere, argento, auro' essent."
[48] cf. Kim (1972); Cotton (1981a) 6; Deniaux (2000) 225ff.
[49] Cf. Lintott (1993) 50-52; Goldsworthy (1994) 124; Braund (1998) 12. See also the role of junior officers in tribunals, e.g. Cicero, *Verr.* 2.1.73-76.
[50] Cf. Harmand (1967) 355; Devijver (1970) 76.

administrative duties of the military tribunate during the Principate, often deduced from epigraphic and papyrological evidence, we are seeing something which was always there, even in the second century, but which no source chose to bring to the foreground. There is no evidence that the functions of the military tribunes in camp that were to be taken over by the *praefectus castrorum* had yet been transferred. Military tribunes had less importance in the field and fewer opportunities to win fame and glory than they had had in the past, but they still took part in combat, and might have a role on the battlefield. The notion that the military tribunate had changed fundamentally in character should not be taken too far.

With military tribunes there is, at least, a reasonably detailed picture of their role within the army, and how they fitted into the command structure. For prefects, however, this is not the case. As indicated above, the term *praefectus* is used of any individual given responsibilities by an imperator, and distinguishing those *praefecti* who were junior officers from those who were given non-military duties is difficult[51]. Moreover, even the roles of prefects who had primarily military duties were not clearly defined in the late Republic. While the term *praefectus equitum* is used of Roman officers who served in the late Republic (although not in contemporary sources), and the term *praefectus classis* is strongly hinted at in Caesar[52], the posts varied considerably from the positions of *praefectus equitum* (and later *praefectus alae*) and *praefectus classis* found in the Principate. Instead, cavalry and naval prefects were generally *praefecti* who were given a command over cavalry or naval forces, and these commands – and their size and scope – were decided upon by the commander who appointed the prefects, taking into account the needs of the situation. Prefects could even command Roman legionary troops[53], especially when appointed to the command of a garrison. The term *praefectus* was applied to individuals who had very different levels of responsibility, and military prefects in the period from 91 – 50BC can be assigned to one of five roles: cavalry prefects; naval prefects; 'military prefects' – the holders of a prefecture, generally an *ad hoc* command involving another specific role or task; military prefects who were garrison commanders; and *praefecti fabrum*, the only military prefecture with a distinct title in the late Republic

[51] Cf. ch. 2, pp.51-56.
[52] Caesar, *B.G.* 3.11.5: D. Brutum adulescentem classi Gallicisque nauibus praefecit (56BC).
[53] Caesar, *B.G.* 6.36ff.; cf. ch. 2, p.46; for examples from 44BC, see Valerius Maximus 3.2.23 (cf. [153] Iustuleius, [66] M. Caesius Scaeua).

but one whose role is not well understood.

Fourteen individuals can be identified as having served as cavalry prefects in the period 91 – 50BC. Of these, [122] C. Flauius Fimbria[54]; [263] Tarquitius Priscus[55], [158] P. Licinius Crassus[56], [307] C. Volusenus Quadratus[57]; [43] Q. Atius Varus[58], and probably [34] M. Antonius[59] and [140] C. Insteius[60] commanded large units of cavalry (often the entire cavalry force available to the commander at the time). Their roles, and relative seniority, echo the broader cavalry commands held by senatorial legates such as Cornelius Scipio in the Augustan period[61], but they should still be classified as junior officers. It is worth noting that both Crassus and Antonius were involved in infantry actions while cavalry prefects. This suggests that their roles were flexible in nature, and that they did not directly command the cavalry that fought under them, which took its direct orders, as before, from native leaders[62].

Those cavalry commanders who were in charge of smaller units appear to have had more temporary, *ad hoc*, commands: [110] Egnatius was in charge of 300 horsemen (although, as he was fleeing the defeat at Carrhae, he may have held no formal post)[63]; [198] (Octauius?) Balbus commanded an advance guard of 700 cavalry at the Colline Gate[64]; [175] C. Marcius Censorinus commanded a unit of cavalry sent to kill the consul Octauius[65]; and the small number of cavalry given to [248] M. Scaptius (1) were intended to enable him to intimidate the Salaminians[66]. In addition, [35] Antonius Hybrida[67] and [227] Pompeius Trogus[68] commanded only a few *turmae* of cavalry. These commands, although of relatively small numbers of troops, appear to have been short-term tactical roles – designated by the imperator to meet the needs of a particular situation – and would not have involved the administration or day-to-day

[54] 87BC: Livy, *Per.* 80; 85BC: Florus 2.9.14; Velleius 2.24.1.
[55] Frontinus, *Strat.* 2.5.31.
[56] Caesar, *B.G.* 1.52.7.
[57] Caesar, *B.G.* 8.48, B.C. 3.60.4.
[58] Caesar, *B.G.* 8.28.2, B.C. 3.37.5; Josephus *A.J.* 14.84, cf. 86, 92.
[59] Plutarch, *Ant.* 3.1; cf. 3.2-4.
[60] Livy, *Per.* 91 Fr. 22.
[61] Cf. Castelli (1992) 194; Saddington (1994) 75; ch. 5, p.143.
[62] Gelzer (1968) 126; Gruen (1974) 114; Greenhalgh (1981) 88; Meier (1996) 260. Were there not such native leaders, Caesar's cavalry at Vosges would have been temporarily without a leader while Crassus was surveying the battlefield and giving orders to the infantry.
[63] Plutarch, *Crass.* 27.8; cf. 27.6-7.
[64] Plutarch, *Sull.* 29.3.
[65] Appian, *B.C.* 1.71.
[66] Cicero, *ad Att.* 6.1.4, cf. 5.21.20, 6.2.8, 6.3.5; cf. M. Scaptius (2).
[67] Asconius 84.13-14C, cf. 88; cf. Cicero, *Com. Pet.* 8.9; Plutarch, *Luc.* 4.1.
[68] Justin 43.5.11-12.

organisation and discipline of the men they commanded in battle. In the period 91 – 50BC, therefore, we do not find officers who appear to have held a post analogous to the *praefecti equitum* of the Principate[69].

Men in command of a fleet could be, but were not necessarily, junior officers. Seven naval prefects are identifiable from this period, as well as two other individuals who have been elsewhere identified as prefects, but who were senior officers, (?L. Marcius) Censorinus[70] and M. Plautius Hypsaeus[71]. Most naval prefects were given the task of commanding a fleet for military operations, and such men tended to be of equestrian rank, sometimes young *nobiles* such as [89] P. Clodius Plucher (who commanded a fleet against the pirates in 67BC[72]) or [149] D. Iunius Brutus Albinus (who commanded Caesar's fleet in northern Gaul[73]). There were relatively few theatres in which a military fleet was required, and we know only of military activity involving ships in the late Republic in the Hellespont against Mithridates ([188] Minucius Rufus (1), [234] C. Popillius (1), and [253] Seruilius[74]), in the Aegean, presumably combating pirate operations (P. Clodius Pulcher and [148] P. Iunius[75]), and in northern Gaul (D. Iunius Brutus)[76]. These men can all be seen as junior officers. We do not, unfortunately, know of any of Pompeius' naval prefects for the campaign of 66BC, although, as the sub-divisions of his fleet were commanded by *legati*, any naval prefects would probably have performed a comparatively minor role.

The relative status of the junior officers who served as (military) naval prefects is difficult to assess, as there are only two individuals whose other military careers are known. D. Iunius Brutus, frequently described by Caesar as "adulescens", served twice as a naval prefect under him, in 56BC and in 49BC[77]. In the interim, however, he was for a short time placed in command of Gallic recruits and cavalry[78], and was

[69] The closest equivalent is perhaps [227] Pompeius Trogus, who commanded a number of *turmas* under Pompeius (Justin 43.5.11-12). On the command of auxiliary infantry in the late Republic, cf. ch. 4, pp.100, 108ff.
[70] Memnon 53 (FGrH 3B.364f.); cf. *(?L. Marcius) Censorinus*.
[71] Valerius Maximus 4.6.3; cf. *M. Plautius Hypsaeus*.
[72] Cicero, *de Har. Resp.* 42; Dio 36.17.2-3.
[73] Caesar, *B.G.* 3.11.5-16.4; Dio 39.40-43; Orosius 6.8.7-16.
[74] Minucius Rufus and Popilius: Appian, *Mith*. 17, cf. 19; Seruilius: Plutarch, *Pomp.* 34.5; cf. Dio 37.3.2-3.
[75] Clodius: Cicero, *de Har. Resp.* 42; Dio 36.17. P. Iunius: I. de Délos 4.1.1856.
[76] Q. Atrius, although technically placed in charge of Caesar's fleet during the invasion of Britain, was in fact superintending the ships while they were beached, not in charge of a fleet at sea: Caesar, *B.G.* 5.9.1, 10.2.
[77] 56BC: Caesar, *B.G*. 3.11.5-16.4; Dio 39.40-43; Orosius 6.8.7-16; 49BC: Caesar, *B.C.* 1.36.5.
[78] Caesar, *B.G*. 7.9.2.

also sent into battle with reinforcements (Roman infantry) at the height of the fighting at Alesia[79]; he was given a legateship in 48BC and became praetor in 45BC. Brutus' military career under Caesar involved, therefore, a variety of roles. As a naval prefect he was responsible for collecting levies of Gallic ships, and commanding the collected fleet in battle, during which individual ships were under the command of military tribunes and centurions[80], showing that a naval prefect might be placed in charge of other junior officers. However, his role thereafter is difficult to assess. As the commander of Gallic levies and, particularly, of cavalry, we might assume that his role was that of cavalry prefect: yet at Alesia he was not in command of any units of cavalry, or of allied troops, and was delegated the role of leading legionary reinforcements. Importantly, perhaps, Brutus was sent with the first wave of reinforcements, followed by the legate C. Fabius with the second wave, and finally by Caesar himself, a progression which suggests that whatever rank he held, he was junior to a legate. The other naval prefect whose junior military career is known in any detail is P. Clodius, who was, in turn, probably a military tribune[81], a naval prefect, and subsequently a civilian prefect in Antioch[82]. Clodius' career at this point is hard to assess. However, his junior career does show him fulfilling three separate roles: as an officer in the legions, as an officer in charge of ships, and as a civilian prefect engaged in diplomacy. That naval commands conferred a considerable degree of independence (prefects could be some distance away from their commanders), and that they could have military tribunes under their command, together suggest that naval prefectures were among the most high-ranking of the junior officer positions.

Six of the military prefects of the period are attested as garrison commanders. [64] P. Caelius commanded Placentia under Octauius in 87BC, and persuaded [217] L. Petronius to kill him rather than allow him to be captured by Cinna[83]; [113] Erucius, if he commanded Chaeroneia under Sulla in 86BC, may have been a garrison commander; [141] L. Insteius, the brother of a cavalry prefect under Sertorius, commanded Contrebia in Spain under the same commander[84]; [280] P. Valerius

[79] Caesar, *B.G*. 7.87.1.
[80] Caesar, *B.G*. 3.11.5-16.4.
[81] Cf. [90] P. Clodius Pulcher.
[82] Cicero, *de Har. Resp*. 42; Dio 36.17.
[83] Valerius Maximus 4.7.5.
[84] Livy, *Per*. 91 Fr. 8.8.

commanded Epidauros in 74BC[85]; [93] C. Cornelius was in charge of Mesembria in 72BC, and was honoured by the town as a patron[86]; while [92] Coponius (1) was left in charge of the town of Carrhae by Crassus[87]. Most of these men appear to have held important military commands, which involved a great deal of independence: while they still answered to the commander (or one of his legates) they might be posted many days from the commander and his *cohors*, and would have had to have been capable of independent action. In addition, most were, like L. Acilius and L. Cornelius Scipio (probably both legates in charge of Aesernia in 90BC) [88], high-status individuals. The exceptions are P. Valerius, about the significance of whose command we have no information and Coponius, whose command was perhaps more minor, conferred upon him for a short period of time to meet an immediate military need, as was the case with [96] P. Cornelius in 46BC[89].

Although they feature less prominently in our sources than the other types of prefect, most of the other military prefects attested in this period were probably junior officers with comparatively minor responsibilities, whose roles, of an *ad hoc* nature, might entail any of a wide range of tasks. Many were in charge of vexillations of one sort or another: [186] L. [Minucius] Basilus, who was later a military tribune, was responsible for the capture of the Esquiline hill under Sulla in 88BC[90]; [175] C. [Marcius] Censorinus, who may have been an equestrian prefect, led a force that was sent to kill the consul Octauius in 87BC[91]; [91] P. Considius was, possibly on account of his military experience, responsible for overseeing some scouting operations in 58BC[92]; [303] C. Volcatius Tullus, an "adulescens", was placed in charge of guarding a bridge over the Rhine by Caesar in 53BC[93]; [275] C. Trebonius, presumably a relative of the legate, was placed in charge of 300 veterans on a foraging expedition[94]; [33] D. Antonius was placed in command of newly levied veteran troops in 51BC, and was responsible for getting them to the front[95]. Military prefects could also have a

[85] Frontinus, *Strat*. 2.11.1.
[86] BE 1952, 87 = BE 1954, 177 (Mesembria, Thracia); cf. Detchev (1950) 59ff.; Tibiletti (1953) 70ff.; Ñaco del Hoyo (2009).
[87] Plutarch, *Cras*. 27.7-8.
[88] See the entries for *L. Acilius* and *L. Cornelius Scipio* (Appian, *B.C.* 1.41).
[89] Caesar, *B.Afr*. 76.1.
[90] Plutarch, *Sull.* 9.5-6.
[91] Appian, *B.C.* 1.71.
[92] Caesar, *B.G.* 1.21-22.
[93] Caesar, *B.G.* 6.29.4.
[94] Caesar, *B.G.* 6.40.4.
[95] Cicero, *ad Fam.* 3.6.5. In this context note also [140] C. Insteius, a cavalry commander who was also

role in the camp, and were employed by Caesar, along with military tribunes, to ensure that a close watch was kept at the siege of Corfinium[96]. Military prefects could also perform more important roles: in 52BC, D. Iunius Brutus Albinus performed a number of significant military roles, including the command of Caesar's camp for a time[97]. Therefore, we should probably suppose that where a task required an officer to oversee it, or where a larger task (such as the command of a significant garrison) required a legate with officers under him, prefects were appointed to the positions in question. Military tribunes could also perform many of these roles: [82] Ap. Claudius was responsible for the defence of the Janiculum in 87BC[98]; [130] A. Gabinius was, according to Plutarch, responsible for the garrison at Chaeroneia in 86BC[99]; [307] C. Volusenus Quadratus, while a military tribune, was sent with a war galley to scout the coast of Britain in 56BC[100]; while the four men sent to find grain for Caesar in the same year are described as "praefectos tribunosque militum"[101]. However, military tribunes had responsibilities within the legion itself, and it might not necessarily have been possible for a commander to spare them, but if required any equestrian *contubernalis* could be appointed as a prefect to perform a given task. Whether or not a prefect gave up his post upon the completion of his designated task is unclear. Cicero implies that it was normal for prefects to ask for additional orders before leaving camp[102], which suggests that those given long-term duties, such as garrisoning towns, may have remained prefects even while in camp, at least until there was no more need for their services. Beyond this, there is little evidence which sheds light upon the question. However, given that there is wide variation in the tasks assigned to prefects, and that there is no known individual identified as a prefect who was not either in charge of a designated task or a *praefectus fabrum* (see below), it is probable that during the late Republic a military prefecture was an important post (and one with certain privileges) but one whose duties could be short-term and *ad hoc*.

---

responsible for raising forces under Sertorius in 76BC (Livy, *Per.* 91 Fr. 8.22) It is likely that other military prefects were involved in the raising of auxiliary forces.

[96] Caesar, *B.C.* 1.21.1. It may also be that, as with [34] M. Antonius at Jerusalem, cavalry prefects were re-assigned for siege duties.

[97] Caesar, *B.G.* 7.9.2, 87.1.

[98] Appian, *B.C.* 1.68; cf. Livy, *Per.* 80.

[99] Plutarch, *Sul.* 16.8, 18.1; cf. 17.6-7, 18.1.

[100] Caesar, *B.G.* 3.5.2; cf. Sheldon (2005) 101.

[101] Caesar, *B.G.* 3.7.2-4, cf. 8.2-4, 9.3, 10.2, 16.4; Dio 39.40.1; Orosius 6.8.67; cf. T. Silius. For another example of a military tribune with an ad hoc command, cf. [182] C. Meuulanus (Cicero, *Sest.* 9).

[102] Cicero, *ad Att.* 6.3.4.

The earliest individual to be described as *praefectus fabrum* is from 108BC: T. Turpilius Silanus is described as "ὁ ἀνὴρ ἦν μὲν ἐκ πατέρων ξένος τῷ Μετέλλῳ, καὶ τότε τὴν ἐπὶ τῶν τεκτόνων ἔχων ἀρχὴν συνεστράτευε"[103] under Q. Metellus Numidicus[104]. This passage in itself presents few problems. As Welch notes, Plutarch was familiar with the post of *praefectus fabrum*, and the title is probably correct[105]. Moreover, as with other *praefecti fabrum*[106], there is no indication of Turpilius' role here, and it is his close relationship with Metellus that is emphasised.

However, Turpilius was then placed in command of the town of Vaga, and had Roman soldiers, including military tribunes, under his command[107]. The language used to describe this command suggests that he was a garrison commander, and not a *praefectus fabrum*, at the time: "φρουρῶν δὲ Βάγαν πόλιν μεγάλην" (Plutarch); "τὸν φρούραρχον Τουρπίλιον" (Appian); "praefectum oppidi T. Turpilium Silanum" (Sallust). Turpilius' position as *praefectus fabrum* is mentioned only by Plutarch. It is possible that he held both positions (the commander of the garrison at Vaga and *praefectus fabrum* to Metellus) at the same time – note that [207] Q. Paconius Lepta was probably both *praefectus fabrum* to Cicero and a legate[108] – but, even so, the two positions should be treated separately: Turpilius was a *praefectus fabrum* who, possibly at the same time, or possibly after leaving the post, was also a garrison commander.

The post of *praefectus fabrum* is the first of the prefectures found in the Principate to be consistently referred to as a distinct post, and, unlike the cavalry or naval prefects, these prefects are explicitly described by a formal title (*praefecti fabrum* or a very close translation in Greek) in nearly all cases[109]. However, the role of the *praefectus fabrum* is hard to assess. It almost certainly evolved from a position in command of

[103] Plutarch, *Mar*. 8.1. Whether Turpilius was a Roman citizen or not has been hotly debated (for the history of the discussion, cf. Welch (1995) 132ff.; Badian (1997) 10ff.); however, Badian ((1997) 10ff.) has demonstrated that Turpilius was probably a Roman citizen from the small town of Collatia.
[104] Cf. RE (Turpilius) 10; Welch (1995) 132ff.; Badian (1997) 10ff.
[105] Welch (1995) 132 no.5.
[106] Cf. ch. 4, p.120-121.
[107] Plutarch, *Mar*. 8.1-2; Sallust, *Iug*. 66 (his command over military tribunes is stated at 66.3); Appian, *Num*. 3.
[108] Cicero *ad Fam.* 5.20.4.
[109] Cf. ch. 2, pp.54-55, for the ambiguous way in which other prefectures are described. The two cases where the technical term is not used are those of Turpilius Silanus (Plutarch, *Mar*. 8.1 (see above)) and [167] N. Magius (Cicero, *ad Att.* 9.7C.2). However, in the case of Magius the fact that he was *praefectus fabrum* is made explicit a few lines later, and in the case of Turpilius, the wording used, "ἐπὶ τῶν τεκτόνων ἔχων ἀρχὴν συνεστράτευε", is extremely close to the technical ἔπαρχος τεκτόνων, and hardly allows for any doubt.

the *fabri*, as Vegetius states[110]; however, by the late Republic, the post had taken on a different character[111]. The literary evidence from the late Republic and early Triumviral period suggests that *praefecti fabrum* were equestrians, and were not necessarily experienced soldiers – as anyone placed in command of the *fabri* would surely have been. Indeed, no literary evidence suggests that military specialism or, indeed, military ability, was a factor in their appointment, and no *praefectus fabrum* is praised for showing military or specialist ability in his performance of the role. It is possible that *praefecti fabrum* were placed in charge of building works: an inscription describes [95] L. Cornelius as "L. Cornelius L. f. Vot(uria) / Q. Catuli co(n)s(ulis) praef(ectus) fabr(um) / censoris architectus"[112]; [172] Mamurra was involved in construction works under Caesar[113]; and [99] C. Cornelius Cn.f. Gallus oversaw construction in Alexandria while *praefectus fabrum*[114]. These examples have been developed by Verzár-Bass to suggest that the principal role of the *praefectus fabrum* in the Republic was to oversee civic construction, and that the post developed into an honorary municipal position in the Principate, being awarded for significant local works[115]. While it is true that, by the Claudian era at least, the post was probably no longer a military position, Verzár-Bass' argument does not take account of the fact that the position remained one of equestrian rank, and appears to have been held as part of an equestrian military career[116]. Moreover, beyond the examples cited above, there is no evidence that *praefecti fabrum* were involved in construction, and if men such as the father of Velleius Paterculus had been involved in significant construction works, we might expect to have some mention of it[117]. The suggestion that such men were architects also appears to sit uneasily with the suicide of C. Velleius along with his commander Ti. Nero, or the death of [121] C. Flauius at Philippi[118]: if such men were architects, why were they present on these occasions, and why did they lose their lives?

---

[110] Vegetius 2.11.
[111] Cf. Dobson (1966) 61ff.; Saddington (1985) 529ff.; Welch (1996) 131ff.; Badian (1997) 16ff.; Cerva (2000) 197ff.; Verzár-Bass (2000) 177ff.
[112] CIL 6.40910 = CIL 1.2961 = AE 1971, 61 = AE 2000, +251 = AE 2003, +19 = EDH HD010465 (Roma).
[113] Cf. Welch (1995) 137.
[114] Cf. AE 1964, 255 = AE 1980, 46 = AE 1987, 103 = AE 1991, +63 = AE 1994, 1815 (Roma); ch. 4, p.121.
[115] Verzár-Bass (2000) 211ff.
[116] Cf. Dobson and Saddington (as above); Millar (1963) 196; Demougin (1988) 682; Devijver (1995) 172; cf. ch. 5, p.159.
[117] Velleius 2.76.1; cf. [289] C. Velleius.
[118] Plutarch, *Brut*. 51.2.

It is more likely, as Suolahti, Dobson, Demougin and Cerva[119] argue, that the role of the *praefectus fabrum* in the pre-imperial period was that of a personal aide, whose duties were dependent upon his commander's wishes. Sometimes this might involve the *praefectus fabrum* concerned being in a different part of a province, and, as consuls in Rome could have *praefecti fabrum*, the position was not always a military one[120]. However, as the majority of *praefecti fabrum* did serve in the provinces, and the majority of known *praefecti fabrum* served under commanders who were actively engaged in military activity, the position is treated as a junior officer post in this thesis.

That a *praefectus fabrum* was the personal aide of a commander is suggested by the close relationship that the *praefecti fabrum* of the late Republic appear to have enjoyed with their commanders. [207] Q. Paconius Lepta is frequently mentioned by Cicero in his letters, but always as a friend ("Lepta tibi salutem dicit"[121]) rather than as a military colleague[122]. [178] Marcius Libo (*praefectus fabrum* under Varro[123]) is represented as taking part in philosophical discussions with his commander; [86] L. Clodius (*praefectus fabrum* of Ap. Claudius Pulcher[124]) was consulted by Cicero as to Claudius' whereabouts, which Cicero portrays as being an 'amicable' gesture, mentioning Clodius' rank so as to highlight the way in which he (Cicero) has been friendly towards Claudius' friends and intimates, including one of Claudius' freedmen. Cicero's portrayal of the selection of the young [97] L. Cornelius Balbus as a *praefectus fabrum* by Caesar implies that it was the closeness of their friendship which stimulated Balbus' appointment, and Balbus served under Caesar for a number of years as *praefectus fabrum*[125]; and the allegedly close nature of Caesar's relationship with Mamurra, another of his *praefecti fabrum*, is, of course, touched upon by Catullus[126].

---

[119] Suolahti (1955) 206-207; Dobson (1966) 62-64; Demougin (1988) 682; Cerva (2000) 180ff.
[120] Cf. L. Cornelius L.f. Vot(uria), and above. During the Augustan period, epigraphic evidence appears to suggest a clearer distinction between *praefecti fabrum* who served under magistrates in Rome and those who served under commanders in the provinces (cf. ch. 5, pp.151-152), but as the status of the post appears to have changed significantly in the intervening years, it is difficult to say how close a parallel is provided by men such as [27] Q. Aemilius Q.f. Pal(atina) Secundus.
[121] Cicero, *ad Fam.* 16.4.4, cf. *ad Att.* 6.1.22.
[122] Cicero also appears to have had a close relationship with [300] Vibius Sicca, his *praefectus fabrum* during his consulship (Plutarch, *Cic*. 32.2; cf. Cicero, *ad Att*. 3.2, 3.4).
[123] Varro, *R.R*. 1.2.7.
[124] Cicero, *ad Fam*. 3.4.1-2, 3.5.3.
[125] Cicero, *pro Balb*. 63.
[126] Catullus 29, 57.

The status of junior officers and the composition of the junior officer corps

The rise in the number of legions in service, described above, brought about an important change in the selection and status of the military tribunate: the majority of military tribunes were no longer elected. In general, not much emphasis has been placed upon this change, although, in fact, it marked a significant shift in the nature of the post. Traditionally, the military tribunate had been an elected position: 24 military tribunes were elected annually for the four consular legions, and only if there were more legions in service were extra military tribunes – we assume six per legion – appointed. For the period 167 – 134BC, only in six years were there more appointed than elected military tribunes, and with an average of just over six legions in service per year, there were on average around 36 military tribunes a year of whom just 12 (33%) would be appointed. For the period 91 – 50BC, by contrast, with an average of 23 legions in service each year, there were on average 138 military tribunes per year of whom 114 (82%) would be appointed[127]. The figures are, however, potentially somewhat misleading, as it is logical to assume that some, if not most, of the military tribunes elected in one year would be in service as appointed military tribunes in one or more subsequent years, and thus a larger proportion of military tribunes than the statistics show would have been elected at some point.

However, even if he had been elected initially, any military tribune serving beyond a single year owed his position to the patronage of his commander, not to the Roman people. Therefore, the military tribunate became, in general, an appointed position, dependent not upon the choice of the Roman people but upon the favour of individual commanders: military tribunes owed their positions to the patronage of their commanders, and to their own patrons who might recommend them. This change must have lowered the status of the military tribunate, even though, as noted above, there was no difference in the roles or responsibilities of elected and appointed military tribunes.

While this change was less important to the status of the junior officer positions as a whole than it was to the status of the military tribunate – prefects had always been appointed – it was nevertheless highly significant. A large proportion of military tribunes (who in this period, we estimate, constituted approximately half of the junior

[127] These figures are calculated from the data in Brunt: see above, n.4.

officer corps) would have had a very different background from that of their second-century colleagues, who were predominantly elected. That there was a decline in the status of the junior officers, and the military tribunate in particular, between the second century and the Principate is clear, and this much is agreed upon by all modern commentators. However, few modern authors can agree where the decline in status began, and when it was that Italians from municipal backgrounds began to dominate the ranks of the junior officers[128]. While men who expected to enter the Senate still held junior officer positions, the vast majority of junior officers in the Principate were men from equestrian families who, while they may have aspired to a senatorial position, generally held their posts as part of an equestrian career[129]. There is a substantial difference between this system and that described by Polybius. Suolahti argues that this decline in status can be seen in the rising proportion of known military tribunes from equestrian and municipal backgrounds throughout the first century[130], and the evidence presented by him shows a growing number of officers coming from outside Rome, initially largely from Latium, Etruria and Campania, and then increasingly from more 'remote' areas such as Picenum and the Central Apennines[131]. However, while this shows that Italians from parts of Italy ever further removed from Rome were serving as junior officers as the century progressed, it does not show that the status of the office was in decline as a result of an influx of men from equestrian and municipal backgrounds, and it need not be taken as more than an indication that the recruitment base for junior officers was widening. Given the rise in the number of officer positions available, this is unsurprising: even ignoring the rise in the number of legions created by the enfranchisement of the Italians, the size of the citizen army still rose by approximately 25% between 167 – 134BC and 91 – 50BC. Coupled with the extra posts made available by the enfranchisement of the Italians, this led to a 270% increase in the number of military tribunates, which was not 'compensated for' by a corresponding fall in the number of prefectures available with the abolition of the post of *praefectus socium*. Even with the doubling in size of the Senate in 81BC, the number of junior officers from non-senatorial families must have risen significantly to cope with the extra demand. This

[128] See Suolahti (1955) 298ff.; Smith (1958) 60, 68; Badian (1959) 15; Gruen (1974) 116; De Blois (1987) 17.
[129] Cf. ch. 8, p.238.
[130] Suolahti (1955) 298.
[131] Suolahti (1955) 145-168, 279-287.

largely explains why the proportion of junior officers who came from senatorial families appears to have dropped sharply[132]: even if the numbers of young members of the senatorial elite serving as military tribunes remained constant, the equestrians and Italians would now outnumber them, and it is likely that a considerable proportion of the military tribunes of the period 91 – 50BC came from former allied communities[133].

Moreover, men from high-status families still served as military tribunes. To the names of Caesar, the younger Cato, M. Valerius Messalla Niger and C. Octauius (mentioned above), we may add [82] Ap. Claudius[134], [199] C. Octauius Graecinus[135], [255] [Q. Seruilius] Caepio[136]; [161] Sex. Lucilius[137] and, probably, [62] Q. Caecilius Metellus Celer[138] and [102] Faustus Cornelius Sulla[139]. If [90] P. Clodius Pulcher was a military tribune, then his name should be added to this list. Moreover, while the second century BC did see *consulares* serving as military tribunes, this took place during a period when the qualification requirement for the military tribunate, and indeed the method of selecting military tribunes, was regularly changing[140], and should not be taken as typical. Nevertheless, it is likely that the first century BC still saw men of senatorial rank serving as military tribunes: [72] L. Cassius (?Longinus)[141] and [235] C. Popillius (2)[142] both appear to have held military tribunates following their quaestorships (both, it should be noted, were elected to the position).

It is, of course, sometimes difficult to tell whether or not a post attested in a literary source as being held by a man whom we know to be of senatorial rank was a prefecture, as – with legateships becoming more common – it was increasingly likely that an important military task would be given to a legate. Nevertheless, a number of men from high-status families are attested as holding prefectures in the period,

[132] Suolahti (1955) 298 (Table 25).
[133] Cf. the figures produced by Suolahti, (1955) 147ff.: given the distortion of our sources, it is likely that the true figure was much higher; cf. ch. 8, pp.227-228, and Gabba (1976) 52.
[134] Appian, *B.C*. 1.68; cf. Livy, *Per*. 80.
[135] CIL 14.3629 = Inscr.It. 4.1.161; cf. CIL 14.3629a = Inscr.It. 4.1.162; CIL 14.3664 = CIL 1.1492 = ILS 5546 = Inscr.It. 4.1.19 = ILLRP 680 = AE 2000, +19 (Tibur, Regio 1, Italia).
[136] Plutarch, *Cato Min*. 8.1.
[137] Cicero, *ad Att.* 5.20.4.
[138] Sallust, *Hist*. 1.135M.
[139] Josephus, *A.J*. 14.69; cf. 73, *B.J*. 1.149.
[140] Cf. ch. 2, pp.64-66.
[141] Cicero, *Verr*. 1.30; cf. Broughton (1951-1986) 3.50.
[142] Syme (1963) 168.

including young men from very prominent families, such as M. Antonius and D. Iunius Brutus Albinus, whose roles are discussed above. The majority of junior officers, with the exception of higher-status naval prefects, were, however, men from equestrian families. This encompassed a wide range of backgrounds: men from prominent families who had a reasonable expectation of high senatorial office; men from established but less prominent families; and men whose families were just obtaining equestrian status for the first time. The heterogeneity of the junior officer corps in this period should not be underestimated.

However, this heterogeneity did not yet include former centurions. While the centurionate of the late Republic was, without doubt, an important position, there was still a significant class distinction between centurions and junior officers, and the centurionate was not yet so desirable that equestrians chose to serve in the army as centurions. That equestrians did serve as centurions is often asserted, most strongly by Gabba, and yet the evidence to back up this claim is extremely slight[143]. Admittedly, the lucrative centurionate could be held for many years, as opposed to the relatively short tenure of junior officer posts[144], but there are no securely identifiable equestrian centurions known from the late Republic. Caesar's commentaries give us the name of the centurion P. Sextius Baculus, who distinguished himself many times in the field, and, as he has the full *tria nomina*, not usually found among centurions at this time, he may have been of equestrian rank[145]. However, Caesar, despite praising his courage and skill in war, never hints that Baculus was an *eques*, and other explanations of his cognomen – such as a camp nickname – may be preferable. There is a candidate from the civil war between Caesar and Pompey: Valerius Flaccus, son of the legate, captured during the campaign at Pharsalus[146]. However, he is not explicitly named as a centurion, merely as one of a group of prisoners which included centurions and veterans[147]. Syme's contention that the lure of military life and its benefits would have drawn "a few young knights – at least the younger sons of equestrian families – from the more military regions of Italy into the [centurionate]

[143] Gabba (1976) 34-35 and (1951) 204; contra, Harmand (1967) 328 esp. n.141 and 358.
[144] During the Principate, it was by no means uncommon for equestrians to prefer the centurionate to a junior officer position (cf. Statius, *Silu.* 5.1.95). On the advantages and disadvantages to be weighed when making such a decision, see Dobson (1972) esp. 195ff.
[145] Caesar, *B.G.* 2.25, 3.5, 6.38.
[146] Caesar, *B.C.* 3.53.2.
[147] Cf. Nicolet (1969) 151.

ranks of Caesar's legions"[148] is not supported by clear evidence. The class difference between centurions and junior officers is clear from several sources, and there is no evidence from the period 91 – 50BC of centurions being promoted to junior officer positions. Cicero, describing losses among Cassius' army, names two men: Asinius Dentro, "centurionem…primi pili nobilem sui generis", and [161] Sex. Lucilius, "T. Gaui Caepionis locupletis et splendidi hominis filium, tribunum militum"[149]. There is a clear status distinction drawn between a centurion, even a *primipilus*, and the young son of a Roman notable. The phrase "nobilem sui generis" in itself suggests a class distinction between officers and centurions[150]. Smith may be right to argue that there were promoted centurions of whom we have no knowledge[151], but his examples of promoted centurions who are attested are all from the civil wars or the Triumviral period, when the status of both centurions and junior officers changed dramatically[152]. For the preceding period, as Nicolet argues, the status difference was still maintained between the equestrian junior officers and centurions, who, at least until retirement, were not equestrians[153].

The relative status of the junior officer positions in the late Republic is difficult to assess. The little information we have about the career path of a junior officer suggests that a prefect was, in the late Republic, generally senior in rank to a military tribune: according to Sallust, [215] M. Petreius, the archetype of the *homo militaris*, served as "tribune, prefect, legate and praetor"[154]; Cicero, in declaring the *stipendia* of his officers and *contubernales*, lists them in the order "prefects, military tribunes, and *contubernales*"[155], an order which is repeated elsewhere in his letters (although it must be noted that 'prefects' here includes civilian as well as military prefects); and Orosius, presumably drawing from Livy, shows the hierarchy of the officers at the siege of Praeneste in much the same way as Sallust, albeit in descending order:

---

[148] Syme (1939) 129.
[149] Cicero, *ad Att*. 5.20.4.
[150] Cf. [204] M. Orfius, a military tribune described by Cicero as "hominem domi splendidum, gratiosum etiam extra domum" (Cicero, *ad Q.F*. 2.13.3).
[151] Smith (1958) 67; cf. Gruen (1974) 384.
[152] Cf. ch. 4, p.124ff.
[153] Nicolet (1979) 318, (1980) 96. In this context, it is worth noting that while Cicero was bound, by law, to report payments to his military tribunes, prefects and contubernales, he was not bound to report payments to his centurions in the same way; nor did making such payments confer the same potential benefits of patronage (Cicero, *ad Fam.* 5.20.7).
[154] Sallust, *Cat*. 59.6.
[155] Cicero, *ad Fam*. 5.20.7.

"legatos, quaestores, praefectos et tribunos"[156]. We know of men who held prefectures following military tribunates, but none who held military tribunates following prefectures: [307] C. Volusenus Quadratus[157] became a cavalry prefect after success as a military tribune[158], and, if he was a military tribune, [90] P. Clodius became a naval prefect later in the same year as his military tribunate. [149] D. Iunius Brutus was placed in charge of military tribunes while serving as a naval prefect[159]. Moreover, although it is generally evidence from a later period (50BC – AD100), the tombs of equestrian prefects identified from funerary imagery by Devijver and van Wonterghem appear to be of higher status than those of the military tribunes[160].

However, as noted above, there was a significant difference in status between prefects; a *praefectus* in charge of 2,000 cavalry was clearly more important than a military tribune, but it is hard to say the same of [303] C. Volcatius Tullius who, as noted above, was placed in charge of a bridge over the Rhine by Caesar[161]. It is probably the case that high status prefectures, such as naval commands or the command of large contingents of cavalry, would have been awarded to individuals before they entered a province. These were positions which a commander would have known he had to fill as soon as he knew the forces he had to command. Any *ad hoc* prefects that might be required could be created from among the equestrians in the commander's entourage. This can perhaps be seen in the appointment of [34] M. Antonius by Gabinius: Gabinius had invited Antonius to join him as a private citizen, but Antonius declined; Gabinius then offered him a cavalry command, which Antonius accepted[162]. As a private citizen, Antonius would have been eligible to be appointed as a prefect later on, which may already have been what Gabinius had in mind when he invited him. While direct comparisons are difficult, as individual

[156] Orosius 5.21.10.
[157] Caesar, *B.G.* 3.5.2, 4.21.1, 4.23.5, 6.41.2, 8.23.4, 8.48.1, *B.C.* 3.60.4. It is of course possible that more than one Volusenus Quadratus served under Caesar, and brothers or fathers and sons serving together were not uncommon (see below, ch. 6). However, Caesar refers in books 3, 4 and 6 of the Gallic Wars to a military tribune named C. Volusenus, Hirtius, in book 8 of the Gallic Wars, to a *praefectus equitum* named C. Volusenus Quadratus, and Caesar, in book 3 of the Civil Wars, to a *praefectus equitum* named C. Volusenus. The same pattern may be observed of [43] Q. Atius Varus, whose full *tria nomina* are given by Hirtius (*B.G.* 8.28.2), while Caesar uses only the *nomen* in book 3 of the Civil Wars (*B.C.* 3.37.5): it is therefore probable that when Caesar and Hirtius talk of C. Volusenus (Quadratus), they are referring to the same man.
[158] Caesar, *B.G.* 1.52.9.
[159] Caesar, *B.G.* 6.29.4.
[160] Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 60ff
[161] Caesar, *B.G.* 6.29.4
[162] Plutarch, *Ant.* 3.1.

military tribunes and prefects are rarely mentioned together, many *ad hoc* prefects were probably similar in rank to the military tribunes: the four men sent by P. Crassus to acquire corn are described as "praefectos tribunosque militum", and in the account which follows no distinctions in rank are made between them – they are collectively "equites Romani"[163]. There were, in any case, no boundaries or set duties to any prefecture: the importance of a prefect and his prefecture depended upon the task he was given and the authority with which he was entrusted to accomplish it. So while *ad hoc* military prefects probably differed little in rank from military tribunes, a military tribune who was made a high-status cavalry prefect had been, in effect, promoted.

However, the status gap between even high-status prefects and military tribunes was not as large as the gap between the junior officer positions and the ranks above and below them: they were all equestrians[164], while legates were of senatorial rank, and centurions were not of equestrian rank. Along with the *contubernales*, the junior officers comprised a clearly identifiable group of equestrians who travelled with or served under a Roman commander in his province, and, probably, formed a significant part of his *consilium*[165].

The suggestion that the junior officers of the final decades of the Republic were, as a whole, less competent than their second-century forebears also needs to be assessed. We do have evidence to suggest that many men serving as junior officers in the first century BC did not have the military experience of those of the second century: the military importance of the military tribunate had declined, the alternative and higher-status post of *legatus* being available for more senior men, and the service requirement for military tribunes had lapsed. Bearing this in mind, it is perhaps natural to assume that the military standard of the junior officers fell into decline. Caesar, in a frequently cited passage describing the reaction of his army to rumours of the massive physical size of Ariovistus' Germans, paints an unflattering picture of his junior officers:

> "So great a fear suddenly seized the whole army that
> the minds and thoughts of all were seriously disturbed.

[163] Caesar, *B.G*. 3.7.1, 10.2; cf. [259] T. Silius.
[164] E.g. Caesar, *B.G*. 1.39.2 and Cicero, *ad Fam*. 5.20.7; cf. Suolahti (1955) 210; Garlan (1975) 158; Gabba (1976) 74-75.
[165] E.g. Caesar *B.G.* 5.28.3, 6.7.8; cf. the discussion of *consilia* in ch.1, p.34ff.; cf. Isaac (1995) 25.

> This began with the military tribunes, prefects and the rest, who had followed Caesar from Rome out of friendship and did not have much military experience ... Because of their shouts and fear even those who were very used to life in camp, soldiers, centurions, and those who were in charge of the cavalry gradually became disconcerted"[166].

The implications of this passage are clear: the military tribunes, the prefects, and the *contubernales* are grouped together and contrasted with the centurions and the experienced soldiers. The entire body of junior officers – and not, it should be noted, the *legati* – are portrayed as inexperienced and cowardly. It is statements such as these that have led some modern commentators to argue that the abilities of junior officers had fallen into a steep decline: military tribunates were, according to Badian, given "rather lightly"[167].

Leaving aside the obvious point that Caesar's comments, which may have had as much to do with the political messages Caesar was sending to Rome as anything else, should neither be taken too literally nor as completely representative of the body of junior officers as a whole[168], there are other barriers to making this kind of assumption. Firstly, the military tribunate was an important position, and it required competent men to perform its duties. Despite their being scared of the Germans, there is no evidence that Caesar dismissed his officers, and in the campaigns there is no similar criticism of their abilities or any suggestion that they were incompetent[169]. Secondly, there could be stiff competition for the junior officer posts, as is shown by Caesar's election to the military tribunate, as well as the fact that there was no shortage of men ready to take up the posts available, as there had been in the second century. Thirdly, as Le Bohec and Goldsworthy[170] point out, the focus of the junior officer positions had changed, and military valour was no longer as important as it

[166] Caesar, *B.G.* 1.39.2-5: "tantus subito timor omnem exercitum occupauit ut non mediocriter omnium mentes animosque perturbaret. Hic primum ortus est a tribunis militum, praefectis, reliquisque qui ex urbe amicitiae causa Caesarem secuti non magnum in re militari usum habebant...Horum uocibus ac timore paulatim etiam ii qui magnum in castris usum habebant, milites centurionesque quique equitatui praeerant, perturbabantur."
[167] Badian (1959) 15.
[168] Cf. Braund (1998) 12.
[169] For the most part at least; cf., however, [91] P. Considius (Caesar, *B.G.* 1.21-22, and below, ch. 6, p.178).
[170] Le Bohec (1994) 37; Goldsworthy (1996) 124ff.

had been: administrative and legal skills were, as we have seen, equally desirable qualities. Moreover, the last thirty years of the Republic provide evidence of a rise in the number of men who served for long periods in the army and who, by gaining promotion and new responsibilities[171], rose to positions of prominence: the increasing numbers of such men during the late Republic suggest that the quality of the junior officers cannot have been in sharp decline.

[171] Cf. ch. 6. pp.176-177.

Ch 4: The Junior Officer Positions 49 – 31BC

The period of the civil wars saw dramatic change among the junior officer positions. In part, this was due to the demand for troops. While the large number of troops in service in the period 91 – 50BC was not unprecedented, the period 49 – 31BC saw record numbers of troops in service, and also saw Roman forces engaged extensively in war at sea. A large number of officers were required to command the expanded armed forces, and the recruitment of experienced soldiers became increasingly difficult. Moreover, the leaders of the various factions needed to reward their allies, with the result that many Italians, and even some provincials, were able to obtain high office, while many of the traditional status barriers between junior officers and centurions began to break down.

In addition, the junior officer positions of the period were affected by the changing nature of warfare itself. Perhaps for the first time since the First Punic War, naval power became a decisive factor in Roman warfare. The late Republic had, of course, seen a number of important naval commands, particularly in the campaigns against piracy and against Mithridates, but in none of these was control of the Roman state decided by sea power. The use of naval power, both for fighting battles at sea and for moving huge numbers of troops and supplies, meant that a large number of commanders were needed to organise the rival fleets.

Moreover, the civil wars tested the loyalty of regions, and of cities, that had rarely been a concern to Roman commanders in the late Republic. During the civil wars, garrisons were needed for areas that might offer an opponent a tactical advantage, or which might not otherwise give a commander their full support. The rise in the number of military prefects needed to command previously secure areas is a characteristic of the Roman military system in this period.

There were, of course, periods of relative peace, and the protagonists and factions involved changed over time. However, the large-scale use of naval power and the pressure on recruitment caused by the unprecedented size of the Roman armed forces were consistent factors throughout the period. Moreover, many of the changes

observed for the period, such as the decline in the status of the military tribunate, are observable from the early years of the war between Caesar and Pompeius to the post-Actium settlement. It is the scale and nature of the warfare, and not the names of the commanders involved, that most defined the junior officer positions from 49 to 31BC and necessitates consideration of these years as a single period (rather than as separate 'Caesarian' and 'Triumviral' periods).

At the outset, it should be noted that the irregularity which is is a common feature of the period affects the identification and understanding of junior officer posts. With almost the entire Mediterranean a theatre of war, many duties were assigned on an *ad hoc* basis and the titles of many officers are not preserved. For example, in 47BC [68] D. Carfulenus – who was to be *tribunus plebis* in 44BC – was an experienced soldier and senior member of Caesar's entourage who was given a number of cohorts with which to perform an important role at a critical moment in a battle[1]: the title of his position was probably not of much concern at the time. It is often extremely difficult to separate legates who are given no title from prefects, and, given that the late Republican procedures for the appointment of legates may well have been ignored or altered, it is possible that any individual of senatorial rank may have been a legate[2]. This ambiguity is present in the evidence of the late Republic, but becomes magnified in the period of civil turmoil by the placement of large numbers of individuals in roles, such as that of garrison commander or naval commander, which appear to have had no clearly defined status in earlier periods, and by the assignment of roles to freedmen and non-Romans throughout the period. It is sometimes only the social status of an individual that has led to his being designated a legate rather than a prefect: the long lists of *legati* gathered in Broughton bear testimony to this. Moreover, a number of officer commands, particularly certain naval commands, should not be regarded as junior officer positions in this period, although their holders may not have been legates. *Pompeius Menodorus* and *Pompeius Democharis*, naval commanders who mainly served under Sextus Pompeius, are referred to as *praefecti classis* by Velleius[3]. Their roles and status, however, mean that while they were not legates, they were not junior officers either: the accusation that Menodorus behaved

[1] D. Carfulenus (Caesar, *B.Alex*. 31; cf. Cicero, *ad Fam.* 10.33.4, *ad Att.* 15.4.1; Appian, *B.C*. 3.66-69); cf. Syme (1939) 132; Broughton (1951-1986) 2.324.
[2] Cf. Badian (1997) 6-7; cf. D. Turullius (Valerius Maximus 1.1.19; Broughton (1951-1986) 2.350, 3.260).
[3] Velleius 2.73.3; cf. Porphyrio, *ad Hor. Ep*. 4.1.

as if he were a praetorian governor while in Sardinia suggests this strongly, as does his importance to Octavian[4]. *Sextus Pompeius* was styled on coinage as "praefectus classis et orae maritimae ex s(enatus) c(onsulto)"[5] in 43BC, but he cannot be considered as a junior officer[6], nor can *D. Laelius*, despite his description in an inscription as an "ἔπαρχος"[7], or *Machaeras*, in charge of two legions and 1,000 cavalry[8]. Such prefectures are analogous to the positions of *praefectus praetorii* and *praefectus Aegypti* in the Principate, prefectures involving command of military forces that were held by equestrians, but were not junior officer positions.

The number of junior officer positions available

Establishing the size of the Roman army during this period is a matter of considerable complexity. At various points over the course of these years, large forces were formed, reformed, and discharged under a number of different commanders, and our sources are not precise enough or detailed enough to allow for the number of legions in service to be counted exactly. Brunt argues that there were at least 45-47 legions in service at the time of Pharsalus, requiring 270-282 military tribunes, and, after discharges and casualties, 34-36 legions in service at the time of Caesar's death (18-20 legions to guard the provinces, and 16 legions for service against the Parthians), requiring 204-216 military tribunes[9]. This latter figure was not spectacularly high, and figures for the late Republic had occasionally been even higher[10]: during 73-72BC at least 33 legions were in service each year, 38 if one includes Perperna's forces. While some of these legions were not at full strength, and a certain number of troops in them were not Roman citizens, they still required officers to command them. Moreover, in addition to legionary tribunes, there would have been a number of tribunes, possibly *tribuni militum*, in charge of those cohorts of (mainly) citizen infantry that were not formed into legions (on which below). There were 30 such cohorts in the Pompeian forces in Spain in 49BC (thus requiring 30 tribunes), but the creation of cohorts of

[4] Dio 48.45.5; cf. Saddington (1990) 259.
[5] BMCRR 2.560ff. = RRC 1.520; cf. Velleius 2.73.1; Saddington (2005b) 205.
[6] Cf. Saddington (1988) 300.
[7] IGRP 3.1018; cf. Caesar, *B.C.* 3.5.3; cf. 3.7.1, 40.5, 100; Cicero, *ad Att*. 11.7.2, 14.1, 15.1-2.
[8] Josephus, *A.J.* 14.434-438, 448, 450, *B.J.* 1.317, 324, 334.
[9] Brunt (1971) 473ff. Nearly all of these figures and those which follow are approximations (for an understanding of how they were arrived at, see Brunt's discussion). In what follows, it is assumed that there were still six military tribunes per legion. It should also be noted that many legions were greatly reduced in size and we cannot tell what effect this may have had on the number of military tribunes in those legions.
[10] Brunt (1971) 449 (Table XIV).

citizen troops appears to have been a short-lived phenomenon, and the total number of such commanders in this period is difficult to estimate with any precision. It is likely that these cohorts were only intended to operate independently as an interim measure, and that they were later formed into legions[11]

In the years following Caesar's death, the number of legions in service soared. By the time of Philippi, the Republicans had approximately 21 legions in service, and the Triumvirs 40, to which can be added the forces of Sextus Pompeius, as well as forces under Cornificius[12] and other commanders. The combined force of approximately 75 legions required approximately 450 military tribunes, a sizeable increase compared to the average of approximately 138 in the period 80-50BC.

This figure remained roughly constant until 36, when Antonius had approximately 22 legions, Octavian around 30, Lepidus around 14 and Sextus Pompeius 10, a total of 76[13]. After the victory over Sextus Pompeius and the exclusion of Lepidus from the Triumvirate, and with the discharge and settlement of troops, the number of legions in service dropped, with perhaps 51 legions in service at the time of Actium, 23 under Antonius and 28 under Octavian, requiring around 306 military tribunes[14]. Even this number of legions represents more than twice the average in service during the period 80-50BC.

The period saw a substantial rise in the number of naval units in service. Roman fleets were in action throughout the period, transporting troops and supplies, attempting to disrupt enemy troop movements, or trying to control the corn supply into Rome. Such fleets might be very large: Octavian had a fleet of over 350 ships for the Actium campaign, and the Pompeians had had a similar fleet in 49-48BC[15]. These fleets needed commanders, and the 15 individuals recorded who were probable junior naval prefects make up a large proportion of the total number of prefects known from the period, a reflection of their increased military importance. However, unlike cavalry units, the size of a fleet or a command varied immensely, and even the kind of rough estimates made below, which would in this case involve dividing the number of ships

[11] For another example of a temporary organisation of newly levied troops (43BC, this time into centuries), cf. Appian, *B.C.* 3.165; Schmitthenner (1958) 26.
[12] Brunt (1971) 480-488.
[13] Brunt (1971) 499ff.; cf. Appian, *B.C.* 5.127; Orosius 6.20.6.
[14] Brunt (1971) 501ff.
[15] Brunt (1971) 500.

in service by the size of the probable units, are not possible: the size of individual naval commands was determined by the needs of the situation and the size of the force available, and it is therefore not possible to estimate the number of naval prefects with any confidence. However, given the nature of such prefectures, it is likely that there were fewer naval prefects than any other kind of junior officer.

The number of auxiliary prefects in service – cavalry prefects and prefects of infantry – is hard to estimate. Our evidence for the period is scanty and weighted towards the early 40s BC, and the influence upon our perception of this period of Caesar, who often records the actions of *praefecti*, is unavoidable: over one third of all officers from the years 49 – 31BC are recorded in his works and in those attributed to him by his successors. Other historians, as Appian notes, appear to have paid scant attention to the identities and roles of the auxiliary units themselves[16], so it can come as no surprise that so little information has survived on their commanders. Only 11 cavalry prefects are recorded for the period, and no commanders of individual auxiliary infantry cohorts are recorded[17]. Moreover, as is discussed below, we have no clear picture of the command structure for the auxiliary cavalry, and almost no information at all about the command structure for auxiliary infantry (including specialist troops such as slingers and archers). Many units may have been commanded by native commanders, and others by Roman officers, as the requirements of the situation and the availability of personnel dictated. In addition, much of the auxiliary infantry recruited at the time was formed into cohorts, and even legions[18], commanded by military tribunes[19], which may well account to some extent for the relative lack of information about infantry prefects.

However, while we have little evidence for the commanders or command structures of auxiliary units, we have enough information to deduce that there were a great number of such units in service. Saddington's study on the Roman use of auxiliary forces at

[16] Appian, *B.C*. 2.289; cf. Saddington (1982) 5.
[17] It is possible that [245] [- - -] Sabinus (2) was in command of a cohort of Spanish infantry, but the lacuna in the relevant part of the text is too big to allow for certainty (Appian, *B.C.* 5.132 (36BC); CIL 1.1295 = CIL 9.4503 = ILS 2488 = ILLRP 500 (Amiternum, Regio 4, Italia)).
[18] E.g. the *legio uernacula* (cf. Caesar, *B.Alex*. 50.3, 53.4, *B.Afr*. 28.2), or the *legio Pontica* (Caesar, *B.Alex*. 34.5); cf. Saddington (1982) 25.
[19] On the commanders of individual cohorts, cf. below, p.102; on the command of the *legio uernacula*, cf. [272] L. Titius, who was "tribunus militum in legione uernacula" (Caesar, *B.Alex*. 57.1).

this time[20] demonstrates both their size, and the range of communities from which they were drawn. On the basis of the data assembled by Saddington, it is safe to say that the number of cavalry prefects in service rose significantly from the numbers of the late Republic. Some examples may help to illustrate this. If, for example, Pompeius had 7,000 cavalry at Pharsalus[21], then he would have required approximately 14 cavalry prefects, or non-Roman native commanders, to command them, with the probable addition of a legate or superior officer in charge of groups of units or the whole cavalry force[22]. This command structure can be seen in the case of Q. Atius Varus, who had at least 2,600 cavalry (as well as 400 infantry) under his command in 48BC, and these would have required around five cavalry prefects (along with one infantry prefect), or their non-Roman equivalents, to command them[23]. Brutus and Cassius had around 20,000 cavalry at Philippi, including 4,000 horse archers, and the Triumvirs around 13,000 – the combined force would probably have required approximately 66 cavalry prefects or their non-Roman equivalents[24]. Antonius had a force of 10,000 cavalry in his Parthian expedition of 36BC, requiring approximately 20 commanders[25], and each side in the final campaigns of the Triumviral era had about 12,000 cavalry, requiring approximately 48 commanders[26]. It is likely, given the development of units named after a particular commander[27], that cavalry prefects remained in their posts for more than a year at a time, as was the case with [278] M. Tullius Cicero's commands in 49-48BC and 43-42BC[28]. However, it is likely that many of these units retained their own native commanders and were not commanded by Roman prefects. This consideration, combined with the scantiness of our evidence and the difficulties of using models of cavalry organisation drawn from the Principate as evidence for this period, makes it difficult to estimate how many of the cavalry commanders of the period were Romans, and therefore prefects.

[20] Saddington (1982) 5-26; cf. Yoshimura (1961) 476ff.
[21] Cf. Saddington (1982) 8.
[22] The total of Caesarian cavalry for the campaign, most of which were lost with Labienus, was probably 4,000-5,000, requiring 8-10 cavalry prefects and possibly a superior officer over them. On the probable structure of cavalry command, and the assumption of roughly 500 men per cavalry prefect, see below.
[23] Saddington (1982) 11.
[24] Appian *B.C*. 4.108, 133; cf. Saddington (1982) 18-19.
[25] Cf. Saddington (1982) 22.
[26] Plutarch, *Ant*. 61.2; cf. Saddington (1982) 22.
[27] On such units, see ch. 5, pp.144-145.
[28] Cf. Cicero, *ad Fam*. 12.14.8; *ad Brut*. 1.4a, 4, 6.1; Plutarch, *Cic*. 45.2; cf. Appian, *B.C*. 4.20; Cicero, *Phil.* 10.13, 11.26, *ad Brut*. 2.4.6, 5.2, 6; Plutarch, *Brut*. 26.2.

It is even harder to estimate the numbers of prefects who were in charge of infantry. The numbers of auxiliary infantry present are reported far more rarely than the numbers of cavalry. Moreover, many of those who would, in earlier eras, have been auxiliary infantry were not commanded by prefects in the period, as they were incorporated either into legions such as the *legio uernacula* or into infantry cohorts commanded by tribunes. As Brunt and Fear argue, a great number of legions throughout the period were raised from Latins, non-Roman provincials, and even slaves[29]. This was a trend which began in the 50s, as the formation of the *legio uernacula* and Legio V Alaudae show, but there were probably as many as eight of these legions in service in 42BC, a significant proportion of the Roman armed forces, and many non-citizens remained in service until after Actium[30]. Moreover, in the Spanish campaign of 49BC, the Pompeian forces raised approximately 30 cohorts of auxiliary infantry[31], and it is likely that it was a group of six of these cohorts that was stationed at Gades with [131] C. Gallonius, cohorts commanded, according to Caesar, by *tribuni*[32]. If the commanders of these units were tribunes, presumably *tribuni militum* given the lack of any qualifying adjective[33], then this provides a clue about why we have so little information on auxiliary infantry prefects: it may be that infantry forces were often formed into legionary style cohorts, or amalgamated into legions such as the *legio uernacula*, and commanded by military tribunes. In other cases, auxiliary troops might be placed under a garrison commander: the former *euocatus* [96] P. Cornelius, in charge of Suessa, had a garrison of Numidian troops under his command[34]. That Cornelius was an *euocatus* may be regarded as testimony to the low status of such commands. Light troops, however, were still needed: Octavian had 5,000 light-armed troops under his command in Sicily in 36BC, along

[29] Brunt (1971) 698-699; Fear (1991) 812ff.; contra, Roldán Hervás (1974) 209ff., (1974a) 457ff.; Le Roux (1982).
[30] Cf. Brunt (1971) 698-699.
[31] Cf. Saddington (1982) 6.
[32] Caesar, *B.C*. 2.18.2; cf. 2.20.2-3. In addition, a number of Roman citizen units were enrolled into similar cohorts, known as *cohortes colonicae* (Caesar, *B.C*. 2.19; cf. Fear (1991) 816). It is likely that such units were commanded by military tribunes.
[33] It is possible that as tribunes in charge of cohorts, which contained a number of Roman citizens, these officers were *tribuni cohortis* (cf. ch. 5, p.146ff.). However, we have no epigraphic evidence for this position in the period, although there must have been many such officers. Given that the Augustan title seems to have come into use in the latter part of that period, and that officers in charge of citizen infantry in Spain in the early Augustan period appear to have been *praefecti* (cf. ch. 5, p.146, Speidel (1976) 339; AE 1973, 501 = AE 1975, 806 = AE 1978, 790), it is more likely that they were *tribuni militum*.
[34] Caesar, *B.Afr*. 75-76.

with 20,000 cavalry[35], requiring, by the standards of the Principate, around 10 infantry prefects and 40 cavalry prefects. The low priority given to light infantry in our sources – perhaps, but not necessarily, indicative of the relatively small numbers of light infantry in use – frustrates any serious attempt to work out how many infantry prefects were in service. Moreover, it is important to note that a high proportion of the infantry forces of the period were specialist archers and slingers[36]: even with the development in the Augustan period of the post of *praefectus cohortis*, there is only one inscription from the period covered by this thesis which may refer to a Roman officer in charge of a unit of archers[37]. It may well be that such specialist troops were commanded by their own native officers, or that, as with the command at Thabena of the legate Q. Marcius Crispus[38], they were divided among other units.

There are 13 garrison commanders recorded from the period. This relatively large figure is probably the result of two trends. Firstly, the widespread violence, chaos and confusion of the period, along with the need to raise troops and money, necessitated an increased use of garrisons, and therefore an increase in the number of officers needed to command them. Secondly, both sides at war were Roman, and therefore any town that fell which was worthy of comment was likely to have been commanded by a Roman officer, who might then be mentioned by name in our sources. The use of garrisons was always part of the Roman campaign strategy, if only to provide a secure supply route[39], but in earlier periods garrison commanders are less likely to be mentioned and it is probable that there were far more garrison commanders in service in the late Republic of whom we have no record. As garrison commanders were appointed as needed, we cannot calculate the number of them in service in the period. However, given their relatively high status and the nature of their duties, it is likely that there were fewer of them than cavalry prefects. The same can be said of other military prefects – officers given another specific task or role, often in battle.

The numbers of *praefecti fabrum* are similarly difficult to assess. Pompeius had more than one – and the context implies more than two – in 49BC[40], and it is likely that

[35] Appian, *B.C.* 5.116; cf. Saddington (1982) 19.
[36] See, for example, Caesar, *B.Afr.* 34; cf. Saddington (1982) 11.
[37] Cf. *[- - -] CIL 9.3664* (Marruuium, Regio 4, Italia).
[38] Caesar, *B.Afr*. 77.2.
[39] E.g. [92] Coponius (1) (Plutarch, *Crass.* 27.7-8).
[40] Cicero, *ad Att.* 9.7C.2; Caesar, *B.C.* 1.24.4-5.

commanders would have had a number of *praefecti fabrum* at any one time. However, given the nature of their roles, it is likely that there were fewer *praefecti fabrum* than any other kind of junior officer with the exception of naval prefects.

The roles and functions of the junior officer positions

The military duties of military tribunes, infantry prefects, and *praefecti fabrum* do not appear to have changed significantly during this period. However, a number of new duties, or a new emphasis to existing duties, can be detected for some of these posts. Moreover, a number of posts, such as garrison-commander and naval commander, appear to have become substantially more important, while others, such as the post of *praefectus castrorum*, were beginning to emerge.

Of the approximately 29 military tribunes known from the period, only two (or perhaps three) are recorded as having taken part in direct combat while holding the post: [117] M. Feridius is known from a sling bullet found at Perusia (so too, perhaps, [166] L. Maenius)[41]; and [308] C. Vulteius Capito was killed after being sent with a thousand men to the relief of C. Antonius[42]. Three military tribunes are recorded as having been captured by their Roman enemies[43]. The similarity in these figures, however, does not mean that there were similar numbers of each, but probably results from our sources' being more likely to record the latter than the former, and the small number of the former is partly accounted for by the fact that many military tribunes are known only from epigraphic evidence.

It is not unlikely that military tribunes still retained the normal duties which tribunes had held in the late Republic. They still, for example, acted as part of the commander's *consilium*, as is attested for three officers from the period: [254] C. Seruilius Brocchus and [249] C. Sentius C.(f.) Aemilia were both part of the *consilium* of Lentulus Crus in 49BC[44]; and the poet [137] Q. Horatius Flaccus participated in legal proceedings as a member of Brutus' *consilium* in 43-42BC[45]. Military tribunes were also supposed to look after the soldiers under their command,

[41] M. Feridius: CIL 11.6721 no. 25 = ILLRP 1115 (Perusia, Regio 7); L. Maenius: CIL 1(2).701 = EE 6 p.82 n.112 (Perusia, Regio 7).
[42] Lucan 4.462-581; Florus 2.13.33; Schol. Bern. 137, 154 Usener.
[43] The two Titii (Caesar, *B.Afr*. 28), and [76] C. Catius Vestinus (Cicero, *ad Fam*. 10.23.5).
[44] Josephus, *A.J.* 14.229, 238.
[45] Horace, *Sat*. 1.6.48, *Carm*. 2.7, cf. *Sat*. 1.7; Suetonius, *vit. Horat*. 1.

and the close relationship between military tribunes and their soldiers is demonstrated by their role in the veteran settlements established after Actium[46]. [40] C. Aqutius (?Aclutius) L.f. Teret(ina) Gallus[47] probably settled at Venafrum with the veterans of Legio II Sabina when the *colonia* was founded – given his voting tribe, this was probably also his home town[48]. This would provide a convincing explanation for his role as *duouir urbis moeniundae*, as the town walls were rebuilt and extended at that time[49]. [118] L. Firmius, a military tribune and former *primipilus*, was honoured by the citizens of Sura and the veterans of Legio IIII Sorana, an otherwise unattested legion probably raised from the area and resettled there[50]. [60] Q. Caecilius Q.f. Atticus was honoured by the colonists of Legio XXXXI at Tuder[51], and it is likely that he served with Legio XXXXI and settled with it. Interestingly, his colleague as *quinquennalis* was one C. Attius P.f. Bucina who, given his cognomen, was almost certainly a former centurion[52]. Military tribunes were also expected by their commanders to provide a conduit between the commander and his men, a duty that was not always fulfilled in this period[53]. Those military tribunes responsible for individual cohorts, on which see above, may have had extra responsibilities. They were, after all, in direct command of a tactical unit, and therefore probably led such units in battle (although no records of this survive). It may be that they also performed administrative duties equivalent to those of an imperial-era tribune of a cohort of citizen infantry[54], but we have no evidence for this. Like infantry prefects, and those prefects given *ad hoc* military duties, they probably reported directly to the

[46] Keppie ((1983) 107, 109) also argues that L. Sergius L.f. Lepidus (CIL 5.50), and M. Vecilius Campus (AE 1938, 110) should be added to this list.
[47] CIL 10.4876 = ILS 2227 = AE 1984, 369 (Venafrum, Regio 1, Italia).
[48] Demougin (1992) 35; cf. Devijver and Van 'T Dack (1982-1983) 170ff.
[49] Devijver and Van 'T Dack (1982-1983) 169; Keppie (1983) 107, 119; (2000a) 253.
[50] On Firmius, cf. CIL 10.5713 = ILLRP 498a = ILS 2226 (Sura, Regio 1, Italia). On Legio IIII Sorana: Keppie (1983) 26-27, 136; contra Ritterling, RE 12.1564; cf. Dobson (1978) 165; Demougin (1988) 589.
[51] CIL 11.4650 = ILS 2230; CIL 11.4651; cf. CIL 11.4652-5653 (Tuder, Regio 6, Italia); Büjükkolanci and Engelmann (1991) 142 no. 8 = BE 1992, 409 (Ephesus, Asia); cf. Keppie (1983) 177; Demougin (1992) 54. On Legio XXXXI, cf. Devijver (1976-2001) 1.192; Keppie (1983) 26-27, 28, 176-177; Broughton (1951-1986) 3.35; Demougin (1992) 54.
[52] CIL 11.4652-4653; cf. Keppie (1983) 177; it should be noted that while it is not stated explicitly that Bucina served in the army, the inscriptions which record him and Caecilius Atticus as *quinquennales* do not mention Atticus' military tribunate either.
[53] Cf. pp.121-123, 124-127; de Blois (1992) 20ff., (2005) 174ff.
[54] Cf. ch. 5, p.146.

commander, but they might also be placed under the command of another junior officer, such as a garrison commander[55].

One duty which is twice attested as having been performed by military tribunes in this period was leading units sent to kill prominent men. Military tribunes oversaw the two most prominent political assassinations of the period, those of Pompeius and Cicero: Pompeius by a unit led by [250] L. Septimius, and Cicero by a unit led by [236] C. Popillius Laenas[56]. The case of Popillius Laenas in particular is interesting. Valerius Maximus reports that he requested the task of killing Cicero himself[57], which may or may not be rhetorical embellishment, but it is clear that he undertook to kill Cicero, and took along with him a centurion and a number of other soldiers, and that while Popillius questioned Cicero's slaves, it was the soldiers who were detailed to do the actual killing. This story is a macabre echo of the account given by Cicero of the killing of the orator C. Antonius in 87BC, whose eloquence so enthralled the soldiers sent to execute him that it was the military tribune commanding them (who was originally waiting outside the house) who had to perform the killing[58]. The story is also echoed in the killing of Agrippa Postumus, who was killed by a centurion on the orders of a military tribune[59]. We may compare the killing of Commius in 52BC, where Caesar sent [307] C. Volusenus Quadratus (who is known to have been a military tribune in 56BC and a cavalry prefect in 51BC) to kill Commius under the pretence of a parley, but a centurion under Volusenus Quadratus performed the actual killing[60]. These were not the only junior officers involved in the killing of political opponents: [85] C. Clodius, for whom no title is preserved, was responsible both for guarding C. Antonius and for killing him when a rescue was attempted[61]. It is unclear how official these actions were: Popillius may have been ordered to kill Cicero, but it is equally possible that he undertook to do so on his own account, and that his soldiers and centurion followed him without question; Septimius' actions may have been

[55] E.g. Caesar, *B.C.* 2.20.2-3 (under [131] C. Gallonius).
[56] L. Septimius: Caesar. *B.C.* 3.104; Plutarch, *Pomp.* 78.1-79.1; Appian, *B.C.* 2.84; Dio 38.1, 42.3-4; cf. Florus 2.13.52; Zonarius 10.9; Lucan 8.596ff.; Schol. Bern. 279U; Popillius Laenas: Plutarch, *Cic.* 48.1; Appian, *B.C.* 4.20.77; Livy *Epit*. 120; Valerius Maximus 5.3.4.
[57] Cf. Valerius Maximus 5.3.4ff.
[58] Cicero, *Orator* 5, *Brutus* 37; from the period of these earlier civil wars, we may also note that in the Marian purges of 87BC, [175] C. [Marcius] Censorinus (for whom no title is preserved) commanded a cavalry troop sent to kill the consul Octauius – although the Geminus sent to kill the elder M. Iunius Brutus in 77BC was probably a legate (Plutarch, *Pomp*. 16.5; Broughton (1951-1986) 3.99).
[59] Tacitus, *Ann.* 1.6.
[60] Caesar, *B.G.* 8.23.4-6; cf. Dio 40.43.1.
[61] Dio 47.24.2, 4.

decried by Caesar, but Pompeius' death was, no doubt, convenient. However, the killing of Commius was the result of a direct order from Caesar, and that of Agrippa Postumus a direct order, so Tacitus tells us, from Tiberius. These events show that junior officers, and particularly military tribunes, were entrusted, perhaps regularly, with performing what must have seemed very unsavoury tasks, possibly as they were low-ranking enough to accept the job, but sufficiently trusted and high-ranking to give orders to the soldiers who would have to carry out the actual killings. Interestingly, both Septimius and Popillius were former centurions and were, therefore, probably of comparatively low status within the junior officer corps[62].

The role of cavalry prefects appears to have developed during the period. As we have seen, cavalry prefects before 51BC are generally not described in our sources as *praefecti equitum*[63]. Although the term is used to describe native commanders, it is not used to refer to Roman commanders of cavalry by Sallust and Cicero, nor by Caesar in the first seven books of the *Bellum Gallicum*. However, the term is used in the last book of the *Bellum Gallicum* (probably written by Hirtius in the early 40s BC) and in the *Bellum Ciuile*[64]. In addition, Cicero describes his son as the commander of a single *ala* of cavalry ("in bello cum te Pompeius alae [alteri] praefecisset")[65] in 48BC. Moreover, while the title of *praefectus equitum* is not securely attested epigraphically until the Augustan period[66], it is nevertheless inferred from the fact that cavalry *alae* were already taking the names of their commanders in the Triumviral period: the *ala Scaeuae* and the *ala Patrui*. Both units were probably founded in the 40s BC and named after their commanders[67], one of whom, [66] M. Caesius Scaeua, was a notable *primipilus* under Caesar[68]. Such permanent units, which were to become the backbone of the imperial cavalry, were later to take geographical or tribal

[62] It is possible, given Antonius' promotion of centurions to tribunates in his praetorian guard, that Popillius' promotion was a recent one (Appian, *B.C.* 3.5, 3.29, 3.32, 3.39).
[63] Cf. ch. 2, pp.54-55.
[64] Cf. Caesar, *B.G.* 8.48, *B.C.* 3.60.4 ([307] C. Volusenus Quadratus), *B.G.* 8.28.2; *B.C.* 3.37.5 ([43] Q. Atius Varus), and *B.C.* 3.38.4 ([203] M. Opimius).
[65] Cicero, *de Off.* 2.45.
[66] The earliest secure epigraphic attestation is for [73] A. Castricius Myriotalenti f. (CIL 14.2105 = ILS 2676 (Lanuuium, Regio 1, Italia)), who probably dates to the 20s BC.
[67] On the *ala Patrui*, cf. [213] [- - -] Patruus (AE 1983, 182 (Fundi, Regio 1, Italia); cf. CIL 9.733 = ILS 2499 = AE 1980, 537 (Larinum, Regio 2, Italia)). On the *ala Scaeuae*, cf. [66] M. Caesius Scaeua (CIL 10.6011 = CIL 1.1569 = ILS 2490 = ILLRP 498 (Minturnae, Regio 1, Italia); Caesar, *B.C.* 3.53.3-5; Valerius Maximus 3.2.23). It is possible that Scaeua, like Iulius Indus (cf. ch.5, p.144), did not formally command the unit, and that the *ala* was named after Scaeua after a single conspicuous action, but given Scaeua's military experience and status, this is rather unlikely.
[68] Caesar, *B.C.* 3.53.3-5; Valerius Maximus 3.2.23.

names: the retention by these early units of the names of their commanders demonstrates the importance of these commands[69], and the fact that these units no longer carried an ethnic identifier demonstrates the shift in recruitment patterns. Even though the majority were, in fact, composed of Gallic cavalry, they were no longer composed of men from a single tribe or region[70].

In addition to these permanent units, there is some indication that the size of individual cavalry units had become standardised. Two of Caesar's cavalry prefects – both titled *praefectus equitum* – appear to have commanded units of around 500 troopers: [106] Cn. Domitius in Africa in 49BC[71], and [307] Volusenus Quadratus in 48BC[72]. In addition, it is likely that [298] Vibius Curius was in charge of 600 cavalry at Brundisium[73]. Moreover, the total of 80 casualties sustained in the attack on Atius Varus' cavalry in 48BC, which was high enough to be of note, suggests that the attacking force may have been a few hundred in size[74]. This evidence should not be taken too far, and commanders presumably obtained what forces they could from wherever they could get them. However, these examples suggest that a cavalry force close to 500 men, the standard cavalry *ala* of the Principate, was already considered a suitable size for one man to command. It is worth noting, however, that not all cavalry units were commanded by a separate prefect: [205] Pacideius (1) in 46BC was in charge of a combined unit of cavalry and infantry[75], and it is likely that other men held similar commands[76].

The emergence of the permanent cavalry *alae*, the possible standardisation of the size of cavalry units, and the contemporary use of the term *praefectus equitum* coincided with a significant development in the recruitment of auxiliary cavalry. The normal system for recruitment, as noted above[77], was that the Roman authorities would

[69] On such units, and the phenomenon of naming a unit after its commander, cf. ch. 5, pp.144-145.
[70] Cf. Birley (1978) 263ff.; Drinkwater (1978) 828.
[71] Caesar, *B.C.* 2.42.3; he had previously served as a *praefectus equitum* under Caesar in 51BC, cf. Caesar, *B.G.* 8.28.2. For the number of cavalry available to Curio, cf. Caesar, *B.C.* 23.1 (500 cavalry on his arrival), with more cavalry sent for from Sicily (Caesar, *B.C.* 2.23.1); cf. Saddington (1982) 11.
[72] Caesar, *B.C.* 3.60.4, cf. Saddington (1982) 9-10.
[73] Cf. Saddington (1982) 11.
[74] Caesar, *B.C.* 3.37.
[75] Caesar, *B.Afr.* 78.
[76] Compare the six cohorts sent to Vibius Curius (Cicero, *ad Att.* 9.6.1), although it is worth noting that we have no indication that Vibius commanded these troops in battle, and it may be that he merely received the force and escorted it.
[77] Cf. ch. 2, pp.58ff.; cf. Busquets-Artigas (2009) 69ff.

request a given number of troops from a community, and those troops would be kept together, under a native commander (who would have been an important man in his own community), until the end of the campaign for which they were levied, when they would return home as a unit[78].

Other systems, however, appear to have been tried. Cicero attacks Verres for instituting a "nouam praedandi rationem ab hoc primum excogitatam ... Verres post imperium constitutum primus imperauit ut ea pecunia omnis a ciuitatibus sibi adnumeraretur, ut is eam pecuniam tractaret quem ipse praefecisset"[79]. Cicero goes on to accuse Verres of mishandling this money in various ways, including taking bribes for not levying sailors from a city and for releasing sailors from their duties, and not paying those in service properly[80]. Leaving aside, if possible, the question of Verres' guilt or innocence, the system which Verres is accused of introducing is far closer to the system adopted during the Principate: in Verres' system, it is the Roman authorities who are responsible for the levying of troops, for the release of individual troops from service, and for the pay and supply of those troops. Despite Cicero's suggestion that this was an entirely unique policy, other commanders did occasionally adopt similar strategies for the raising of naval forces – although the danger of similar accusations might well have been the reason why Roman commanders were slow to adopt such a model[81], and Flaccus was accused of corruption for doing much the same in 63BC[82]. The administrative work involved might also have deterred other commanders: Lucullus was offered 3,000 talents by the Senate for raising a fleet, but refused, preferring to raise them in the normal way[83], and it is interesting that Caesar, discussing the organisation of Pompeius' naval forces in 49BC, mentions that Bibulus was responsible for their administration as well as their overall command ("praepositus cuncta administrabat")[84].

---

[78] Cf. Dixon and Southern (1992) 22.
[79] Cicero, *Verr.* 5.60, cf. 61. On what Cicero considered to be normal practice, cf. ch. 2, pp.59-61.
[80] Cicero, *Verr.* 5.61.
[81] Cf. Joliffe (1919) 35, 47; Busquets-Artigas (2009) 70-71. It is possible that the Spanish cavalry granted citizenship by Pompeius Strabo were directly recruited in response to the crisis of the Social war (cf. Pina Polo (2003) 197ff.). There are, however, as Ñaco del Hoyo argues ((2006) 152-153), problems with this suggestion, and there is no evidence that this force was not recruited in the normal way.
[82] Cicero, *Flac.* 27, 32; cf. Joliffe (1919) 35-38.
[83] Plutarch, *Luc*. 13.3; cf. Busquets-Artigas (2009) 71.
[84] Caesar, *B.C*. 3.5.3-4.

However, the long campaigns of the civil wars and Triumviral period saw Gallic and Spanish cavalry serving for long periods, and, as Drinkwater and Speidel[85] argue, the recruiting pattern appears to have changed: some Spanish and Gallic cavalry were formed into 'permanent' units, under Roman commanders[86], which were kept in service from campaign to campaign with reinforcements in the form of new troops. Such units would no longer have had the same character as the more traditional levies[87], and they mirror the development of the Roman legionary system from a citizen army (where troops were mostly levied into newly-formed legions and looked to return home at the end of a campaign) to a 'professional' army, with troops recruited into existing, 'permanent' legions and serving for a number of years. These 'permanent *alae*' would have needed a different system of administration, and command, to the traditional units of *auxilia*, and this is almost certainly the period during which the form of cavalry prefect known from the Principate – responsible for the administration and command of a 'permanent' ala of cavalry – began to emerge. It may not be coincidental that some of the first known *praefecti cohortis* commanded Egyptian units, an area where direct recruitment of local troops appears to have begun at an early stage[88].

The emergence of such units can be seen in the fraud committed by Raucilius and Egus, two sons of a Gallic chief, in 48BC[89]. The two were accused by their men of falsifying the rosters submitted to Caesar, and of appropriating the extra pay ("addiderunt falsum ab his equitum numerum deferri, quorum stipendium auerterent"), while the *praefectus equitum* who commanded them, [307] Volusenus Quadratus, remained ignorant of the fraud. Notably, Caesar does not try to excuse or justify Quadratus' ignorance – there is no suggestion that Quadratus was duped. This strongly implies that Quadratus' role, unlike the *praefecti equitum* of the Principate, did not involve the administration or discipline of the men directly under his command, and handled the unit's accounts[90], and it is, perhaps, significant that the troops who were being defrauded made their complaint to Caesar directly, rather than

[85] Drinkwater (1978) 826ff.; Speidel (1980) 212-213; cf. Spaul (1994) 19ff., 145.
[86] Cf. Birley (1978) 258; on the possibility of direct recruiting in the East and Balkans under Pompeius, see Yoshimura (1961) 480.
[87] Cf. Saddington (1997) 493ff.
[88] Birley (1961) 128ff.; Speidel (1976) 512-515; Daris (1988) 757; Spaul (2000) 445; cf. [124] M. Florus.
[89] Caesar, *B.C.* 3.59ff.
[90] Cf. Pliny, *Ep* 7.31; Brunt (1983) 48.

to Quadratus. However, as with the system attributed to Verres, Caesar was responsible for overseeing the rosters of the troops and their pay. This suggests, therefore, that the troops involved had not been levied in the usual way. As Saddington notes[91], the model of recruitment and command suggested here is something of an amalgam of the traditional Republican system and that of the 'regimental' *alae* of the Principate. It is tempting to speculate that it was this fraud, and the subsequent defection of Raucilius and Egus[92], that first prompted Caesar to place the day-to-day running of such units under the direct command of a Roman prefect.

It is also worth noting that if, as Lassère suggests, the origins of the imperial *cohors Gaetulorum* can be found in the unit of Getulians who deserted from Juba to Caesar[93], then this is further evidence for the adoption of new methods of auxiliary organisation. The Getulians, described as clients of Marius, had deserted from the Pompeian forces, and do not appear to have had a commander of their own. Even if one of their native commanders had come with them, there is no suggestion that they managed to bring any money with them, and therefore Caesar would have had to provide for their pay and supplies from his own reserves. It is also likely that Caesar would have wanted to keep a close eye on troops who had already deserted once, and placed them under the command of a Roman prefect.

Therefore the development of 'regimental' *alae* and *cohortes* may have been the result not of a tactical innovation, but an administrative one. Where Rome levied its auxiliary troops by calling upon allied communities to provide men, pay and supplies, these units would be sent to Rome under native commanders who oversaw the day-to-day operation of the men under their command. Where Rome took over the responsibility of the pay and supply of these units, it necessarily took over the responsibility of their day-to-day command. It is worth noting, however, Wightman's analysis of Gallic silver coinage in the early Principate[94], which suggests that coins were minted by Gallic nobles and used to pay newly levied Gallic auxiliaries. We do not, however, know whether the auxiliaries involved were part of the new permanent

[91] Saddington (1970) 102.
[92] Caesar, *B.C.* 3.61.
[93] Caesar, *B.Afr.* 32.3, 35; cf. Lassère (1999) 249ff.
[94] Wightman (1976) 76ff.; (1977) 119ff.

cavalry *alae*, or whether they were still commanded by native commanders[95].

However, many, perhaps most, units of auxiliaries were still commanded by their own *nobiles*, and the traditional way of recruiting auxiliary units persisted well into the Principate[96]. Most units from the period 49 – 31BC are identified in our literary sources by their tribal affinity or geographic origin[97], and the use of the phrase "auxiliariei Hispanei" on an inscription naming one [- - -] Sabinus also suggests that such terms were in common use[98]. If many of these units were commanded by native officers, then this would help to account for the relative lack of cavalry commanders (and auxiliary infantry commanders) mentioned during the period. In other words, the two systems – as they continued to do so under the Principate – existed side by side.

As in the Principate, the various units of cavalry were probably grouped together under a single commander, who was responsible for the overall command of the cavalry. We have little direct evidence for a chain of command[99], but the large units of cavalry detailed above (e.g. of 20,000) would have surely required more than one commander. Such men were often high-ranking, as with Cornelius Scipio under Augustus[100], It is suggestive that when Nonius Asprenas, a man of praetorian rank, is described as bringing cavalry to Caesar before the Spanish campaign of 45BC, no title is given or even implied[101]. With thousands of cavalry under him, Nonius Asprenas probably held a similar position to that of P. Cornelius Scipio in AD13-14[102] – a

[95] It is also worth noting, as Busquets-Artigas argues ((2009) 71ff., contra Callataÿ (1997) 282) that while a great deal of coin was minted by Roman commanders in the East, there is no clear evidence that it was used to pay auxiliaries, and was probably used to pay legionaries. Lucullus' coinage, minted under Sulla (cf. Plutarch, *Luc*. 2.1) from gold and silver looted from temple treasuries after Sulla was declared a *hostis*, may have gone to pay Peloponnesian *auxilia* (cf. Busquets-Artigas (2009) 71), but this is by no means certain. Moreover, Sulla, acting without the normal authority of a Roman governor, might more readily have resorted to unorthodox means to raise *auxilia*. The most likely example of Roman coin being minted to pay auxiliaries in the late Republic comes from Crete (Callataÿ (1997) 371f.; Busquets-Artigas (2009) 72), whose archers were employed by the Romans as, effectively, mercenaries throughout much of the Republican period (e.g. Plutarch, *C. Gracc.* 16.3-4), and whose recruitment and command were unusual even in the imperial period (cf. Haynes (2001) 66ff.). Given the specialist nature of such troops, it is likely that they were led by native commanders in the late Republic (when the coins were issued).
[96] Cf. ch. 5, p.143; Alföldy (1968) 136-137; Wightman (1979) 79; Drinkwater (1983) 24.
[97] Saddington (1982) 24; Haynes (2001) 64; cf. Birley (1978) 259.
[98] [245] [---] Sabinus (2) CIL 1.1295 = CIL 9.4503 = ILS 2488 = ILLRP 500 (Amiternum, Regio 4, Italia); cf. Spaul (1994) 19ff., 145.
[99] Cf. Saddington (1982) 12.
[100] Cf. ch.5, p.143.
[101] "Suo loco praeteritum est quod equites ex Italia cum Asprenate ad Caesarem uenissent", Caesar, *B.Hisp*. 10.2; on the size of the cavalry forces, cf. Saddington (1982) 12-13.
[102] Cf. ch. 5, p.143.

senior cavalry commander with junior cavalry prefects under his command. [87] Clodius Arquitius, later wounded in a cavalry engagement, was probably one of these more junior commanders[103]. In addition to Asprenas we have men such as [256] P. Seruilius Rullus, who was in command of around 1,500 cavalry – although it is possible that he was only commanding them while they were in transit[104] – and C. Munatius Plancus, who commanded a force of 3,000 cavalry sent ahead of the main force commanded by his brother in 43BC[105]. Most of these men, some of whom were legates, should not be considered as junior officers, although if Seruilius Rullus was responsible only for overseeing the movement of the cavalry under his command then he probably should be considered as a junior officer. However, it is often difficult to establish precisely the size of an individual command: as Saddington notes[106], the technical military language of the Principate was not widely in use, and there is not a great deal of standardisation between our authors. This means that we must be careful when reading that [203] M. Opimius was in command of two *turmae*[107]: in the imperial period, this would mean that he was in command of a fraction of an *ala*, but this may not have been the case in 48BC[108]. In addition, it is unclear what Cicero meant by writing that [298] Vibius Curius, a cavalry prefect under Caesar, had received six cohorts from Alba: the context suggests that they were probably not cavalry, perhaps suggesting that Curius' role included the management of other units for a time[109].

Eleven cavalry prefects[110] are known from the period, and all of those who can be securely dated are from the 40s BC. In contrast with the military tribunes of our period, all but one of those known from literary sources are recorded as either taking part in engagements, or as being in independent command of troops: the exception is C. Volusenus Quadratus, mentioned above in the context of the fraud committed by Raucilius and Egus in 48BC, but who is recorded in independent command, and in

[103] Caesar, *B.Hisp.* 23.8.
[104] Appian, *B.C.* 5.58; Dio 48.28.1.
[105] Cicero, *ad Fam*. 10.9.3, 10.11.2; cf. Saddington (1982) 16.
[106] Saddington (1982) 23.
[107] Caesar, *B.C*. 3.38.4. Furthermore, they may have been only a part of his command.
[108] For other examples of the use of the word *turma* in this context, see Saddington (1982) 23.
[109] Cicero, *ad Att*. 9.6.1; cf. Caesar, *B.C*. 1.24.3. On the size of Caesar's cavalry at the time, cf. Saddington (1982) 5-6.
[110] With a possible twelfth in [245] [- - -] Sabinus (2) (Appian, *B.C.* 5.132 (36BC); CIL 1.1295 = CIL 9.4503 = ILS 2488 = ILLRP 500 (Amiternum, Regio 4, Italia)).

combat, as *praefectus equitum* in 51BC[111]. Three of these officers were involved in ambushes or surprise attacks: M. Opimius was captured in an ambush[112]; Q. Atius Varus was attacked while watering his horses in 48BC[113]; and P. Seruilius Rullus lost 400 of his 1,500 cavalrymen to a surprise attack by M. Antonius[114]. This suggests one of the reasons why cavalry commanders had to be experienced men: they led the units that were generally the furthest away from the main body of the army, and the most likely units to be attacked, and attacked in such a way that they were forced to act quickly and independently.

Cavalry prefects were also responsible for overseeing the movement of their troops to and from campaigns, and to winter quarters[115], and may well have provided a personal bodyguard to their commanders in a similar fashion to Caesar's German bodyguard[116]. However, not all cavalry commanders had to be military specialists. Cicero praised his son lavishly for his deeds while a cavalry commander in Pompeius' army[117], but he does so for his son's ability to ride, throw a javelin, and endure the hardships of the camp, not for his son's performance on the field. The young Cicero appears to have gained from his experience, however, and in 43-2BC had an important independent command in Macedonia[118], during which he received the surrender of a legion[119].

As noted above, a large number of prefects responsible for garrisoning towns or regions are known from the period, 13 in all. Of these, the majority were responsible for a town or city and its surrounding territory during the period 49-46BC: [46] C. Attius Paelignus and [165] Q. Lucretius Vespillo, a man of senatorial rank, were in command of Sulmo with seven cohorts[120]; [131] C. Gallonius was put in charge of Gades by Varro with six cohorts, and the town appears to have been intended to

[111] 51BC: Caesar, *B.G.* 8.48; 48BC: Caesar, *B.C.* 3.60.4.
[112] Caesar, *B.C.* 3.38.4.
[113] Caesar, *B.C.* 3.37.5.
[114] Appian, *B.C.* 5.58; Dio 48.28.1.
[115] Cf. M. Tullius Cicero and P. Seruilius Rufus, above.
[116] Cf. the behaviour of Cn. Domitius towards Curio, Caesar, *B.C.* 2.41-2.
[117] Cicero, *de Off.* 2.45: "Quo tamen in bello cum te Pompeius alae [alteri] praefecisset, magnam laudem et a summo uiro et ab exercitu consequebare equitando, iaculando, omni militari labore tolerando".
[118] Cicero, *ad Brut.* 1.6.1.
[119] Cicero, *Phil.* 10.13.
[120] Caesar, *B.C.* 1.18; cf. Cicero, *ad Att.* 8.4.3; Orosius 6.15.4.

anchor Varro's operations in the region[121]; [196] Octacilius Crassus commanded a sizeable force, including 400 cavalry, at Lissus[122]; [261] L. Staberius was in charge of Apollonia under Pompeius[123]; [96] P. Cornelius was in command of Sarsura under Metellus Scipio[124]; [160] L. Liuineius Regulus had a legion under his command at Hadrumentum[125]; and [187] C. Minucius Reginus was captured while in command of Zeta[126]. It is worth noting that these men are all known from the Caesarian accounts from this period: however, it is likely that the phenomenon continued throughout the Triumviral period, but that our source material no longer saw fit, for some reason, to mention such men[127]. The size of the forces mentioned above, as well as the status of men such as Q. Lucretius Vespillo, demonstrates how important these commands were. Two prefects are also noted serving under Cassius: [283] L. Varus at Rhodes[128] and [258] L. Sextilius Rufus at Tarsus[129]; and there may have been similar prefects at Antioch[130]. In addition, two prefects were assigned to more general commands: [265] [?Q.] Terentius Culleo, appointed by Lepidus to guard the coast road along the maritime Alps[131], and the former military tribune [54] C. Baebius T.f. Clu(stumina), whose title was probably *praefectus orae maritimae Hispaniae citerioris*[132]. Baebius may also have had some form of naval force under his command, yet his role under Ap. Claudius Pulcher or Clauisius Sabinus, as Barbieri and Bollini suggest, was responsibility for the security of the coastline itself[133].

Some of these men, such as Terentius Culleo and C. Baebius, were responsible for ensuring that areas which were already secure remained so. As such, their role almost

[121] Caesar, *B.C.* 2.18.2; cf. 20.2-3.
[122] Caesar, *B.C.* 3.28-9.
[123] Caesar, *B.C.* 3.12.
[124] Caesar, *B.Afr.* 76.1.
[125] Caesar, *B.Afr.* 89.3.
[126] Caesar, *B.Afr.* 68.4.
[127] To this list might also be added: *Q. Marcius Crispus* (Caesar, *B.Afr.* 77.2), who was probably a legate; [190] L. Munatius Flaccus (Caesar, *B.Hisp.* 19.4; cf. Valerius Maximus 9.2.4; Dio 43.33.4-35.5; Frontinus, *Strat.* 3.14.1) who surrendered to Caesar at Ategua and may have been in command of the town.
[128] Appian, *B.C.* 4.74; Velleius 2.71.1.
[129] Dio 47.31.1.
[130] Cicero, *ad Fam.* 12.15.7.
[131] Cicero, *ad Fam.* 10.34.2; Appian, *B.C.* 3.83.
[132] CIL 11.623 = ILS 2672 = AE 1978, 335 = EDH HD005009 (Forum Livii, Regio 8). Bollini's suggestion ((1975) 343-344) that the title should read *praefectus orae maritimae Hispaniae citerioris et Galliae* is also possible.
[133] Barbieri (1941) 274-275; Bollini (1975) 345; cf. Q. Pompeius Rufus, "praef(ectus) orae marit(imae) Hispan(iae) Citer(ioris) Gallia[e] N[a]rbon(ensis) bello qu[od Imp(erator)] Galba p[ro r(e) p(ublica)?] gessit" in AD68-69 (CIL 8.13 = IRT 537 = ILS 1014 = AE 1948, 3 = AE 1952, +104 = AE 1962, 34 = EDH HD019665 (Lepcis Magna, Tripolitania)).

parallels the role of civilian governors, and foreshadows the military prefects responsible for the command of recently pacified areas in the Principate[134]. They also probably had the additional role of raising money and supplies from the local inhabitants. [105] Q. Curtius Salassus, although probably not a garrison commander, was given the task of extracting money from the Arcadians. He was caught by them and burned to death, a sign of how unpopular such levies were, and how harshly Roman commanders sought to obtain them[135]. Given L. Varus' appointment in Rhodes soon after Cassius raised a large financial levy there[136], it seems logical to conclude that other garrison commanders will generally have had the role of extracting levies from the population under their control. Men such as Gallonius, Octacilius Crassus and Liuineius Regulus, however, were responsible for command in regions where conflict was either anticipated or already in progress: they were expected to use the troops under their control independently in order to ensure that important strategic towns and cities did not fall, and to ensure that other military forces in the area were able to function.

Military skill was not, however, the only qualification such commands would have needed: diplomatic and political *nous* was also important. These commands appear to have relied upon local co-operation. [46] C. Attius Paelignus, Lucretius Vespillo, Octacilius Crassus, and L. Staberius, as well as L. Munatius Flaccus, were forced to surrender or flee after the citizens of the town under their command revolted, refused to fight, or simply opened the gates to the approaching enemy. Clearly, few towns would willingly endure a siege, let alone the consequences of being taken by storm, on behalf of what they perceived to be someone else's civil war, and it would have taken an astute man to ensure that a town under threat could be depended upon.

As noted above, the period of the civil wars saw a massive increase in the use of naval power. Besides their use in battle or to patrol coastlines[137], ships were used extensively to transport men and supplies[138], particularly corn[139]. The period also saw

[134] Cf. ch. 5, pp.149-150; Wrobel (2009) 77ff.
[135] Jerome, *Chr*. ad ann. 42; Dio 48.24.3; cf. also Cassius Parnasius at Appian, *B.C.* 5.2.
[136] Appian, *B.C.* 4.73.
[137] Cf. Q. Aquila (Caesar, *B.Afr*. 62, 67.1).
[138] Cf. for example, Caesar's anger at [125] Fonteius' misuse of transport ships (Caesar, *B.Afr.* 54.1-4). This may have been only a pretext for Fonteius' dismissal, but it nevertheless suggests that the pressure on naval resources was significant.

Roman legionary troops being regularly employed at sea, as epitomised by the name of Legio X Fretensis, earned in the straits at Messina[140]. However, as noted above, a large proportion of naval commanders were legates, and many of the remaining commanders were not junior officers[141]: the naval warfare of the period was so exceptional in its scale and importance that, as Saddington notes, it is difficult to "trace any clear line of evolution" between the commanders of the late Republic and the Principate[142].

We do, however, have some evidence of how the naval command structure worked in the period. Pompeius, who, of course, had considerable experience in naval warfare, is said to have organised his forces as follows:

> "In command of the Egyptian ships was Pompeius' son; of the Asian, D. Laelius and C. Triarius; of the Syrian, C. Cassius; of the Rhodian, C. Marcellus with C. Coponius; of the Liburnian and Achaian fleet, Scribonius Libo and M. Octauius. However, the entire naval command and all administrative matters were in the hands of M. Bibulus, in whom all power ultimately resided."[143]

The passage (which, we must remember, is an enemy's account) would seem to imply that, with the exception of C. Coponius (the phrasing here suggests a subordinate role), each held a roughly equal position under M. Bibulus. However, given that C. Coponius was of senatorial rank, it is likely that he was a praetor or a legate[144]. The

---

[139] Saddington (2005) 205; cf. the naval command of Lucretius Vespillo and Minucius Rufus (Caesar, *B.C.* 3.7.1; cf. Orosius 6.15.4; Appian, *B.C.* 2.54), where the corn that was in the ships was, perhaps, the focus of their command, rather than the ships themselves. Moreover, as Saddington notes, one of Sextus Pompeius' main duties as *praefectus classis et orae maritimae* was the protection of the grain supply: this, of course, turned out to be one of his major strategic weapons.

[140] Saddington (2005) 207; cf. Keppie (1984) 119.

[141] Cf. Saddington (1990) 299. A list of all naval commanders, regardless of rank, can be found at Saddington (1990) 305ff.

[142] Saddington (1988) 299.

[143] Caesar, *B.C.* 3.5.3-4: "praeerat Aegyptiis nauibus Pompeius filius, Asiaticis D. Laelius et C. Triarius, Syriacis C. Cassius, Rhodiis C. Marcellus cum C. Coponio, Liburnicae atque Achaicae classi Scribonius Libo et M. Octauius. toti tamen officio maritimo M. Bibulus praepositus cuncta administrabat; ad hunc summa imperii respiciebat.". A similar command structure appears to have been employed by Pompeius in the pirate campaign of 67BC (Appian, *Mith.* 95), although in this campaign his naval commanders were propraetorian legates.

[144] Cf. Broughton (1951-1986) 2.257, 276.

chain of command was probably more flexible than Caesar's description suggests, for the young Pompeius was able to remove Laelius, himself a man of some status[145], from the Asian fleet and leave him to blockade Oricum[146], while Laelius was able to place two other naval officers, [165] Q. Lucretius Vespillo and [189] Minucius Rufus (2) in charge of operations there[147]. How the command structure worked below the naval commanders in charge of squadrons of ships is unclear. However, given that a ship under its captain can be viewed as a self-contained unit, a further command structure was probably unnecessary. This can be seen in an episode following Curio's defeat at Utica, when the quaestor M. Rufus gave orders to individual ship's captains during the panic which followed – [120] [?Flaminius] Flamma, who was probably the naval prefect responsible for these ships, appears to have fled[148]. Any detachment of ships, however, would have required a separate commander, and it is in such roles that the majority of junior naval commanders for our period can be found: [143] L. Iulius Caesar was in command of 10 ships which had just been repaired[149]; Q. Lucretius Vespillo and Minucius Rufus commanded a small fleet of grain ships at Oricum; [193] L. Nasidius was in charge of a detachment of ships sent to reinforce Massilia in 49BC, although his later command, in 47BC, was more significant[150]; [70] L. Cassius was in charge of guarding the Hellespont during the Pharsalus campaign, although the ten ships he commanded at the time were probably only a part of his total command[151]; [38] Q. Aquila and [81] L. Cispius [?Laeuus] commanded small squadron of ships involved in the blockade of Thapsus[152]; [258] L. Sextilius Rufus commanded a part of Cassius' fleet against Dolabella[153]; [84] Clodius was sent with 13 ships to reinforce Rhodes in 42BC[154]; [180] T. Marius C.f. Ste(llatina) Siculus was "pr(aefectus) in classe Cn. Lentuli pr(aetoris)"[155]. All of these officers commanded comparatively small detachments of ships that were split from the main force to

[145] Cf. D. Laelius (Caesar, *B.C.* 3.5.3; cf. 3.7.1, 40.5, 100; Cicero, *ad Att.* 11.7.2, 14.1. 15.1-2; IGRP 3.1018). His senior rank is confirmed by the fact that, as Cicero reports (*ad Att.* 11.7.2), he was grouped with Cato, Dolabella, and Cicero when Caesar was considering who he would allow to return to Italy after the war.
[146] Caesar, *B.C.* 3.7.1.
[147] Caesar, *B.C.* 3.7.1; Orosius 6.15.4; Appian, *B.C.* 2.54.
[148] Caesar, *B.C.* 2.43; Appian, *B.C.* 2.46; cf. Cicero, *ad Att*. 12.52.1, 14.16.4.
[149] Caesar, *B.C*. 2.23.3.
[150] Caesar *B.C.* 2.3-4; cf. *B.Afr.* 64, 98; Dio 42.56.3.
[151] Suetonius, *Iul.* 63; cf. Dio 42.6.2; Appian, *B.C*. 2.88, 111.
[152] Caesar, *B.Afr.* 62, 67.1.
[153] Cicero, *ad Fam.* 12.13.4.
[154] Appian, *B.C.* 5.2.
[155] CIL 11.6058 (Uruinum Mataurense, Regio 6, Italia); cf. Val. Max. 7.9.2 (= 6.8.6); cf. Demougin (1992) 38-39.

perform a specific task. The large 'battle fleets' of naval engagements such as Naulochus or Actium were commanded by officers of a higher rank, as is demonstrated by the high status of the commanders of the various wings at the battle of Actium[156]. Junior officers were also involved in raising fleets: [107] Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus for Brutus in 44BC[157], and [177] L. (Marcius) Figulus under Dolabella in 43BC[158].

A number of other military prefects are known from the period, many of them in important roles, and a number of whom were in command of infantry (often legionary infantry), and who are categorised in this thesis as infantry prefects[159]. [144] Sex. Iulius Caesar was sent to receive the surrender of Varro's legion[160]; [66] M. Caesius Scaeua's famous stand was in response to an attack led by [153] Iustuleius, a "praefectus" under Pompeius[161]; [68] D. Carfulenus, who was later a legate[162], held an important command in battle under Caesar in 47BC; the two Pacideii ([205] and [206]) are named along with Labienus as commanders in Africa, and one was important enough to dictate part of the order of battle[163]; [299] L. Vibius Paciaecus was sent with a number of cohorts to the relief of Ulia, and later provided Caesar with intelligence reports[164]; [152] M. Iulius Silanus, who went over to Antonius from Lepidus, was probably a prefect[165]; Cato's son ([238] M. Porcius Cato (2)) was probably an infantry prefect at Philippi[166]; [105] Q. Curtius Salassus, in charge of raising money from the Arcadians for Antonius, was in charge of four cohorts[167]; and [123] Flauius Gallus, who led a rearguard action against the Parthians in 36BC was probably a prefect[168]. Other prefects are known in less important roles, such as [220] L. Pinarius Scarpus, who guarded Antonius' baggage at Philippi[169]; and [180] T.

[156] Cf. Broughton (1951-1986) 2.420-423; Saddington (1988) 300.
[157] Cicero, *ad Att.* 16.4.4; cf. *Phil*. 10.13; *ad Brut*. 1.5.3, 7.2, 14.1.
[158] Appian, *B.C*. 4.60; Cicero, *ad Fam.* 12.13.3.
[159] See Appendix C for all examples (the abbreviation used is IP).
[160] Caesar, *B.C.* 2.20.7.
[161] Valerius Maximus 3.2.23.
[162] Cf. Broughton (1951-1986) 2.324.
[163] Caesar, *B.Afr*. 13.1, 78.4.
[164] The number of cohorts was either VI or XI (the text is corrupt); see Caesar, *B.Hisp*. 3.4 (cf. Cicero, *ad Fam*. 6.18.2, *ad Att*. 12.2.1).
[165] Dio 46.38.6-7; on the translation of Μάρκῳ Σιλανῷ τῷ στρατιάρχῳ, see his entry in Appendix A.
[166] Appian, *B.C.* 4.135; cf. Velleius 2.71.2; Plutarch, *Brut*. 49.5, *Cato Min*. 73-74; Zonarius 10.20.
[167] Jerome, *Chr*. ad ann. 42, p.146 Helm; cf. Dio 48.24.3, 41.4-6.
[168] Plutarch, *Ant*. 42-43. *Machaeras*, sent by Ventidius with two legions and one thousand cavalry to aid Herod in Judea, should not be considered as a junior officer (Josephus, *A.J*. 14.434-438, 448, 450, *B.J*. 1.317, 324, 334).
[169] Cf. Appian, *B.C*. 4.107.

Marius Siculus was probably trying to make the most of a relatively junior position with the phrase "praefectus duorum principum"[170]. All of these posts were created for a specific purpose, and it is unlikely that such a prefecture entailed duties such as administration or discipline beyond those required to perform the task that was at hand. Moreover, in contrast to certain cavalry prefects, there is no evidence that these prefects regularly reported to anyone other than the commander (or, if they were part of a larger detachment, the legate in charge). Such prefectures would, of course, have required independent action and leadership, and it is not surprising that the holders of such posts often appear to have been individuals of relatively high standing.

The period also saw the emergence of a new type of infantry prefecture – the post of *praefectus castrorum*. While the title is not epigraphically attested until the Augustan period, which is likely to be when the post was formalised, [76] P. Caucilius is described as "P. Caucilius, who had previously been placed in charge of Pompey's camp"[171]. His role and status were fairly minor – he is described as sending a letter dictated by Pompey to procure a litter – and it may be that he was, in function at least, and perhaps in name, a *praefectus castrorum*, although we may designate him alternatively as an infantry prefect[172]. A Roscius ([242] Roscius (1)), who was killed in battle, is also mentioned as ὁ φύλαξ of Cornificius' camp[173], and he may also have performed an equivalent role. Again, however, we can have no real idea as to how many such individuals existed, or how regular their roles were: even in the Augustan period, the position was not firmly established[174].

Eight *praefecti fabrum* are recorded from the period, and their duties appear to have remained relatively unchanged from the late Republic: [167] N. Magius, *praefectus fabrum* under Pompeius in 49BC, was an envoy for Caesar to Pompeius after his capture[175]; [226] Cn. Pompeius Theophanes was employed by Pompeius to console the Rhodians for the loss of their fleet, and, notes Caesar, was particularly trusted by

[170] Demougin (1992) 38-39; cf. p.134.
[171] "P. Caucilius qui castris antea Pompei praepositus esset" (Caesar, *B.Hisp.* 32.7).
[172] On the functions and duties of *praefecti castrorum*, see ch. 5, pp.147-149.
[173] Appian, *B.C.* 4.56.
[174] If the post was established, it is likely that *praefecti castrorum* were equestrian in status; cf. ch. 5, p.157.
[175] Cicero, *ad Att.* 9.7C.2; Caesar, *B.C.* 1.24.4-5.

Pompeius[176]. Both officers were, therefore, employed in diplomatic and sensitive business, and were therefore presumably regarded as highly dependable individuals. The close relationship that often existed between a commander and his *praefecti fabrum* is further shown by the suicide of [289] C. Velleius following the death of his commander Ti. Nero, and by the strong response elicited from Brutus when told of the death at Philippi of his *praefectus fabrum* [121] C. Flauius[177]. The historic link between the post and construction is, perhaps, reinforced by the case of [99] C. Cornelius Cn.f. Gallus (who straddles this period and the Augustan era and is not counted as one of the eight *praefecti fabrum* attested from 49 – 31BC), who appears to have been involved in building while in Egypt as a *praefectus fabrum*[178]. Unusually for this period, Cornelius Gallus may have had military experience before taking up the post of *praefectus fabrum*, winning over the army of L. Pinarius and gaining a military victory against Antonius, as Badian and Welch note[179]. However, there is no evidence that he did this while *praefectus fabrum*, and it is likely that he did not[180].

Junior officers, as well as legates and even *contubernales*, had other, more general roles as well. One of these was to provide intelligence reports. When [299] L. Vibius Paciaecus was dispatched to the relief of Ulia, Caesar noted that "he was a man well known in the province, and well acquainted with it"[181]. Paciaecus used this knowledge to evade the blockading army and relieve the town, and he later sent intelligence reports to Caesar on the size and movement of Cn. Pompeius' legions[182]. Such information from the field must have been vital, and Caesar was able to put it to good use, as Shelby notes[183]. Likewise, spies posed a threat to a commander's authority, as is illustrated by Pansa's deathbed warning to Octavian that the officers in his newly formed legions were spies appointed by the Senate[184].

---

[176] Plutarch, *Cic*. 38.4; cf. Caesar, *B.C*. 3.18.3; SIG(3) 755. The trust shown to Theodorus, another of Pompeius' freedmen, in the intrigue surrounding the attempted assassination of Domitius Ahenobarbus is further evidence of the extent to which Pompeius trusted his freedmen (Appian, *B.C.* 5.137).
[177] C. Velleius: Velleius 2.76.1; C. Flauius: Plutarch, *Brut*. 51.2.
[178] AE 1964, 255 = AE 1980, 46 = AE 1987, 103 = AE 1991, +63 = AE 1994, 1815 (Roma).
[179] Dio 51.9; Welch (1995) 144; Badian (1997) 10.
[180] Moreover, as Badian notes, there is no direct evidence to support Welch's argument that Theophanes had any experience of military command before taking up his post (Welch (1995) 140-142; Badian (1997) 7); nor should we necessarily assume that Flauius' death at Philippi occurred while he was in command of troops.
[181] Caesar, *B.Hisp*. 3.4.
[182] Cicero, *ad Fam*. 6.18.2; *ad Att*. 12.2.1.
[183] Shelby (2005) 125.
[184] Appian, *B.C.* 3.76.

The most important attribute of junior officers of the Triumviral period appears to have been loyalty to their commander. A number of incidents are recorded where officers were punished for disloyalty. The dismissal of the military tribune [125] A. Fonteius by Caesar may have been in part for his misuse of a transport ship, but Caesar also remarks upon his disloyalty, something for which [50] C. Auienus and two centurions were also dismissed, probably because they supported the soldiers during the mutiny at Placentia[185]. Antonius dismissed a number of military tribunes after Octavian sent spies and pamphleteers into his camp disguised as merchants, and collusion was clearly suspected[186]. Caesar had tried the same thing with Petreius' troops in Spain, and an officer, probably a military tribune, was executed for trying to prevent the punishment of the spies[187].

Perhaps wary of the fates of Sertorius and Fimbria, commanders during this period were frequently suspicious of their officers and of others in their entourage. Curius, a member of Domitius Ahenobarbus' entourage (but apparently without a formal post), was executed for treachery: he had, Appian tells us, planned to take Ahenobarbus hostage in order to bargain for his life. Pompeius put one of his freedmen, Theodorus, to death after suspecting him of revealing the plot[188]; and he also executed P. Curtius Salassus, who was of equestrian rank, for plotting against him[189]. Octavian, on taking over the legions of Fufius Calenus, acted on Pansa's warning and replaced the officers with his own men[190]. As De Blois points out, Octavian found the newly formed legions he took over from Pansa difficult to control, and this may be as a result of

[185] Auienus is specifically accused of having stirred up a mutiny (Caesar, *B.Afr.* 54).
[186] Appian, *B.C.* 3.44.
[187] Appian, *B.C.* 2.43. Petreius was attempting to quell a suggestion, apparently supported by Labienus, that they abandon Spain to Caesar. The two opposing armies were camped close together, and Caesar's men were mixing with the Pompeian forces, spreading talk of surrender. In such a situation it is possible to imagine that Petreius' subsequent tour through his camp – where he killed any of Caesar's men that he found – would have been perceived as both excessive and dangerous even by his own friends, and that the officer involved was opposing Petreius but was not acting seditiously. On the other hand, it may be, as De Blois suggests, that the officer was directly approached by Caesar's men in order to spread discontent (De Blois (2005) 174; note also the earlier defection of centurions and military tribunes from Petreius to Caesar (Caesar, *B.C.* 1.77)). The rank of the officer involved is uncertain: the word used by Appian is "ἡγεμών", which might mean a military tribune or a prefect. Given that, at the time, Spanish and Italian forces appear to have been mixed up together – Appian reports that Caesar later chose to give a direct address only to those who were from Italy (*B.C.* 2.43) – it is possible that this officer was a prefect. However, as we have seen (p.102), it is likely that Spanish troops were commanded by tribunes, and therefore that the individual involved was a military tribune.
[188] Appian, *B.C.* 5.137.
[189] Cicero, *ad Fam.* 6.18.2; cf. *P. Curtius (Salassus)*; [105] Q. Curtius Salassus.
[190] Appian, *B.C.* 5.51.

problems he had in controlling the officer corps[191]. Moreover, in a bid to ensure loyalty, Antonius promoted centurions to serve as the officers (almost certainly military tribunes) of his bodyguard. This move was not entirely successful, as they then led the attempt by Caesarian troops to intervene in the conflict between Antonius and Octavian[192].

This emphasis on loyalty was entirely natural: rebellious officers could prove extremely troublesome. They could, for example, undermine the defence of a city: Caesar reports that the tribunes under [131] C. Gallonius conspired with the town's elders to expel Gallonius from Gades[193]; Domitius Ahenobarbus' army at Corfinium conspired with both its military tribunes and centurions to throw the gates open to Caesar[194]; and (to take an earlier example) Appian reports that Marius was able to enter Rome in 87BC after the military tribune responsible for the Janiculum, [82] Ap. Claudius, opened a gate for him: Claudius, reports Appian, had been reminded by Marius that Claudius owed him a favour[195]. Moreover, not merely could officers send information to the enemy, but they were very effective in rousing discontent among the soldiers. In addition to the examples above, Octavian's difficulties in raising troops after Mutina could well, as De Blois argues, have been the result of action by the 'disloyal' senate-appointed officers[196], and when [152] M. Iunius Silanus and [265] [Q.?] Terentius Culeo, who had helped Antonius to cross the Alps unhindered, returned to Lepidus' camp, he was careful to keep them away both from the soldiers and from the other officers[197]. It was clearly essential to ensure the loyalty of the junior officer corps, something also shown by Octavian's decision to separate military tribunes and centurions from mutinous troops and appease them with gifts[198]. [165] Q. Lucretius Vespillo was also rewarded for his loyalty: when C. Attius Paelignus opened the gates to Antonius' forces, Vespillo fled to Pompeius, and he was later given a naval prefecture[199].

[191] De Blois (2000) 21.
[192] Appian, *B.C.* 3.5, 3.29, 3.32, 3.39.
[193] Cf. Caesar, *B.C.* 2.20.2-3.
[194] Caesar, *B.C.* 1.20.
[195] Appian, *B.C.* 1.68.
[196] De Blois (2000) 27-28.
[197] Cicero, *ad Fam.* 10.34.2.
[198] Appian, *B.C.* 5.128; Dio 49.14.3.
[199] Cf. above, p.118.

This loyalty had its price. Officers caught on the losing side were often shown little or no mercy. The two Titii, military tribunes from Spain who were the sons of a man promoted to the Senate by Caesar's influence, were captured and killed[200]. [75] C. Catius Vestinus, a military tribune serving under Cassius, was treated as a *hostis* when captured by Plancius[201]. Admittedly, these actions took place while the conflicts in which these individuals were involved were still going on, but long after Philippi a great number of Republican officers were unable to return to Italy, even comparatively low-ranking individuals[202]. Defections were not unknown either: besides the defection of Menodorus (who was probably a senior rather than a junior officer), we also hear of that of [176] C. Marcius (?Crispinus), a military tribune who defected to Caesar at Corduba[203], as did [190] L. Munatius Flaccus, a garrison commander in the same war. Munatius' defection is described in detail in Caesar, who says that a message was received, purporting to be from Munatius, claiming that Pompeius had abandoned him, and promising to serve Caesar with the same loyalty he had shown Pompeius. The literal truth of this is difficult to accept, but it is interesting to note the weight Caesar puts on Munatius' defection and Pompeius' "abandonment" of his loyal officer.[204]

The status of junior officers and the composition of the junior officer corps

During the period, military tribunes often appear to have held a different status from the other officers. Military tribunes and centurions were punished as a group by Caesar for failing to discipline the troops[205], but a general in the late Republic would have to have been a brave man to punish his legates or prefects. It is perhaps the case that the military tribunes of this period were considered more of a class with the centurions than with the prefects. Military tribunes and centurions were also treated as a group by Octavian: Appian records that in 36BC Octavian promised purple-bordered togas and decurion status to the military tribunes and centurions of his army – hardly a gift for the son of a senator[206]. The response of the military tribune [202]

[200] Caesar, *B Afr*. 28; cf. [270] Titius (1) and [271] Titius (2).
[201] Cicero, *ad Fam.* 10.23.5.
[202] Horace, *Sat*. 1.6.48; Suetonius, *Vit. Hor*. 1.
[203] Caesar, *B.Hisp*. 11.2.
[204] Caesar, *B.Hisp*. 19.4.
[205] Caesar, *B.Afr.* 54.
[206] Appian, *B.C.* 5.128; Dio (49.13) talks only of centurions, not military tribunes, but Appian specifically describes Ofillius as a χιλίαρχος.

Ofillius to this promise is even more interesting: he is said to have responded that these were gifts for children, and that the rewards for a soldier were land and money. This, as Smith points out, is the speech of an ordinary soldier, not of a member of the political elite[207].

The grouping together of military tribunes with centurions does appear to have been a growing trend in the period. In the run-up to the battle of Pharsalus, Caesar separates the dead of an engagement into common soldiers, *equites* (listed by name), and "32 military tribunes <and> centurions"; not merely are no military tribunes named, but they are placed as a group with the centurions, rather than with the *equites*[208]. The implication of this is that military tribunes were, as a body, no longer as important as they had been in earlier periods. We should, perhaps, be somewhat cautious in our use of this passage, partly because it has not survived entirely intact, and partly because this engagement, which led to the deaths of around 1,000 Roman soldiers, was clearly a shocking one: Cato is said to have wept at the waste of life. Perhaps Caesar wished to emphasise the loss of such young, promising, Italian *equites* rather than that of established military officers, whose deaths might not evoke as much pathos. Military tribunes are again grouped with centurions by Caesar (who was at the time raising funds to pay donatives to his troops) when he refers to the collective shame of the legions for military failure[209]. Furthermore, they appear with centurions in the frequent interventions between Antonius and Octavian made by former Caesarian troops[210]. These are perhaps indications that the military tribunes and the centurions could in certain circumstances be thought of as belonging to the same group. However, this is not simply evidence for a decline in the status of the military tribunate; it is also evidence for an increase in the status of centurions, particularly *primipili*. The pressure for recruitment would have meant that competent centurions were particularly in demand, and their abilities more valued than they had previously been.

We should not, however, take this evidence too far: Caesar's punishment of the military tribunes and centurions as a group may well have been because they held

[207] Smith (1958) 68-69. On the rewards given to military tribunes as part of the programme of colonial settlement, see ch. 8.
[208] Caesar, *B.C.* 3.71.
[209] Appian, *B.C.* 2.47 (Placentia), 2.63 (Dyrrachium).
[210] Appian, *B.C.* 3.32, 3.29, 5.20, 5.23f., 5.59, 5.64.

posts with clearly defined roles within the legion's hierarchy, and because they were in charge together of the discipline of Roman citizen troops, which the prefects, outside the legion's hierarchy and generally in command of auxiliaries, were not. Moreover, in 48BC Caesar rewarded centurions and equestrians who defected to him from Petreius' forces differently: "centuriones in ampliores ordines, equites Romanos in tribunicium restituit honorem"[211]. The phrase itself is curious, as it seems to imply that by defecting to Caesar, those involved had forfeited their military ranks[212]. However, the examples above do not find ready parallels in the evidence from the late Republic, and appear to show the military tribunes of the period 49 – 31BC as comprising both members of the municipal elite, for whom a purple-bordered toga would indeed be an honour, and career soldiers for whom money and land, not a seat in the Senate, were the ultimate goal. This is a contrast with the higher-status military tribunes of the late Republic. As evidence of the pressures put upon commanders to ensure the loyalty of their troops, Dio adds that the mutinous soldiers of 36BC were not truly discontented: they simply wanted to be able to sell their services to Antonius at a higher price[213]. This suggestion should, of course, be treated carefully, since for Octavian it would be a convenient explanation of a mutiny that was more probably founded on long-standing grievances. Nevertheless, it demonstrates that trained and experienced men were in demand throughout the period, and that their services could not be taken for granted. L. Antonius clearly understood this, giving a grant of land to the military tribunes who had served under Caesar (a gift commonly given to enlisted men, not to high-ranking members of the elite)[214]. Perhaps even more interestingly, the military tribunes then voted him a statue. It would be difficult to imagine that the military tribunes of Caesar's army in 59BC would have taken such action as a corporate body. The voting of the statue also suggests a hint by that body of military tribunes (a part of the junior officer corps) to L. Antonius and other commanders that this particular group of officers wished to encourage similar grants of land in the future. Evidence of these land grants can also be found in the role that a number of military tribunes played in the eventual settlements of the legions[215].

[211] Caesar, B.C. 1.77; cf. Nicolet (1969) 146.
[212] Cf. Peskett (1974) 107 n.1.
[213] Dio 49.13.3.
[214] Cicero, *Phil*., 6.13-14; Macrobius *Sat*. 1.10.16.
[215] Cf. ch. 8, pp.230ff.

As we have seen[216], the period also saw military tribunes siding with the troops against their commanders, either in mutinies (such as that of which Auienus is accused by Caesar) or in pressing Octavian and Antonius to settle their differences. Only on one occasion is a military tribune recorded as backing the commander in a dispute with troops[217]. The allegedly seditious behaviour of Auienus suggests that even in the early period of the civil wars the barrier between military tribunes and those underneath them was beginning to weaken. While parallels might be drawn between their actions and those of [90] P. Clodius Pulcher in 67BC[218], it should be remembered that Clodius was an ambitious young man from an extremely important family, and had strong connections with the political elite: the same cannot be said for Auienus. The (presumed) killing of Ofillius and the anonymous officer under Petreius, is, perhaps, further evidence of a decline in the status of the post. They appear to have been disposed of without ceremony. Clodius, by contrast, merely left Lucullus for another commander.

It is also worth noting that there is no evidence for election to the military tribunate in this period. Indeed, the last attested examples of men elected to the military tribunate date from 70BC[219], and there is no suggestion in Suetonius that [83] Tiberius was elected to the military tribunate in 26BC[220]. We cannot say that it was certainly in this period that the practice of electing military tribunes fell into abeyance. However, it is worth noting that an elected military tribune appears to have been designated in legal texts as "tribunus militum legionibus IIII primis aliqua earum" (or similar phrase)[221], and that Pansa's levy of 43BC was the last consular levy of four legions numbered I-IV[222].

---

[216] E.g. Caesar, *B.C.* 1.20; cf. pp.122-123.
[217] L. Titius in 48BC. He was later made a senator (Caesar, *B.Alex*. 57.1). Given the unpopularity of Q. Cassius Longinus, and the rebellion of the *legio uernacula* in which L. Titius served (cf. Fear (1991) 818-820), this loyalty was indeed conspicuous. He may, in fact, have been the father of the two Titii later killed for their loyalty to Caesar (Caesar, *B.Afr.* 28). There is no evidence that T. Quin(c)tius Scapula and Q. Aponius, the two knights who later took over the *legio uernacula* and Pompeius' former Legio II, were junior officers. They appear to have taken direct command of both legions (Dio 43.29; cf. Fear (1991) 808-812).
[218] Plutarch, *Luc*. 34.2-4; Dio 36.14-18; cf. [90] P. Clodius Pulcher.
[219] Cicero, *Verr.* 1.30: [72] L. Cassius (?Longinus); [103] M. Crepereius; [276] Cn. Tremellius Scrofa.
[220] Suetonius, *Tib.* 9.1.
[221] *Lex repetundarum* l.2 in Crawford (1996); on the language used to describe elected military tribunes, cf. ch. 2, pp.64-65.
[222] Schmitthenner (1958) 31-32; it may be significant that Pansa warned Octavian not trust the officers in these legions, which suggests that, perhaps, he did not appoint them (Appian, *B.C.* 3.76).

Various considerations suggest that military tribunes were of a comparatively low status: their role in killing high-profile men; the large number of military tribunates available in comparison to the other officer positions; the fact that, as we shall see, the majority of known *primipilares* who were promoted to a junior officer position were promoted to the military tribunates. Moreover, while we find young members of the senatorial elite serving as prefects in this period, we do not find them holding military tribunate. Another thing which suggests the comparatively low status of military tribunes during this period is the limited evidence of promotion found in our epigraphic sources. Of the 21 junior officers recorded in inscriptions datable to the years 49 – 31BC or to the period immediately following Actium, only four held another junior officer post, suggesting that most military tribunes held only that position[223]. Some idea of the relative status of the military tribunate and the other junior officer positions can be gained by assessing the attested promotions. [180] T. Marius Siculus was promoted from the military tribunate to an undetermined military prefecture and thence to a naval prefecture[224]; [54] C. Baebius was promoted from the military tribunate to the position of *praefectus orae maritimae*[225]; [213] Patruus may have been promoted from the military tribunate to the position of *praefectus equitum*[226], the career path followed by [307] Volusenus Quadratus, who had received his promotion to the post of *praefectus equitum* in 51BC[227]; and [100] [. ?Corne]lius Alexidis f. Cor(nelia) Menodor(us), datable to the Triumviral period, held at different points the positions of *praefectus fabrum* and military tribune[228]. Literary evidence, as we have seen[229], rarely provides an indication of promotion between junior officer positions, and the only officer from this period known from literary evidence who held more than one distinct type of junior officer position is [165] Q. Lucretius Vespillo[230].

[223] The promotion of [291] Q. Veranius (cf. AE 1981, 824 = BE 1982, 376 (Xanthos, Lycia)) to the position of *pro legato*, while coming after his military tribunate, may have owed more to his role as a tutor to the elder Drusus; cf. Balland (1981) 85, 93ff. On the role of *pro legato*, cf. ch. 5, p.150.
[224] CIL 11.6058 (Uruinum Mataurense, Regio 6, Italia); cf. Valerius Maximus 7.9.2 (= 6.8.6).
[225] CIL 11.623 = ILS 2672 = AE 1978, 335 = EDH HD005009 (Forum Liuii, Regio 8).
[226] The inscription itself is too fragmentary to be certain; cf. AE 1983, 182 (Fundi, Regio 1, Italia); CIL 9.733 = ILS 2499 = AE 1980, 537 (Larinum, Regio 2, Italia).
[227] Caesar, *B.G.* 8.48.
[228] AE 1993, 1479 = AE 1997, 1436 (Ephesus, Asia).
[229] Cf. ch. 3, pp.91-92.
[230] In addition, there are two individuals known from inscriptions who may have been promoted in this period: [60] Q. Caecilius Q.f. Atticus may have held a prefecture and a military tribunate; and it is possible that [4] [- - -] f. Pap(iria) (CIL 6.32935 (Roma)), who was probably *praefectus fabrum* and may have been a military tribune, dates to this period (Pflaum (1960-1961) 10; Demougin (1983) 297).

The status of cavalry prefects does indeed appear to have been higher than that of military tribunes. In particular, the young [278] M. Tullius Cicero, of consular family, was twice appointed as a cavalry prefect. Cavalry prefects do not appear to have taken a role in mutinies, nor are they found petitioning for land or other grants. Moreover, there is no sense in our sources, as we find with the military tribunes, that the status of the post had dropped significantly from that which it had enjoyed in the late Republic. The promotion of [66] M. Caesius Scaeua from the position of *primipilus* to a cavalry prefecture is a reflection of his truly exceptional reputation as a soldier[231]. It is worth noting, also, that there were grades of responsibility, and probably of status, within the role of cavalry prefect. The position which the young Cicero held in 43 – 42BC appears to have been very different from the position which he held in 49 – 48BC, and to have involved a great deal more responsibility[232].

The status of garrison commanders appears to have varied: [96] P. Cornelius, in charge of Sarsura under Metellus Scipio, was an *euocatus*, probably a former *primipilus*[233]; [187] C. Minucius Reginus, commander of Zeta, and [132] C. Gallonius, at Gades, are explicitly described as equestrians[234]; while [166] Q. Lucretius Vespillo was a man of senatorial rank[235]. However, apart from Cornelius and Lucretius Vespillo, all of the other officers appear to have been equestrians. In all likelihood, two particular factors will have decided the status of the man given a garrison to command. The first was probably the importance of the command itself, both tactically and in terms of the number of men to be commanded: the command of Sulmo by Lucretius Vespillo and [46] Attius Paelignus, for instance, appears to have been a very important one (they had seven cohorts – more than half a legion – under them), and [160] L. Liuineius Regulus had a legion under him at Hadrumentum[236], while [96] P. Cornelius' command is likely to have been only a fraction of that size, as his responsibility was probably more the guarding of grain stores than providing Caesar with a tactical threat[237]. An additional example is provided by [54] C. Baebius' command over the Spanish coastline, an extremely important command over a wide

[231] Valerius Maximus 3.2.23; cf. Caesar, *B.C.* 3.53.3-5.
[232] See above, p.107, 114.
[233] Caesar, *B.Afr.* 76.1.
[234] Minucius Reginus: Caesar, *B.Afr.* 68.4; C. Gallonius: Caesar, *B.C.* 2.18.2.
[235] Caesar, *B.C.* 1.18.
[236] Caesar, *B.Afr.* 89.3.
[237] Caesar, *B.Afr.* 75-76.

area of Octavian's territory: we should not be surprised, therefore, that a man of experience was appointed to the position[238]. The second factor was probably the availability of potential commanders: [131] Gallonius, for example, was a friend of Domitius Ahenobarbus who was in the province to do business for him, and his appointment may have owed much to his being in the right, or perhaps wrong, place at the time; Cornelius' appointment came at a time when Caesar and Metellus Scipio were about to engage in a major battle, and it may be that the appointment to the position of a man with such a low status came about because Metellus Scipio needed all of his best commanders in one place for the battle, or that few people would have been prepared to take up such a dangerous post, or that there was so little time to make the appointment. It is also possible that the type of troops being commanded would have made a difference. The fact that Cornelius was in charge of Numidian troops might be the reason why a former *euocatus* was promoted to such a position (though we should not assume that the equestrian [187] Minucius Reginus, for example, was in command of citizen infantry). Furthermore, other abilities besides military experience may have helped, such as familiarity with a region. However, given our relatively limited knowledge about the individuals who held the position, we can never be certain about which factors played a part in the appointment of a given individual to a given post.

As noted above, a large proportion of the naval commanders of the period were not junior officers. Their roles, and social status – many were of senatorial rank[239] – were determined by the central importance of naval warfare to the period, something which had not occurred for nearly 200 years, and would not occur again for centuries. It is no surprise, therefore, that the junior naval prefectures of the period appear to have ranked as among the highest junior officer positions available. As we have seen, [180] T. Marius Siculus reached the post only after being promoted twice following his holding of the military tribunate[240], a pattern echoed in the careers of naval prefects in the Augustan period[241]. In addition, the young [107] Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus, who came from one of the most famous Roman families and was singled out for conspicuous praise by Cicero, appears to have held a comparatively junior role as a

[238] CIL 11.623 = ILS 2672 = AE 1978, 335 = EDH HD005009 (Forum Liuii, Regio 8).
[239] Saddington (1988) 299.
[240] Cf. p.118.
[241] Cf. ch. 5, p.158.

naval prefect[242], as did [143] L. Iulius Caesar[243], while another comparatively junior naval prefect, [165] Q. Lucretius Vespillo, was of senatorial rank[244]. Clearly, the importance of the post was also related to the competence and experience of the individual who held it, and [193] L. Nasidius was able to obtain an important naval prefecture in 47BC after holding a smaller naval prefecture in 49BC[245].

Praefecti fabrum appear to have varied somewhat in status. Some, such as [99] Cornelius Gallus and [121] C. Flauius were men of some status and position[246]. Although a foreigner, the same should probably be said of [226] Cn. Pompeius Theophanes: as Badian points out, had Pompeius won, he might well have enjoyed a similar status to that of Cornelius Balbus[247]. However [100] [. ?Corne]lius Alexidis f. Cor(nelia) Menodor(us)[248], who went on to hold the military tribunate, boasted that he was "primus ex is qui in Asia habitant"[249] to hold the military tribunate. This suggests, that although of considerable local status, his role as a *praefectus fabrum* was far less important than that of Pompeius Theophanes – it is, perhaps, unwise to extrapolate from Cornelius Menodorus to officers from Italy, the origin, it appears, of all the other known *praefecti fabrum* of the period.

The period of the civil wars also saw many commanders using freedmen as military officers. Pompeius, Caesar, Octavian, and Sextus Pompeius all did so, and Pompeius Theophanes – Pompeius' close friend and *praefectus fabrum* – was given citizenship by Pompeius. The use of freedmen was, clearly, inspired by a need to try to guarantee the loyalty of one's officers: Sextus Pompeius in particular used his father's freedmen, but despite his high position, Menodorus still deserted[250]. However, we should be careful of making too much of the fact that these men were freedmen. After all, they were not just anyone's freedmen, but the freedmen of some of the most powerful men in the Roman world. Moreover, as Saddington points out, many of Octavian's key supporters – such as Saluidienus Rufus, T. Statilius Taurus and, in

[242] Cicero, *Phil*. 10.13: "adulescens summa uirtute, grauitate, constantia"; on his naval command, see above, p.119.
[243] Caesar, *B.C.* 2.23.3.
[244] Caesar, *B.C*. 1.18.
[245] 49BC: Caesar, *B.C*. 2.3-4, 7; cf. Schol. Bern. on Lucan 3.524; 47BC: Caesar, *B.Afr.* 64, 98; cf. Dio 42.56.3.
[246] Cf. p.121.
[247] Badian (1997) 7.
[248] AE 1993, 1479 = AE 1997, 1436 (Ephesus, Asia).
[249] On the meaning of this phrase cf. AE 1993, 1479 = AE 1997, 1436 (Ephesus, Asia).
[250] Cf. Appian, *B.C.* 5.78, 80-81.

particular, M. Agrippa – were men of modest social origins in comparison to the major commanders of the late Republic[251]. The example of Agrippa is, perhaps, instructive: whatever his relationship with Octavian, he was an extremely competent military commander. Similarly, the rise of men such as Menodorus and *[Cn. Pompeius] Democharis* (who should probably be considered a senior rather than a junior officer) may have been significantly accelerated by their relationship to their former masters, but they must also have been competent soldiers.

However, it is interesting to note that, while freedmen are found acting as naval commanders or as garrison commanders[252], they rarely held other posts in command of Roman citizen troops. It may be that Roman troops would have resented being placed under their command, or that their commanders took to heart Cicero's warning that military power had to be backed by the appearance of legitimacy[253]. However, freedmen do appear to have served as military tribunes, and, as further evidence of the diminution of the post's status, they did not have to be the freedmen of anyone of rank: Horace describes an anonymous freedman who had reached the military tribunate, despite the whip marks on his back[254], and while the subject of the poem may not have been an identifiable individual, it is nevertheless suggestive of real examples of military tribunes who were freedmen. Horace himself was of comparatively humble origins, being the son of a freedman from Venusia, and held a military tribunate[255], and it is perhaps significant that he appears to acknowledge that, by the Augustan period, such a promotion might be seen as a step too far for the son of a freedman[256]. Further possible evidence for a decline in the status of the military tribunate comes from [219] Q. Pinarius L. f. Aem(ilia), who appears to have married his freedwoman[257]. However, as Pinarius' service probably dates from the post-Actium period[258], and as equestrians were free to marry their freedwomen if they so wished, this should probably not be taken as evidence for a decline in the status of the junior officer positions.

---

[251] Saddington (2005) 206.
[252] E.g. Octavian's freedman [145] C. Iulius Helenus served as a naval commander in the war against Sextus Pompeius: Appian *B.C*. 5.66; Dio 48.30.8, 48.45.5.
[253] Cicero, *Phil*. 11.26.
[254] Horace, Ep. 4, cf. [285] (?Vedius Rufus*)*.
[255] Suetonius, *vit. Horat*. 1; Horace, *Sat*. 1.6.48ff., *Carm*. 2.7, cf. *Sat*. 1.7.
[256] Horace, *Sat*. 1.6.49-50; cf. Fraenkel (1957) 10-11.
[257] Devijver (1976-2001) 4.1681; Demougin (1992) 42.
[258] On the Legio VI Macedonicae in which Pinarius served, see Keppie (1983) 83ff.

Along with the appointment of freedmen, a further possible indication of a decline in the status of the junior officer positions is the appearance of junior officers who came from outside Italy. In addition to the freedmen, and to Pompeius Theophanes, we know of a number of other officers: the two Titii from Spain ([270] and [271]), whose father – possibly a military tribune under Pompeius[259] – was of senatorial rank[260]; [100] [?Corne]lius Menodorus was presumably from the Eastern provinces; while an anonymous military tribune from Prisanos who served in Legio XXXI, probably under Brutus or Antonius, almost certainly dates to the period before Actium[261]. The fact that both the Republicans and Antonius had limited opportunities to recruit officers in Italy must have increased the opportunities available for men from the Eastern provinces. There must have been other officers from the provinces as well, especially and among the commanders of infantry cohorts raised from Spain, Gaul, and Macedonia. The majority of attested officers from the provinces (including both of those who are known from epigraphic evidence) were military tribunes. However, this development should probably be seen more as an indication of the higher status of non-Italians in Roman society generally: Pompeius Theophanes and the two Titii were of relatively high status, and given the limited numbers of known individuals, we should be wary of assuming that a post held by a non-Italian was a post that had lost status.

Moreover, many junior officers were experienced men. A number of officers served over several years, sometimes in more than one role[262], and they presumably earned their promotions, or, as in the cases of [278] M. Tullius Cicero and [193] L. Nasidius, developed within their role[263]. Military specialisms are also evident, ironically, in a number of commanders who were unsuccessful: *C. Valerius Triarius*, a naval commander in 49BC (though probably a senior rather than a junior officer) who was with Pompeius at Pharsalus[264], advised Pompeius to hold his men in position and await Caesar's attack, hoping to tire out Caesar's troops; his strategy failed. Equally

[259] Cf. [272] L. Titius (Caesar, *B.Alex.* 57.1).
[260] Caesar, *B.Afr*. 28.
[261] AE 1933, 199; cf. [1] [- - -] (AE 1933, 199). On Legio XXXI, cf. Shmitthenner (1958) 17, 56, 198 n.2; Devijver (1976-2001) 1.192; Keppie (1983) 26-27, 28, 176-177; Broughton (1986) 35; Demougin (1992) 54
[262] e.g. [180] T. Marius Siculus who, despite Valerius Maximus' scorn, was therefore probably a competent officer.
[263] Cf. p.118.
[264] Caesar, *B.C*. 3.6.3, 3.92.

unsuccessful was [205] Pacideius (1), who attempted novel manoeuvring at two African battles, both of which ended in failure[265]. Of course, both of these accounts are Caesarian and both officers were Pompeian, so we should be cautious of taking them at face value. However, they appear to show that there were tacticians in the officer corps, and that they could suggest new tactics and manoeuvres. The rise to prominence of many senior commanders, as argued above, should also be attributed, at least in part, to their military abilities. The high status of certain of the military prefectures[266] is testimony to the importance placed on the ability to lead and command, and the increased status of centurions and the promotion of *primipilares* to officer positions can partly be attributed to the increased importance of such military abilities.

The promotion of centurions to junior officer posts is an important development in the period. Four such promotions are known from literary sources: [250] L. Septimius and [236] C. Popillius Laenas[267], the killers of Pompeius and Cicero respectively; [96] P. Cornelius, who was an *euocatus*[268]; and [180] T. Marius Siculus who was, Valerius Maximus informs us, promoted "ab infimo militiae loco"[269], and had presumably been a centurion; however, to this list might be added [66] M. Caesius Scaeua, whose promotion to *praefectus equitum* is not explicitly recorded in a literary source. From epigraphic evidence, the only case that can be securely dated to the period is that of [118] L. Firmius, a *primipilus* who went on to hold the military tribunate[270]. As Smith and Gabba[271] point out, it can hardly be that the handful of cases we hear of were the only examples of men to be promoted from the ranks. The immense increase in the number of junior officer posts created by two competing Roman armies (along with the high casualty rate) would have offered far greater opportunities for service and a far greater demand than normal for talented men to fill the extra places. It is unsurprising that the junior officer post for which there was the greatest pressure on recruitment, the military tribunate, is the post which exhibits the sharpest decline in status during the period. The need to recruit and retain the services of senior

[265] Cf. Caesar, *B.Afr*. 13.1, 78.4.
[266] Cf. p.119.
[267] Cf. p.106.
[268] On *euocati* in the early Principate, cf. Birley (1981) 28-29; Maxfield (1981) 210.
[269] Valerius Maximus 7.9.2 (= 6.8.6).
[270] CIL 10.5713 = ILLRP 498a = ILS 2226 (Sura, Regio 1, Italia).
[271] Smith (1958) 67; Gabba (1976) 34.

centurions, in particular[272], can be seen in L. Firmius, who probably re-enlisted on the formation of Legio IIII Sorana in 43BC[273]. Firmius was probably a *primipilus* before his election to the position of *quattuoruir* at Sura, which suggests that he had already retired from the army, before becoming a military tribune in Legio IIII Sorana, which was recruited from the region[274]. It is perhaps no surprise, then, that this is the period in which we encounter men such as [202] Ofillius, the protesting military tribune in Sicily who wanted land and money, not honours.

It is very important to note, moreover, that the relative decline of the military tribunate, and the potential decline in the status of the junior officer positions, began during the period 49 – 31BC, and not earlier. Historians such as Smith and Gabba[275] have tended to apply evidence from this period (such as the evidence of promoted centurions) to argue that the decline in status of the military tribunate began in the 70s and 60s BC. Moreover, the decline in status of the junior officer positions should not be overstated. Many of the new posts available went to men who might still have been competing for junior officer positions in the late Republic, including those, such as the Titii and [?Corne]lius Menodorus, who were not from Italy. Furthermore, many of those who took the new opportunities opened by the events of the period were not necessarily men of lower military status. It is likely that, during such a period, former centurions would have been highly valued by their commanders, especially as they, unlike young *equites* drafted in to fight, would have had considerable military experience, and would have been difficult to retain in service without the offer of them additional incentives, a development which is continued in the Augustan period.

[272] Cf. Nicolet (1974) 878 no. 145.
[273] Keppie (1983) 26-27, 136; contra Ritterling, RE 12.1564; cf. Dobson (1978) 165; Demougin (1988) 589.
[274] On Firmius, cf. CIL 10.5713 = ILLRP 498a = ILS 2226 (Sura, Regio 1, Italia).
[275] Smith (1958) 66ff., Gabba (1976) 36ff.

Ch. 5: The Junior Officer Positions 30 BC – AD 14

The Augustan era saw the most dramatic series of changes to the Roman army in the period covered by this thesis. The long commands given to Marius, Pompeius, and Caesar had offered them a chance to institute reforms within their armies, but such reforms could only have limited impact. Augustus' control of all Roman military forces allowed him to make a number of changes[1] – those to the size of the armed forces and to the conditions of service, for example, are well known – and, perhaps more importantly, to experiment with different ways of organising his armies. Augustus faced a number of challenges, some of them inherited from the Triumviral period, such as the decline in the status of some of the junior officer positions, while others were the result of specific crises, such as the Pannonian revolt. Moreover, the Augustan period also saw a great deal of perhaps overdue reform, particularly the beginnings of a permanent and structured array of *auxilia*. The results of this can be seen particularly clearly in the many cursus inscriptions that record junior officers from the Augustan period, which reveal a number of new posts and career patterns.

Many of these posts, such as those of *praefectus castrorum* and *praefectus cohortis*, were to become firmly established and continued for centuries. However, as we shall see, these posts were only in the early stages of evolution, and their roles and responsibilities, as well as the status of the men that held them, were yet to be established. Other innovations were more short-lived. The military tribunate *a populo*, and the positions of *praefectus leuis armaturae* and *praefectus nauium*, for example, as well as the commands of citizen cohorts, all show the ways in which the Augustan system was prepared to experiment with new posts and structures. Moreover, the status and functions of long-established posts, such as that of *praefectus fabrum* and the military tribunate, had yet to evolve even into the positions they were to become in the Claudian period, let alone into those of the high Empire.

These innovations, matched with the social changes affecting the junior officer positions of the period 49 – 31BC, produced a diverse officer corps. The military career structure of the post-Flavian period, especially the concept of the equestrian *militia*, was in its early stages of development, and by no means constituted the

[1] Cf. Keppie (1984) 129ff.; Demougin (1988) 286; Devijver 1995 176.

established career-path that was to come. The Augustan period is marked by diverse patterns of office-holding, and by a broad range of positions that might be held, for example, by both the sons of senators or by former centurions.

The number of junior officer positions available

As with the late Republican period, it is possible to estimate how many military tribunates were available during the Augustan period by first calculating the number of legions in service. While there is debate about the precise distribution of the legions, and while it is unclear exactly how fast the bulk of the Triumviral legions were disbanded, it is generally accepted that Augustus quite quickly reduced the number of legions in service to 28[2]. This, of course, means that there would have been 168 military tribunates available each year – an increase on the average for the late Republic, but a substantial drop on the number of military tribunates available during the period 49 – 31BC.

As with the earlier periods, it is more difficult to calculate the number of prefects in service[3]. From the Augustan reform of the navy, we know that along with the two *praefecti classis* in service each year (one stationed at Misenum and the other at Ravenna), there was an unknown but comparatively small number of junior prefects in charge of various naval bases, such as the one at Forum Iulii ([24] [- - -]us T.f. Teret(ina))[4]. It is hard to estimate the numbers of infantry and cavalry prefects who were responsible for commanding the *auxilia*, about which our evidence, throughout the period, is fragmentary[5]. It is also difficult to estimate the proportion of auxiliaries in service on the basis of the number of legions: in AD7, Tiberius commanded ten legions, 70 infantry cohorts, and 14 cavalry *alae*, as well as other forces not clearly defined but which included Thracian cavalry[6]; Varus lost only six infantry cohorts and three cavalry *alae* along with his three legions[7]; the strength of the Roman army in Egypt is given by Strabo as three legions, nine infantry cohorts, and three cavalry *alae*[8]. Taken together, these figures suggest that the number of cavalry *alae* in service might be roughly equivalent to the number of legions, but they do not help us to

[2] Keppie (1984) 205-212 (Appendix 2); Webster (1996) 44.
[3] Cf. Demougin (1988) 302-303.
[4] Saddington (1991a) 397-398.
[5] Cf. Saddington (1982) 77.
[6] Velleius 2.113.1; cf. Saddington (1982) 80.
[7] Velleius 2.117.1.
[8] Strabo 17.1.54.

estimate the number of infantry cohorts in service. In the Claudian army, it is estimated that there were 300 *praefecti cohortis* in service annually, as well as 100 *praefecti alae* (equivalent to Augustan *praefecti equitum*), of whom ten were *praefecti alae milliariae,* of which there is no direct Augustan equivalent, and 190 military tribunes[9]. However, we cannot directly extrapolate from these figures to produce estimates for the Augustan army, as there were many more legions in service at the time (the figure is probably 38) and, moreover, the use and organisation of auxiliary forces changed significantly during the early Julio-Claudian period. Had the ratio of *praefecti cohortis*:*tribuni militum*:*praefecti equitum* been the same in the Augustan period as in the Claudian period (when there five rather than six equestrian military tribunes per legion), i.e. 300:190:99, there would have been approximately 220 *praefecti cohortis* and approximately 72 *praefecti equitum* in service annually[10]. This, however, is very different from the proportions of junior officers known from surviving inscriptions: of the 104 known junior officers who probably served in the Augustan period, 76 served as military tribunes[11], 32 as *praefecti fabrum*, 28 as *praefecti equitum*[12], 9 as *praefecti cohortis*, 14 as *praefecti castrorum*, and 6 held other kinds of military prefectures. This demonstrates, perhaps, that *praefecti* in general are under-represented. While it is not surprising that more military tribunes are recorded than *praefecti cohortis* (and than commanders of cohorts of citizen infantry, both relatively new posts), since the post held greater social status, the relative under-representation (in comparison with the Claudian figures) of *praefecti equitum*, who were at least of equivalent status, and in earlier and later periods of higher status, is interesting. It may be that the municipal elite, who provided so many of the military tribunes in this period, were more likely than prefects to be commemorated (in civic inscriptions or in prominent funerary monuments) in such a way as to allow their names and cursuses to survive.

It may also be the case that prefects, and *praefecti equitum* in particular, were more likely to stay in their posts for a longer period of time. Most officers in the Roman army of the post-Flavian period served for more than one year, with 2-3 years in one

[9] Devijver (1973) 552, (1995) 182-183.
[10] For the figure of five (rather than six) military tribunes in each legion who were junior officers, see below.
[11] Including 27 *tribuni militum a populo*, 2 men who may have been *tribunus militum pro legato*, 2 military tribunes in charge of auxiliary cohorts, and 2 tribunes in charge of praetorian or urban cohorts.
[12] Including two men in charge of a *cohorts equitata*.

post being the norm[13], and while we should be wary of extrapolating too far from our knowledge of the career patterns of the post-Flavian period, the trend of office holding in the Julio-Claudian period was, nevertheless, heading in the direction of the established, long-term military equestrian cursus of the Flavian and post-Flavian eras. We should, therefore, consider that it was probably fairly common for individuals to remain in their posts for more than one year (for an example of this, see [150] T. Iunius D.f. Ani(ensi) Montanus), and that, therefore, the number of vacant posts available in any given year was substantially lower than the total number of officer positions.

The roles and functions of the junior officer positions

The most established junior officer position remained the military tribunate. Of the 104 junior officers known from the Augustan period, nearly three-quarters are attested as having served as military tribunes at some point in their careers. That the position is the most often recorded in our (mainly epigraphic) sources should not come as a surprise: as we have seen, there were more military tribunates available annually than any other junior officer position. However, the large number of military tribunates among those who also held prefectures (41 such individuals are known), suggests that the military tribunate was a normal part of a junior officer's career: most junior officers who held only one post held the military tribunate, and most junior officers who held more than one post held the military tribunate at some point.

The military tribunate does not appear to have changed in character during the Augustan period. In the later Principate, the military tribunate was split into two distinct posts, with each legion having one *tribunus legionis*, a senator's son on the way to a political career, and five *tribuni militum*[14], who were of equestrian rank and were normally drawn from the municipal elite[15]. The legionary tribune was the second in command of the legion, and commanded it in the absence of the legionary legate[16].

---

[13] Anderson (1984) 8.

[14] The terms *tribunus laticlauus* (for legionary tribunes, cf. Suetonius, *Dom.* 10) and *tribunus angusticlauus* (for the other five military tribunes, who were of equestrian status), may not have been in current use during the early Principate. The earliest possible use of the term *tribunus laticlauus* given by Devijver ((1976-2001) C171) is Tiberian, but this is a hypothetical supplement to an inscription (*AE* 1974, 411) rather than a clear attestation (cf. von Domaszewski (1967) LV, 172).

[15] Birley (1953) 139; Devijver (1974) 149; Garlan (1975) 158-159; Davies (1989) 37; Le Bohec (1994) 38-41; Goldsworthy (1996) 31.

[16] See von Domaszewski (1908) 130ff., (1967) LV, 172; Devijver (1970) 67; Dobson (1972) 203; Davies (1984) 37; Le Bohec (1994) 42.

Legionary tribunes had their own staff, and held substantial military and judicial responsibilities[17]. However, there is little evidence for the existence of this post in the Augustan period. Suetonius states that to give the sons of senators military experience, Augustus "non tribunatum modo legionum, sed et praefecturas alarum dedit"[18] – but this is not evidence for a separate type of military tribunate. The term *tribunus legionis* is found in the period, albeit rarely, but it is as a contraction of *tribunus militum legionis X*, and not necessarily in association with those of high status[19]: Suetonius' terminology here (note also the use of "praefecturas alarum" not *praefecturas equitum*) seems out of place for the Augustan period. A number of individuals of high social status are recorded as *tribuni militum*, and there is no evidence that they held a new post entitled *tribunus legionis* or one of higher status than the 'normal' military tribunate: [83] Tiberius, and possibly *Marcellus*, served as a military tribune during the Cantabrian war[20]; [212] Passienus Rufus, the son of a proconsul[21], served as a military tribune, as did others who may have come from senatorial families[22]; and [225] Cn. Pompeius C.f. Teret(ina) Proculus[23], an equestrian of high standing, also served as a "tribunus militum" and not as a *tribunus legionis*. In the absence of other evidence, it is assumed here that no new post was created, and that six military tribunes of equivalent, equestrian, rank served in each legion. Moreover, it is worth noting that the post of *legatus legionis* dates from the very end of the Augustan period[24]. In addition, while in the later Principate the equestrian military tribunes were junior to both the *praefectus castrorum* and the *primipilus bis*[25], the latter position dates from the Claudian period, while the position of *praefectus castrorum*, as we shall see, was still in its infancy, and it is likely that *praefecti castrorum* were not yet senior to the military tribunes[26]. Until the

[17] Birley (1953) 139; Garlan (1975) 158; Le Bohec (1994) 38.
[18] Suetonius, *Aug.* 38.2.
[19] E.g. [219] Q. Pinarius L.f. Aem(elia), who married his freedwoman. The term is more commonly found among inscriptions of the later empire, and often among those who were clearly not of senatorial status (e.g. CIL 3.647 = CIL 3.7337 = ILS 2538 = AE 2003, 1606 (Philippi, Macedonia)).
[20] Suetonius, *Tib*. 9.1; cf. Dio 53.26; Pliny *N.H.* 14.64.
[21] CIL 8.26580.
[22] Cf. [183] Post. Mimisius C.f. Sardus (CIL 14.259), [231] C. Pontius C.f. Paelignus (CIL 5.434), and [209] Sex. Papinius Q.f. Allenius (CIL 5.2823).
[23] CIL 6.3530.
[24] Keppie (1984) 129-130. It is worth noting that, in the later Julio-Claudian period at least, legionary legates could be relatively young men (cf. Tacitus *Ann.* 15.28, *Hist.* 3.9; von Domaszewski (1967) LV, 172).
[25] Dobson (1982) 334; Demougin (1992) 269; Keppie (1996a) 108; Saddington (1996b) 244.
[26] This is also suggested by the order in which Velleius (2.112.6) lists Messalinus' officers: military tribunes, *praefectus castrorum*, *praefecti cohortis*.

introduction of the legionary legate, military tribunes would have been responsible, as before, directly to the commander (or the legate or prefect in charge of a detachment).

The Augustan period provides little direct evidence on the duties of military tribunes. The cursus of [115] Fabricius Tuscus[27] mentions that he was "trib(uno) mil(itum) leg(ionis) III / Cyr(enaicae) VIII trib(uno) dilectus ingenuorum / quem Romae habuit" which, as it is unlikely to have been a formal post[28], suggests that military tribunes may have been responsible for some part of the *dilectus*, or more likely that they played a role in the emergency conscription of citizens that followed the Pannonian revolt. Otherwise, [154] P. Iuuentius Rufus' involvement with mining operations in Egypt[29] is a rare example of an association between the military tribunate and another role in a cursus inscription: it is likely that the absence of such information shows that the military tribunate was a stable position, with understood roles and responsibilities.

It is worth noting, however, the administrative nature of the military tribunate in the later Julio-Claudian period[30]. Suetonius records that Claudius attempted to codify an equestrian military career, beginning with the post of *praefectus cohortis* (prefect of auxiliary infantry), progressing to *praefectus equitum* and from there to the military tribunate[31], and this is borne out by epigraphic evidence[32]. On the face of it, this order of officer posts is odd. The equestrian prefecture was arguably a post of greater military importance, requiring independent thought and action and giving the office-holder a considerable degree of power and initiative: from the Flavian period onwards, it was the highest equestrian officer post in the equestrian *militiae*[33]. It seems that Claudius' intention was not to select just good soldiers but also good administrators: many military tribunes also worked within the provincial administration, as well as routinely aiding in large administrative tasks such as censuses[34]. The men who had been promoted through Claudius' career path would be the most competent administrators, who would then be in line for junior

[27] AE 1973, 50.
[28] Cf. Brunt (1974) 184.
[29] AE 1910, 207; cf. Saddington (1987) 269; Demougin (1992) 195).
[30] Although military tribunes might still take an active role in combat, e.g. Velleius 2.112.6, and command detachments (cf. Saddington (2003) 21).
[31] Suetonius, *Claud.* 25.1.
[32] Compare CIL 10.797 and CIL 10.7351; see Devijver (1972) 168 and (1973) 550 for further examples.
[33] Statius, *Silu.* 5.1.95; von Domaszewski (1967) 122ff.; Devijver (1973) 550, (1989) 77; Keppie (1984) 177; Le Bohec (1994) 42 (although the command of an *ala milliaria* was senior to the command of a normal cavalry *ala*).
[34] Anderson (1984) 8.

procuratorships: the military cursus was thus integrated into the civilian administrative structure. Claudius may have been attempting reform, but the stress laid on the administrative ability of the junior officers was not a new trend, and it continued – as we can see in Pliny's letters of recommendation for junior officer posts[35] – into the Flavian period and beyond. It should be noted, however, that the military tribunate was still very much a military post, and that, as we shall see, even those who held multiple prefectures would normally hold the military tribunate.

The post of *praefectus equitum* had, as we have seen, begun to emerge during the civil wars and the Triumviral period, and was firmly established by the start of the Augustan period. However, the Augustan period also saw the use, as in previous periods, of auxiliary cavalry commanded by, or at least in part led by, their own native commanders: Arminius (cf. *(C. Iulius) Arminius*) is described by Tacitus as "ductor popularium", and was almost certainly not a junior officer, nor a Roman citizen at the time of his command[36]; the same title was used of Flauus (cf. *(?C. ?Iulius) Flauus*), who may have been in command of a decury[37] but received military *dona* which ranked below those granted to centurions[38]; and another non-Roman citizen at the time *(?C. ?Iulius) Charioualda*, is described by Tacitus as "Charioualda dux Batauorum"[39].

Moreover, it is notable that Arminius, Flauus and Charioualda are not described as having independent cavalry commands, and it is likely that, as with many of the cavalry commands of the earlier periods, they had Roman officers placed above them – a similar position to that of Raucilius and Egus, two sons of a Gallic chieftain who served in a cavalry unit commanded by [307] C. Volusenus Quadratus[40]. It is clear, moreover, that a structure of cavalry command – individual *alae* being commanded by Roman officers with an overall commander of senior rank for a large campaign – was beginning to emerge. This would, however, have given commanders of individual

[35] Pliny, *Ep.* 10.86b, 87; cf. Deniaux (2000) 232-233.
[36] Tacitus, Ann. 2.10.3; cf. Timpe (1970) 21ff.; Alföldy (1977) 10; Saddington (1982) 79; Demougin (1992) 117-118.
[37] Cf. Saddington (1991a) 3536 n.82.
[38] Cf. Timpe (1970) 42; Maxfield (1981) 125. It is possible that he went on to command an *ala*, and that the *ala Gallorum Flauiana* was named after him However, there are a number of other possible reasons for the name (Birley (1978) 166-167; Spaul (1994) 115; cf. Timpe (1970) 42 n.92).
[39] Tacitus, *Ann.* 2.11.
[40] Caesar, *B.C.* 3.59-60.

alae a great deal of independence, especially in comparison to military tribunes, as well as responsibility for command on the battlefield.

However, permanent cavalry *alae* like those of the later imperial period were only beginning to emerge[41], and many cavalry units were raised, as in earlier times, through levies of allied forces for particular campaigns, which would explain the presence of local nobles. The title *praefectus alae* was almost certainly not yet in use, as no officer holding the title can be shown to have served in the Augustan period. Of the literary evidence and cursus inscriptions recording prefects in charge of cavalry units from this period, all but two use the term *praefectus equitum* to describe junior officers in charge of a cavalry *ala*. The only two inscriptions to use different titles are the only ones where the units commanded are identified. In the first of these, that set up to [115] C. Fabricius C.f. Ani(ensi) Tuscus[42], who is described as *praef(ecto) equit(um) alae praet(oriae)*, the *ala praetoria* may have been a unit guarding a commander, and not a standard cavalry unit, although it is more likely that it was the unit which was to become the *ala I praetoria ciuium Romanorum*[43]. The second inscription[44], however, is more interesting. It is an honorific inscription to a P. Cornelius Scipio, who was quaestor in AD2 – 3, and a legate in Germany in AD13 – 14, made by five *alae*[45]. The *praefecti* of these *alae*, whose names do not survive[46], were commanders of cavalry units who appear to have served under P. Cornelius Scipio in Germany, and it is likely that Scipio was placed in some form of general cavalry command there[47] as was L. Stertinus, who may have succeeded him[48], and Albinouanus Pedo[49]. The titles of the five prefects are, in themselves, interesting: the text reads "alae Astyrum [praef(ecto) - - -] / Agrippiana praef(ecto) N[- - -] / Hispanorum ueterana p[raef(ecto) - - -] / praetoria praef(ecto) [- - -] / Hispanorum

[41] Cf. Saddington (1982) 34. It is worth noting that while there is evidence of individuals commanding mixed cavalry and infantry units (cf. *Albinouanus Pedo* (Tacitus, *Ann.* 1.60); [19] [- - -]ius Sex. f. [- - -] (CIL 10.7351)), the post of *praefectus equitatus* was yet to emerge (Saddington (1980) 24, (1982) 57; Demougin (1992) 184; contra, Devijver (1976-2001) 1.90).
[42] AE 1973, 501
[43] On the *ala praetoria*, which served in Germany in the Augustan period, cf. CIL 6.41050 and Spaul (1994) 187. On the possibility that the unit was a guard unit, cf. Brunt (1974) 184; Speidel (1975) 165; Saddington (1982) 57.
[44] CIL 6.41050.
[45] AE 1992, 186 adnot.; Castelli (1992) 193-194; Saddington (1994) 73, 75.
[46] Cf. [8] [---] (CIL 6.41050) (1).
[47] Castelli (1992) 194; Saddington (1994) 75.
[48] Tacitus, *Ann.* 2.8.4, 11, 17.1; cf. Saddington (1980) 184 no. 36, (1991a) 3536 no. A2. 75, (1994) 75.
[49] Saddington (1980) 24; Demougin (1992) 184; contra, Devijver (1976) 90. Cf. *Albinouanus Pedo*. It is likely that a similar position or positions would have been created for the fourteen *alae* in the army of Tiberius in AD7 (Velleius 2.113.1).

tironum [praef(ecto) - - -]". Of note is the fact that the prefects are apparently not described as *praefecti equitum* (note the "N" following the word *praef(ecto)* in the second line of the quoted text). This is perhaps because the dedicators wished to emphasise the importance of the units, and chose the form "ala x praefecto y" rather than the somewhat clumsy solution of "ala x praefecto equitum y". It can be suggested, therefore, that both inscriptions attempt to solve the problem of how to identify the cavalry unit commanded by a *praefectus equitum*). The solution of eliding the word "equitum", producing the title *praefectus alae*, was the one later adopted. Also of note in the second inscription are the *alae* themselves: the *ala Hispanorum tironum* and *ala Hispanorum ueterana* are not subsequently attested, and these units were therefore probably not established cavalry *alae*[50]. However, the other three units were to become permanent cavalry *alae*[51]. The inscription, therefore, is an interesting demonstration of the evolving nature of Roman cavalry organisation.

The use of the name *ala Agrippiana* is also of note. The phenomenon of cavalry units that were named after their commanders has been identified by Birley[52], but it is notable that some of these units, such as the *ala Scaeuae*[53], date from the 40s BC, whereas others belong to the Tiberian and later periods[54]. The suggestion, therefore, that units were named after their first commander is a possibility, but it does not account for the *ala Gallorum Indiana* (almost certainly named after a man, Iulius Indus, who did not found it or formally command it[55]), for the existence of the *ala Agrippiana* itself (whose name, as Keppie suggests, surely derives from M. Agrippa[56]), or for the succession of names given to a unit commanded by three *praefecti cohortis* (cf. [124] M. Florus, [116] Facundus, and *Niger (?Camerensi)*) which is known from inscriptions found at Wadi Hammamat in the Eastern desert. These inscriptions appear to identify the unit by the name of the man in command at

[50] Cf. Spaul (1994) 21.
[51] On these *alae*, see Spaul (1994) 24 (*ala Agrippiana*), 37 (*ala Astyrum*), and 187 (*ala praetoria*).
[52] Birley (1978) 262ff.; cf. Fink (1953) 210ff.
[53] E.g. CIL 10.6011. On the *ala Scaeuae*, cf. [66] M. Caesius Scaeua; ILS 2490 adnot.; Mommsen (1884) 142; Cheesman (1914) 24; Devijver (1976-2001) 2.768; Saddington (1980) 28; Keppie (1983) 142; Spaul (1994) 20. Note also the *ala Patrui,* established in the Triumviral period ([213] [---] Patruus (CIL 9.773); cf. Birley (1978) 263; Devijver (1976-2001) 2.687; Speidel (1977) 514ff., (1980) 211ff.; Demougin (1992) 41).
[54] Cf. Birley (1978) 264ff.
[55] Cf. Alföldy (1968) 19; Birley (1978) 267; Spaul (1994) 153; cf. Timpe (1970) 60; Saddington (1982) 37, (1991a) 3537 no. 7.
[56] Cf. Keppie (1996b) 381.

the time each inscription was set up[57], and we can, therefore, identify a number of successive commanders. In all probability, auxiliary units, like the legions themselves, took time to develop an identity, and, like legions such as Legio VI Victrix[58], might be in existence for some time before acquiring a name. However, the personal names carried by many cavalry *alae*, and at least one early infantry cohort, demonstrate the strong identity which an auxiliary prefect might impart upon his unit. It is highly likely, therefore, that the command of an auxiliary unit entailed a significant degree of independence. This independence would also offer the prefect a chance to win renown, especially if, as with the *ala Indiana* and many legion *cognomina*, a name might be given to a unit as a result of a notable military action.

The post of *praefectus cohortis* in the Augustan period is, in itself, poorly understood[59]. Partly this is due to its rarity (only nine men are attested as having held the title), but also due to its varying nature. Not only is it the case that known *praefecti cohortis* were in charge of widely differing units, but also that other individuals held similar or equivalent posts with different titles. This is almost certainly due to the evolving nature of auxiliary command in the Augustan period. Some of these units were, it seems, still commanded by their own native leaders, who were probably not citizens (cf. *Staius Esdragassi f.*, "principi Trumplinorum, praef(ecto) [c]ohort(is) Trumplinorum"[60]). Other units were temporary levies, raised for a specific campaign, as had happened in the late Republic, as can be seen in [69] Caristanius Fronto Caesianus Iulius' command of the *cohors Bosporanorum*. The cohort, as well as the permanent cohort that was later to bear this name, was raised from tribes living in the Crimea[61], but the permanently established unit is not attested epigraphically until the Flavian period, when it served in Pannonia[62], although Bosporan units are recorded by Tacitus in AD49[63]. It is likely, as Spaul suggests, that the reference to a *cohors Bosporanorum* in AE 2001, 1918 and 1920 is to a temporary

[57] Speidel (1977) 514-515; cf. Cheesman (1914) 24, 45; Demougin (1992) 126; contra, Lesquier (1918) 530. Speidel's suggestion (Speidel (1977) 515), that originally auxiliary units were named after their commanding officer at the time, but then they sometimes took the names of their last commander as their permanent names, is intriguing, but in the light of the existence of early units such as the *ala Scaeuae* and the fact that the *ala Agrippiana* was established as early as AD15, it is unlikely to be correct.
[58] Ritterling, RE 12.1601; Pflaum (1978) 204; Keppie (2000a) 30.
[59] Cf. Saddington (2003) 23.
[60] CIL 5.4910.
[61] Cheesman (1913) 255; Saddington (1982) 161; Spaul (2000) 343.
[62] Spaul (2000) 343.
[63] Tacitus, *Ann*. 12.16; Spaul (2000) 343.

unit of troops raised for a specific purpose. Other cohorts were coming to resemble the permanently established 'regimental' cohorts of the high Empire, such as the unit commanded by Florus, Facundus, and Niger in the Eastern desert, which was to become either the *cohors I Thebaeorum* or (possibly) the *cohors II Ituraeorum*[64]. It is, perhaps, significant that no *praefectus cohortis* can be securely dated to earlier than c. AD6, and the creation of the post may in itself reflect the development of more permanent command structures for more permanent units as the Augustan era developed. It should also be noted that *praefecti cohortis* could, like military tribunes, be called upon to perform other duties. [27] Q. Aemilius Q.f. Pal(atina) Secundus[65] helped to conduct a census while *praefectus cohortis,* and [115] C. Fabricius C.f. Ani(ensi) Tuscus[66] was in charge of some work performed in the colony of Alexandreia Troas.

There were, in addition, other commands similar in scope to that of the *praefectus cohortis*. [173] Cn. Manlius Cn.f. Pa[p(iria)], and [98] P. Cornelius P.f. Sabat(ina) Cicatricula both appear to have been placed in charge of units of Roman citizens. They are described as *praefecti cohortium* and served in Spain, which suggests, perhaps, that the units they commanded were not cohorts in the Flavian sense (permanently organised auxiliary units), but a more temporary group of citizen soldiers organised into cohorts for a specific purpose[67], as with the cohorts of 500 men raised during the confusion of the Social War that were never assigned to legions, or the citizen cohorts found during the early 40s BC. Their commands may have been connected to the early Spanish wars of the Augustan period, which required a great deal of manpower. It should be noted that it was the *cohors Apula* that Fabricius Tuscus commanded as a *praefectus*, and the commander of a similar cohort, the *cohors Lusitanorum*, was also a *praefectus cohortis*[68]; so too were the *cohortes classicae* raised in 28BC commanded by *praefecti*[69]. However, a different title was held by [239] L. Purtisius Atinas, namely *tribunus cohortis* (the title later given to the commanders of citizen infantry cohorts and commanders of the individual Rome cohorts) as the commander of the *cohors VI uoluntariorum*, a unit raised, in all

[64] Speidel (1977) 515; Daris (1988) 757; Demougin (1992) 126; Spaul (2000) 445.
[65] CIL 3.6687.
[66] AE 1973, 501; cf. Saddington (1982) 57; Ricl (1997) 67.
[67] Le Roux (1982) 91; Alföldy (1985) 398.
[68] Cf. M. Sufenas M.f. Proculus (AE 1978, 830).
[69] Speidel (1976) 340-341, 345.

likelihood, during or after the Varus revolt, and indicative of an emergency levy, perhaps of freedmen[70]; 10,000 such volunteers were to serve with Tiberius, approximately 20 cohorts[71], and members of these units were to rank along with regular legionaries in Augustus' will[72]. Fabricius Tuscus was also a *tribunus dilectus ingenuorum*, although this probably refers to a specific duty as a military tribune[73]. Little can be concluded definitely from such sparse evidence, but the change in the titles of posts, as well as the titles of units, might suggest a reorganisation, and formalising, of the structure of emergency and freedmen levies that parallels the likely development of a regular auxiliary infantry[74]. The position of *praefectus cohortium* suggests, perhaps, that some of these cohorts, and presumably their commanders, served under a senior prefect (a parallel, perhaps, with the organisation of cavalry command). However, it is likely that most prefects in charge of infantry cohorts were directly responsible to the commander (or to the legate or prefect in charge of a detachment)[75]. In addition to these positions, the post of *praefectus ueteranorum* may well have come into existence at this time[76]. This was an equestrian-ranked infantry prefecture, responsible for time-expired legionary veterans who were retained in service as reservists, and who could be called to active duty. However, the responsibilities of the position remain obscure[77].

Fifteen *praefecti castrorum* are attested as having served in the Augustan period. However, the role itself is not easily defined. During the later imperial period, the *praefectus castrorum* was third in command of the legion, after the legionary legate and the *tribunus legionis*, and was a man of fifteen years' experience or more, responsible for such things as the location and erection of the camp, supplies, and the building and managing of siege equipment[78]. However, our evidence for the Augustan

[70] Speidel (1976) 348-349; Demougin (1988) 349 nn.271, 273; Keppie (1996b) 382-383. See also [292] M. Vergilius M.f. Teret(ina) Gallus Lusius, a *trib(unus) mil(itum) cohort(is) primae*. For commanders of individual Rome cohorts, see [173] Cn. Manlius Cn.f. Pa[p(iria)], described as *trib(unus) cohortis praet(oriae)*, and [301] A. Virgius L.f. Marsus, described as *tr(ibunus) mil(itum) ... cohort(ium) XI et IIII praetoriar(um)*.
[71] Velleius 2.113.1; cf. Saddington (1982) 80.
[72] Tacitus, *Ann*. 1.8: "legionariis aut cohortibus ciuium Romanorum trecenos nummos uiritim dedit".
[73] The title is extremely obscure, cf. Brunt (1974) 184.
[74] Cf. Speidel (1976) 340-341, 345; Keppie (1996b) 383.
[75] E.g. Velleius 2.112.6.
[76] Cf. Keppie (1973) 15.
[77] On the *uexilla ueteranorum*, see Keppie (1973) 8ff.
[78] Suolahti (1955) 202; Dobson (1964) 413; Saddington (1990) 69; Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 98; Patterson (1993) 99; cf. CIL 8.18078. On the later *praefectus castrorum Aegypti*, cf. Dobson (1982) 334; Demougin (1992) 269; Keppie (1996) 108.

period suggests a different role. Literary sources indicate that *praefecti castrorum* were placed in charge of detachments of troops operating in forts behind the front line: [63] Caedicius, one of the three *praefecti castrorum* named in Velleius' account of the aftermath of the defeat of Quinctilius Varus, is seen commanding a garrison protecting the Roman line of march[79]; both [47] Aufidienus Rufus[80] and [111] M'. Ennius[81] were in charge of detachments of troops, Aufidienus Rufus being responsible for the construction of bridges and roads. However, one inscription suggests that the role might also involve very different duties: AE 1964, 107 although somewhat fragmentary, shows an individual who served as *praefectus castrorum* under Tiberius, Gaius and Lucius Caesar, and Agrippa Postumus (until the latter's fall in AD7), and in a number of different provinces (including Hispania, Illyria and Armenia)[82]. It is highly unlikely, therefore, that he was the commander of a legionary camp (as were later *praefecti castrorum*), or that he was a specialist *praefectus castrorum* who served under a number of different commanders in widely differing provinces – a competent man would surely have been promoted.[83] The named relationship to members of the imperial house might suggest that he was the commander of a military entourage[84], and commanders are also named for the post of *praefectus castrorum* in the cursuses of [51] Sex. Aulienus Sex.f. Ani(ensi) and [71] L. Cassius L.f. Corneo[lus], though the latter may have been a *praefectus fabrum*. However, both of these individuals had exceptionally long and varied officer careers (cf. also [23] [---]us T.f. Teret(ina)), which suggests that, while they had a close relationship to their commander while *praefectus castrorum*, they may have been military officers with a more general remit than commanders of an entourage. The relative position of the post in the careers of men who went on to hold other posts also suggests that it ranked above the military tribunate, but below other high-ranking prefectures, which suggests an independent command, but only over forces of roughly the strength of a cohort.

[79] Velleius 2.119.4; the other two also, [109] L. Eggius and [77] Ceionius, were clearly not in command of a legionary camp apiece: cf. Syme (1932) 111.
[80] Tacitus, *Ann*. 1.20.
[81] Dio 55.33.2.
[82] Cf. [2] [---] (AE 1964, 107).
[83] However, Syme's suggestion that *praefecti castrorum* were, at this point, attached to a commander rather than to a particular legion is clearly correct (Syme (1932) 111). Note also [80] L. Cirpinius T.f. Vel(ina) (CIL 9.5748 = ILS 2687 (Ricina, Regio 5, Italia)), who was *praefectus legionis XXII* in Egypt, a phrase which is generally taken to refer to the post of *praefectus castrorum* (cf. Pflaum (1960-1961) 16 no. 3; Dobson (1978) 191-192 no. 57; Demougin (1992) 266; Saddington (1996b) 251 no. 39).
[84] Cf. Dobson (1978) 169; Demougin (1992) 114.

Attested only in the Augustan period, the post of *praefectus leuis armaturae* is a curious one[85]. We know of three officers who held the post ([21] [---u]rius C.f. Aem(ilia) Gallu[s], [214] [S]ex. Pedius Sex.f. Ar[n(ensis)] Lusianus Hirrutus, and [51] Sex. Aulienus Sex.f. Ani(ensi)). Taken together with the career of *Staius Esdragassi f.* ("praefectus cohortis Trumplinorum"[86]) and *C. Iulius Ag[e]dili [f. Fabi]a Macer*[87] (whose command, although significant, was probably not a junior officer position), it is likely that the post of *praefectus leuis armaturae* was that of a commander of specialist light auxiliary infantry who were used to control the newly pacified and highly mountainous Alps, a place where the heavy infantry of the legion might be too slow and immobile to be effective, after the withdrawal of the legions, possibly also involving civilian command of the area in which the troops were stationed, or amalgamated with the position of civilian commander of the area[88]. The argument of Wells that Raetia was stripped of its legions in AD6 to combat the Pannonian revolt would probably date the post to the period following AD6, but this remains only a possibility[89]. The lack of evidence for the post from beyond the early Julio-Claudian period suggests that it was created for the specific purpose of controlling the Alps, and then lapsed.

A number of military prefectures of an *ad hoc*, or general, nature can be found in the Augustan period. Where their roles can be identified, such prefectures appear to have been associated with the administrative control of a region, such as the aforementioned [S]ex. Pedius Sex.f. Ar[n(ensi)] Lusianus Hirrutus (*praefectus Raetis Vindolicis uallis Poeninae et leuis armaturae*[90]), [293] Vestalis[91], the anonymous dedicand of CIL 5.3346[92], or [146] C. Iulius Papius[93], who served in Egypt, is described as a prefect, and appears to have been in command of a number of centurions. Such prefectures, described well by Saddington as "Military Praefecti with Administrative Functions"[94], were a feature, along with the post of *pro legato*[95], of the

[85] Cf. Wrobel (2009) 77ff.
[86] CIL 5.4910.
[87] Cf. Wrobel (2009) 79-80.
[88] Cf. Saddington (1980) 24.
[89] Wells (1972) 78.
[90] CIL 9.3044.
[91] Ovid, *Pont.* 4.7.1-2, 15-16, 49.
[92] Cf. [3] [---] (CIL 5.3346).
[93] CIG 3.4931-4932.
[94] Saddington (1987) 268.
[95] Cf. Demougin (1992) 55-6; Sasel (1974) 467-468; Knapp (1981) 137-140.

experiments taking place in Roman provincial government at the time. Such men appear to have been given independent commands in order to control their territories, so it is possible to describe them as junior officers, but may also be seen as governors whose responsibilities were not important enough, for whatever reason, to be given pro-magisterial status[96]. It is worth noting that non-Roman nobles might also be assigned nominal prefectures to legitimize their control over an area, but there is no evidence that they were in control of Roman troops (cf. *[C. Iulius Cotti f. D]onni re[gis n. Donnus]*).

Six naval prefects can confidently be dated to the Augustan period, of whom five ([51] Sex. Aulienus Sex.f. Ani(ensi), [98] P. Cornelius P.f. Sabat(ina) Cicatricula, [233] L. Pontius L.f. Strabo, [73] A. Castricius Myriotalenti f., and [19] [---]ius Sex.f. [---]) were *praefecti classis* and one ([24] [---]us T.f. Teret(ina)) was *praefectus nauium*.[97] The *praefecti classis* were, at this point, administrative commanders of the fleets stationed at Misenum and Ravenna[98], and while there must have been commanders of the ships who provided logistical support to the army, particularly to Tiberius and Germanicus while campaigning in Germany, we have little evidence of what duties they performed, and should probably assume that they performed similar duties to those of naval prefects in earlier periods. However, while the *praefecti classis* of the period were high-ranking officers, they should probably still be considered as junior officers. As we shall see below, other equestrian officer positions, such as the post of *praefectus fabrum*, could be held after the post of *praefectus classis*, and there is a direct equivalence between the posts of *praefectus classis* and *praefectus equitum* in two inscriptions (on which see below). The post of *praefectus nauium* was, however, new to the Augustan period. As Devijver notes[99] it is unclear if the it is a military prefecture. Saddington[100] regards it as a variant upon *praefectus classis*, and although Grenier's suggestion that the *praefectus nauium* was in charge of ships and transportation for the legions is an interesting one, the suggestion that the post relates to ships which were taken from the battle of Actium to

[96] On such commands, and on the post of *pro legato*, see Sasel (1974) 467-468; Balland (1981) 91-92; Knapp (1981) 137-140; Demougin (1992) 55-56; Sasel (1974); Saddington (1987) 268ff.; Piso (1999) 321ff.; Loreto (2000) 10.
[97] There is an additional possible *praefectus classis* from the period: cf. [30] Q. Allius Q.f. Vel(ina) Rufus.
[98] Syme (1932) 110ff.; Demougin (1992) 118; cf. Dobson (1978) 129.
[99] Devijver (1976-2001) 1.434.
[100] Saddington (1988a) 302.

Forum Iulii, but which were not numerous enough to comprise a fleet, is more persuasive[101].

The cursus of A. Castricius Myriotalenti f. presents a curious problem, as it features the phrase "praefectus equitum et classis". While Saddington[102] suggests that the phrase "praefectus equitum et classis" represents a single post, this is unlikely to be correct. It is true that, if two posts are meant, the use of "et" in such a way is rare[103], but there is another example (L. Pontius Strabo[104]), and the rarity of use does not outweigh the inherent problem of imagining a regular prefecture that involved command of both a fleet and cavalry at the same time. We have no literary parallels that describe such a command, and on balance it is probably better to view these in both cases as two separate positions.

Despite the later character of the office, it is likely that the post of *praefectus fabrum* at this time still retained its military character, at least in many cases. In the Augustan period, the post was rarely held as part of a purely civilian career, and of the 32 *praefecti fabrum* known from the Augustan period, only four held no other equestrian military post. In addition, it is found in the middle of military careers in seven cases, which suggests strongly that it was part of a military career (cf. [24] [---]us T.f. Teret(ina), [115] C. Fabricius C.f. Ani(ensi) Tuscus, [133] Q. Gauius T.f. Cla(udia) Pedo, [297] M'. Vibius M'.f. Vel(ina) Balbinus, and [301] A. Virgius L.f. Marsus)[105]. However, one inscription suggests the opposite: the cursus of [27] Q. Aemilius Q.f. Pal(atina) Secundus[106]. This cursus first details his military honours, that he served under Augustus, and was decorated, and that he commanded two cohorts of infantry, leading one unit in the capture of a fort; this section includes the information that, as an officer, he helped conduct the census in Syria[107]. There then follow the words, "ante militiem praefectus fabrum delatus a duobus co(n)s(ulibus) ad aerarium", which appears to constitute an explicit statement that the post of *praefectus fabrum* was, at the time, a civilian one. While this was certainly to become the case in the later Julio-

[101] Grenier (1960) 60; Pflaum (1978) 196; Christol and Demougin (1982) 149-151; Demougin (1992) 80; cf. Tacitus, Ann. 4.5.1; AE 1952, 169.
[102] Saddington (1988a) 301-302, (1990) 270.
[103] Saddington (1988a) 301-302; (1990) 268-269.
[104] Cf. CIL 11.6964; Pflaum (1960-1961) 1042; Devijver (1976-2001) 2.670; Demougin (1992) 161.
[105] Cf. Sablayrolles (1984) 240; contra Pflaum (1978) 196.
[106] CIL 3.6687.
[107] Balty and Balty (1977) 117-120; Saddington (1982) 57, (1985) 537.

Claudian period[108], the fact that men with long military careers held the post suggests that for most it remained a military one[109]. It is perhaps best to see Aemilius Secundus' statement as representing the civilian side of a post that had different natures depending on the person one served under[110]; [99] Cornelius Gallus, for example, was responsible as *praefectus fabrum* for overseeing the construction of the *forum Iulium* in Alexandria[111]; while *Q. Decius Q.f. M.n. Saturninus*, whose equestrian officer career was probably Tiberian in date[112], was "praefectus fabrum iure dicundo et sortiendis iudicibus in Asia"[113]. If, as argued in earlier chapters, the roles and duties of a *praefectus fabrum* were largely determined by the man who appointed him, then the holder of the position might be seen as a civilian or as a military officer, depending on his responsibilities. The fact that Aemilius Secundus' cursus explicitly states that the role was a civilian one, and that it adds the information that he served under two consuls "ad aerarium", suggests that his responsibilities were unusual, and that, perhaps, the normal character of the office was more military[114]. Given the evidence about the careers of other Augustan officers, the post of *praefectus fabrum* is still treated as a military position here, albeit one, as before, with no clearly defined set of responsibilities.

The status of junior officers and the composition of the junior officer corps

The holding of a junior officer position in the Augustan period was, as before, a clear indication of equestrian status. However, it is worth emphasising the broad range of backgrounds that this might encompass, including both the established senatorial and equestrian class, and those who had recently acquired equestrian status, such as the municipal elite or those promoted from the centurionate[115]. The status of such individuals relative to their late Republican counterparts is, however, difficult to establish: while most recorded individuals are from a municipal background, this may simply be the result of the origin of the evidence that has survived, which mostly consists of inscriptions from municipal Italy. The lack of an equivalent source to

[108] Saller (1980) 45; Cerva (2000) 185.
[109] Cf. Cerva (2000) 180. See also [95] L. Cornelius L. f. Vot(uria).
[110] Cf. Dobson (1966) 64; Saddington (1985) 537.
[111] AE 1964, 255; cf. Fishwick (1987) 66ff.; Alföldy (1990) 33ff.
[112] Devijver (1976-1993) 320; cf. Saddington (1996a) 162.
[113] CIL 10.5393 = ILS 6286; CIL 10.5394; cf. CIL 10.5392 (Aquinum, Regio 1, Italia); cf. Dobson (1966) 65; Sablayrolles (1984) 240; Demougin (1992) 230.
[114] Cf. Dobson (1966) 65.
[115] A more detailed analysis of the importance of the junior officer posts to the municipal elite can be found in ch. 9; cf. Demougin (1988) 287, 316-318.

either Cicero or Caesar also prevents a comparison between genres of evidence; while epigraphic evidence allows a much better definition of the terminology of the various posts individuals held, it does not offer us the same insight as can literature into the general status of the junior officer positions. However, there is no evidence in our literary sources for this period, as there is in the sources for the period 49 – 31BC, of a blurring of the distinction between the junior officer and centurionate positions: the treatment of *praefecti castrorum* in the mutinies of AD14 is in fact, as we shall see, evidence of the clear distinction between the *primi ordines* and the junior officers[116]. Moreover, while Augustus experienced difficulty in recruiting ordinary soldiers, there does not appear to have been any problem in the recruitment of junior officers. Suetonius does record that Augustus particularly encouraged the sons of senators to serve as junior officers, but this is not in itself evidence of a decline in the status of the, markedly equestrian, junior officer positions[117].

The military tribunate itself can be seen as a defining mark of equestrian status[118]. While *primipilares* might become military tribunes, and members of the imperial house and the sons of senators held the position at a young age, as they had in the late Republic, the majority of its holders were equestrians from municipal Italy. The post was generally held before the post of *praefectus equitum*[119], and after that of *praefectus cohortis* or *praefectus castrorum*, but beyond this there was, as we shall see, no clear hierarchy of the junior officer positions in the Augustan period. Furthermore, it is unlikely that any military tribunes were elected to the position: although there is no evidence referring to the cessation of the practice, there are no attestations of elected military tribunes in the imperial period, and it is likely that election had lapsed as a means of appointment to the military tribunate.

The title of *tribunus militum a populo* is an interesting example of experimentation in the Augustan era. Augustus appears to have directly encouraged the link between equestrian rank and the junior officer positions, and Suetonius records that in order to

---

[116] Cf. Dobson (1978) 172; Demougin (1988) 361ff.

[117] Suetonius, *Aug.* 38 (see ch. 6, pp.199-200); in addition, the creation of the position of *tribunus militum a populo* (on which see below) was a measure intended to increase the number of equestrians (Suetonius, *Aug.* 46), not to restore the status of the junior officer positions, something that, in itself, perhaps argues for the security of this status. Moreover, the reluctance of some equestrians to perform military service, as recorded by Suetonius (*Aug.* 24.1) is probably a result of reluctance on the part of certain individuals, and does not indicate a lowering of the status of the junior officer posts.

[118] Cf. Demougin (1988) 284-285.

[119] Although see, for example, the case of [36] L. Aponius [- - -] (CIL 12.4230).

maintain the number of equestrians, Augustus invited municipal towns to nominate men to serve as junior officers[120]. This initiative, as Nicolet has demonstrated[121], is visible in the title of *tribunus militum a populo*. Nine of the 27 known *tribuni militum a populo* are datable on grounds other than merely epigraphic phrasing[122], and all belong to the Augustan period; of those whose careers can be dated more precisely (Q. Caecilius, M. Holconius Rufus, C. Lucilius C.f. Benignus Ninnianus, Q. Octauius Sagitta, and M. Tullius), all appear to have held their military tribunates in the mid-Augustan period. Given that the title was short-lived, and that it can be dated to a relatively small time-frame, it is likely that the initiative Suetonius refers to was, equally, a short-lived one. However, *tribuni militum a populo* appear to have belonged to the upper levels of the municipal elite: men such as [29] M. Allius M.f. Men(enia) Ru[fus], [55] P. Baebius P.fil. Pobl(ilia) Tuticanus, M. Holconius Rufus, L. Cellius, Q. Caecilius, M. Tullius and [231] Pompullius L.f. Lappa were highly visible members of their communities, and notable civic benefactors, and a number of other *tribuni militum a populo* received municipal honours[123]. The title, as Nicolet argues[124], is only found among the municipal elite[125], and all of the inscriptions recording *tribuni militum a populo* are found in Italy and outside Rome: it is clear, therefore, that the title is not a legacy from the elected military tribunate, or the elected military tribunate itself[126]. The post might also be followed by other junior officer positions, and at least three *tribuni militum a populo* went on to hold the post of *praefectus equitum* (Q. Octauius Sagitta, Q. Gauius Pedo, and P. Baebius Tuticanus; possibly also [185] M. Minicius T.f.), and eight also served as *praefecti fabrum*[127]. However, in all but two cases (L. Aurelius Sex.f. and M. Allius M.f. Men(enia) Ru[fus]), the post appears first in the equestrian cursus, and in those two cases both men had previously been *praefecti fabrum* and were to hold no other

[120] Suetonius, *Aug*. 46: Ac necubi aut honestorum deficeret copia aut multitudinis suboles, equestrem militiam petentis etiam ex commendatione publica cuiusque oppidi ordinabat.
[121] Nicolet (1967) 29ff.; although cf. Devijver (1992b) 432.
[122] [52] L. Aurelius Sex.f.; [57] Q. Caecilius L.f.; [78] L. Cellius L.f. Men(enia); [88] A. Clodius A.f. Men(enia) Flaccus; [136] M. Holconius M.f. Rufus; [162] C. Lucilius C.f. Benignus Ninnianus; [164] M. Lucretius Decidianus Rufus; [277] M. Tullius M.f.; and [201] Q. Octauius L.f. C.n. L.pron. Ser(gia) Sagitta.
[123] Cf. [13] [---] (CIL 9.3159), [247] M. Satrius N.f. Teret(ina) Rufus and [286] A. Veius M.f.; cf. Deniaux (2000) 233ff.
[124] Nicolet (1967) 29ff.; cf. Castén (1975) 99.
[125] Only one of the known *tribuni militum a populo* achieved senatorial rank ([162] C. Lucilius C.f. Benignus Ninnianus).
[126] Cf. Devijver (1992b) 432.
[127] The sample size involved is too small for too much weight to be placed upon the figures.

equestrian post. This might mean one of two things, that Augustus' initiative sought to bring men into the army who had not previously served there, or, as Castrén suggests[128], that the post was purely honorary. There is no evidence to prove the issue either way, but it should, perhaps, be noted that if the aim of the initiative was to encourage men of high municipal standing to become junior officers, then this is exactly the pattern of post-holding we would expect to see. It may also be significant that in inscriptions the position is not grouped with municipal honours but among the military and equestrian positions[129]. Given the links between Augustan initiatives to define the status of the equestrian order and the junior officer positions, *tribuni militum a populo* should probably be considered as active military officers. If so, then they would have served in the legions alongside the other *tribuni militum* and were, once they had joined their units, ordinary military tribunes; the title given to these men would have reflected only the way in which they were appointed.

The position of *praefecti equitum* in the later Julio-Claudian period should not be thought to be the same as that of *praefecti equitum* in the Augustan period. During the Augustan period *praefecti equitum* might be former *primipilares* (e.g. [24] [---]us T.f. Teret(ina)), former military tribunes (e.g. [218] Cn. Petronius Cn.f. Pom(ptina) Asellio; [290] C. Velleius Paterculus), former *tribuni militum a populo* (e.g. [133] Q. Gauius T.f. Cla(udia) Pedo; [55] P. Baebius P.fil. Pobl(ilia) Tuticanus), or young members of the senatorial elite ([42] M. Arrius M.f. Maximus). The post could be held before or after a military tribunate (before: [36] L. Aponius [---]; after: [---]us T.f. Teret(ina)), before the post of *praefectus castrorum* (e.g. [---]us T.f. Teret(ina); L. Aponius [---]), and before or after the post of *praefectus fabrum* (before: [---]us T.f. Teret(ina); after: [201] Q. Octauius L.f. C.n. L.pron. Ser(gia) Sagitta). The post was therefore certainly equestrian, but, like many other prefectures at the time, did not yet

[128] Castrén (1975) 99; cf. Suetonius, *Claud*. 25, in the context of Claudius' creation of honorary posts. It should be noted, however, that Castrén's suggestion (cf. Nicolet (1966) 63) that the post does not appear in its correct chronological position assumes that there was a clearly defined officer hierachy for the period, which appears not to have been the case. Moreover, Castrén's statement that [78] L. Cellius is the "only exception" to the observation that the post "was usually given after the person's second duovirate", is inaccurate: the cursuses in the inscriptions naming [191] M. Munatuleius M.f. Ani(ensi) Marcellus and [162] C. Lucilius C.f. Benignus Ninnianus list no municipal posts (and we can probably add [30] M. Allius M.f. Men(enia) Ru[fus] to this pair), and only one municipal administrative post is given in the cursuses of L. Aurelius Sex.f., L. Cellius L.f. Men(enia), P. Baebius P.fil. Pobl(ilia) Tuticanus, [132] Q. Gau[i]us A.f. Aqui[l]a, and [174] M. Manlius C.f. Pollio, to name only those whose cursuses have survived sufficiently well for us to be confident of this. In addition, two *tribuni militum a populo* held the post without, it seems, having held the duovirate: [57] Q. Caecilius L.f. and [132] Q. Gau[i]us A.f. Aqui[l]a (cf. Saddington (1996a) 162).

[129] Cf. ch. 1, pp.39ff.

have a fixed status. It is interesting that during the Augustan period it does not necessarily seem to have been higher in rank than the military tribunate (although this was almost certainly the case in earlier periods). This is perhaps because the high-status cavalry commands of the late Republic were now being undertaken by those, such as P. Cornelius Scipio, who had the status of a legate, or is perhaps a function of the statuses of the various men who held the post: with former *primipili* commanding cavalry units, there was no clear distinction in rank, as there had been before, between military tribunes and equestrian prefects. This might also be seen in Augustus' attempt, as described by Suetonius, to encourage the sons of senators to take up such positions as that of *praefectus equitum*[130], which, like the creation of the post of *tribunus militum a populo*, was an attempt to encourage men of a higher status to hold the post. It is unclear what is meant by Suetonius' statement that Augustus often appointed two young men of senatorial family to the command of each *ala*: the post of *subpraefectus*, sometimes linked to this passage, is not attested in the Augustan period[131]; whatever the precise nature of Augustus' initiative, it is not visible in the epigraphic record, although it is possible that both men simply held the title of *praefectus equitum* and shared the duties of command between them.

The status of the men in command of infantry cohorts is equally difficult to define[132]. They were normally equestrian in rank. Such a command could be held after a military tribunate (cf. [69] C. Caristanius C.f. Ser(gia) Fronto Caesianus Iulius) and several *praefecti cohortis* went on to hold the position of *praefectus fabrum*. Two commanders of infantry cohorts ([301] A. Virgius L.f. Marsus and [292] M. Vergilius M.f. Teret(ina) Gallus Lusius) were former *primipili*, but both were successful soldiers who held other equestrian posts between their primipilate and the command of an infantry cohort. However, as it was a new role, and as there were few, if any, permanently established infantry cohorts, its status was also probably dependent upon the nature and importance of the individual command. Those given a major command, say of four cohorts of citizen troops (cf. [98] P. Cornelius P.f. Sabat(ina) Cicatricula),

---

[130] Suetonius, *Aug.* 38: "militiamque auspicantibus non tribunatum modo legionum, sed et praefecturas alarum dedit; ac ne qui expers castrorum esset, binos plerumque laticlauios praeposuit singulis alis." Note that the suggestion in this passage that the post of *praefectus equitum* was clearly superior to that of *tribunus militum* is likely to be a reflection of the situation in Suetonius' own time (cf. Demougin (1988) 288).

[131] The post is, however, found in the Tiberian period, cf. Holder (1980) 244 nos. E18, E40; Saddington (1980) 33 no. 31; Saddington (1988a) 71 on *Ti. Iulius C.f. Fab(ia) Viator*.

[132] Demougin (1988) 347; Devijver (1995) 178.

were probably of higher status than men such as [124] Florus or [116] Facundus, who were in command of much smaller units – indeed, men such as Cicatricula may have been placed in command over the *praefecti* (or *tribunus*) *cohortis* of each cohort. In this respect, the position has a similar status to equivalent prefectures in the late Republic. The exception to this is, perhaps, the post of commander of a praetorian or urban cohort, two holders of which ([173] Cn. Manlius Cn.f. Pa[p(iria)] and A. Virgius L.f. Marsus) are known from the Augustan period. However, the development of the Rome cohorts was a feature of the very end of the Augustan period, and it is hard to place too much weight on what were extremely new posts, as important as those posts were to become.

Of the fourteen attested *praefecti castrorum*, at least four ([24] [---]us T.f. Teret(ina), [51] Sex. Aulienus Sex.f. Ani(ensi), [294] Vespasius Pollio, and [36] L. Aponius [---]), and probably one other ([71] L. Cassius L.f. Corneo[lus]) held the position after holding the military tribunate. This, in addition to the literary evidence of Suetonius on the career of Vespasian's ancestor Vespasius Pollio[133], is enough to demonstrate that the post was equestrian in rank in the Augustan period[134]; the post also appears to have been held after that of *praefectus equitum* (cf. ([---]us T.f. Teret(ina) and L. Aponius [---]), which suggests that it was of considerable status, though we do not have enough information to know how usual this was. The same evidence suggests that it was held before the position of *praefectus fabrum*. This is also shown by the diplomatic overtures made by Scenobarbus to [111] M'. Ennius[135], which would not have been plausible unless Ennius was considered to be of considerable status.

However, of the *praefecti castrorum* who were previously military tribunes, at least two, and probably three ([---]us T.f. Teret(ina) and Sex. Aulienus Sex.f. Ani(ensi), and probably L. Cassius L.f. Corneo[lus]) were also *primipilares*[136], and two held the post as part of long military careers; [---]us T.f. Teret(ina) and Sex. Aulienus Sex.f. Ani(ensi) also both held naval prefectures. That they had been centurions is, perhaps, significant in light of the humiliation of Aufidienus Rufus by the mutineers of

[133] Suetonius, *Vesp.* 1.3; cf. also the treatment of *praefecti castrorum* in Tacitus (*Ann.* 1.23.3, 32.2), where they are grouped with the military tribunes, and in Velleius (2.112.6) where they are grouped with the military tribunes and the *praefecti cohortis* (cf. Saddington (1996b) 244).
[134] The post is not included in Devijver (1976-1993), although others consider the post to be an equestrian one; cf. Dobson (1978) 165 n.2; Saddington (1988) 301, (1990) 69, (1996b) 244; Demougin (1992) 118.
[135] Dio 55.33.2.
[136] Cf. also the early imperial, and possibly Augustan, *C. Musanus C.f.* (AE 1954, 163).

AD14[137], which was also experienced by a number of centurions, but not any other equestrian officers[138]. These individuals may perhaps, therefore, be regarded as military specialists[139], who came, perhaps, from a lower social group than other junior officers, and who were still considered by the rank and file, at least, as former centurions.

The status of *praefecti leuis armaturae* is uncertain, as we know of only three officers who held the title. Two of the three holders of the post were former *primipilares*, and held at least one other prefecture, which suggests that, like the post of *praefectus castrorum*, it may have been a specialist military post. That the post is placed after that of *tribunus militum* but before that of naval prefect, *praefectus castrorum* and *praefectus fabrum* in the cursus of Sex. Aulienus shows that it was at least an equestrian prefecture[140].

Of the six securely attested naval prefects, all held the post after holding a military tribunate and at least one auxiliary prefecture, and only two went on to hold other junior officer posts, suggesting that naval prefectures were generally of a higher status than other junior officer positions; [19] [---]ius Sex. f. [---] appears to have held the post after the position of *tribunus militum pro legato*, which also suggests that the post was of high status. That [---]us T.f. Teret(ina) was *praefectus nauium* at the end of his career may suggest that, at least in the Augustan period, the post was of equivalent status to that of *praefectus classis*. The fact that all six had long military careers (as did the possible naval prefect from the period [29] Q. Allius Q.f. Vel(ina) Rufus and the other naval prefect known from an early inscription ([180] T. Marius C.f. Ste(llatina) Siculus)), and that two of the six were promoted *primipilares*, suggests that the post was held by experienced officers of proven ability[141]. That both known *praefecti nauium* (only one, [---]us T.f. Teret(ina), is assignable to this period) were also members of the *conlegium honoris et uirtutis*[142] also suggests that these officers retained a close relationship with the armed forces: this *conlegium* appears to have been a veterans' organisation, which may have functioned a little like a reserve

[137] Tacitus, *Ann*. 1.20; see also the actions of M'. Ennius in Tacitus, *Ann*. 1.38.
[138] Cf. Tacitus, *Ann*. 1.32.
[139] Cf. Saddington (1988) 301.
[140] CIL 10.4868; contra, Saddington ((1980) 32).
[141] Cf. Saddington (1990) 69.
[142] Christol and Demougin (1982) 148ff; cf. CIL 4371-4372 = AE 1982, 694.

force[143]. However, while Saddington may be correct in arguing that this post, like that of *praefectus castrorum*, is evidence of a new 'career path' for experienced military men, the role was clearly of significantly higher status than that of *praefectus castrorum*.

Praefecti fabrum, on the other hand, are more closely compared with military tribunes and cavalry prefects[144]. The post might be held before or after a military tribunate or cavalry prefecture[145]. It could, however, be of a higher status: it appears in the cursus of Sex. Aulienus Sex.f. Ani(ensi) after his naval prefecture, and at the end of a long military career. Its holders were military men ([---]us T.f. Teret(ina), [71] L. Cassius L.f. Corneo[lus], M. Vergilius M.f. Teret(ina) Gallus Lusius, and [4] [---]f. Pap(iria) were former *primipilares*), and members of the municipal elite (eight also held the position of *tribunus militum a populo*), as well as equestrians of extremely high status (cf. [99] C. Cornelius Cn.f. Gallus). It would appear, therefore, that the post was an equestrian one, but that the exact status of the individual, and the status of the post, was determined by the commander who appointed him and by the commander's perception of that appointment. A further indication of their status, and their close relationship to the commander, is provided by the *lex Ursonensis*, where the governor's *praefectus fabrum* was accorded special theatre seating along with Roman magistrates, promagistrates, and their sons[146].

By the Augustan period, the presence in the junior officer corps of former *primipilares* was established and, presumably, accepted. Such men would certainly have expected to be given the opportunity to compete for equestrian military positions: as we have seen, the period 49 – 31BC brought an increased status for centurions, and a breaking-down of the barrier between centurions and equestrian officers. The development of the post of *primipilus*[147] was accompanied by the promotion of such men as [66] M. Caesius Scaeua[148] and [118] L. Firmius L.f.[149] to junior officer positions. It is, therefore, no surprise that the Augustan and Julio-

[143] Pflaum (1978) 196; Christol and Demougin (1982) 147-148; Devijver (1976-1993) 1821.
[144] Cf. Dobson (1966) 65; Cerva (2000) 182-185.
[145] For a list of examples of each, see Dobson (1966) 70ff.
[146] Ch. 127 in Crawford (1996); cf. Badian (1997) 17.
[147] Cf. Dobson (1978) 6-9.
[148] CIL 10.6011.
[149] CIL 10.5713.

Claudian periods saw the regular promotion of relatively high-status former centurions into the officer corps.

However, in contrast to later periods, the career path for a former centurion varied greatly. From the middle of the Julio-Claudian period onwards, former *primipili* generally held the post of *praefectus castrorum* (which by that time was third-in-command of the legion), in which position they often served for a great length of time), or within the Rome cohorts (early examples of which are the probably late-Augustan [301] A. Virgius L.f. Marsus and [292] M. Vergilius M.f. Teret(ina) Gallus Lusius, the earliest known commanders of praetorian cohorts[150]), or held the post of *primipilus bis*[151]. However, during the Augustan period former *primipili* might apparently hold any junior officer position, and many were to hold more than one. Two examples from the nine known *primipilares* who also held a junior officer position serve to illustrate both points – Sex. Aulienus Sex.f. Ani(ensi)[152], who was *primipilus,* military tribune, *praefectus leuis armaturae*, *praefectus castrorum*, *praefectus classis*, and *praefectus fabrum*, and [---]us T.f. Teret(ina)[153], who was *primipilus*, military tribune, *praefectus equitum*, *praefectus castrorum*, *praefectus fabrum* and *praefectus nauium*. That Augustus would have wanted to retain the services of such experienced and capable soldiers is clear: men such as Aulienus and [- - -]us T.f. were, presumably, able to repay their promotion from the centurionate with many years of competent service. Moreover, the use of former centurions as *praefecti leuis armaturae* and as governors of small rebellious regions[154] during the early Principate is a clear demonstration of their competence in independent command and as administrators. That there was not yet a separate equestrian career path for such men is, perhaps, not surprising: as we have seen, the Augustan period was a time of experimentation and change within the entire junior officer corps, and whatever need there might have been to protect the status of other junior officer positions was not yet evident. Moreover, former *primipili* make up a comparatively small proportion of known junior officers in the period, and it is unlikely, after the developments of the period 49 – 31BC, that a small number of former centurions

[150] AE 1978, 286 = AE 1996, 513; M. Vergilius M.f. Teret(ina) Gallus Lusius: CIL 10.4862 = ILS 2690.
[151] Birley (1953) 134-5; Dobson (1964) 65, (1966) 77, (1978) 6ff.; Demougin (1982) 147; Davies (1989) 37.
[152] CIL 10.4868.
[153] AE 1952, 169.
[154] Cf. *Sex. Iulius S.f. Pol(lia) Rufus* (CIL 14.2954).

would have been seen as a threat to the status of the positions. Thus the promotion of very able centurions still allowed the status distinction between the centurionate and the officer posts to be maintained, a distinction also marked by separate iconography and military decorations[155].

In addition, the Augustan period appears to show a rise in the number of men who held multiple positions. This is partly the result of an increased quantity of epigraphic evidence, which is more likely to contain details of an officer's career, but despite this it is hard to imagine that Sallust's description of M. Petreius would have been so exceptional in the Augustan period: men with long military careers are not unusual in the epigraphic record[156]. However, the men who served alongside the most experienced officers such as [- - -]us T.f. Teret(ina) were not inexperienced either. As Saddington shows, military prefectures were rarely the only military command held[157], and perhaps more interestingly, over half the military tribunes attested (41) went on to hold another junior officer position. This is a higher proportion than might have been expected, given the later imperial pattern of office-holding, where the pattern was of a municipal elite serving in nearby provinces for 3-4 years[158] as a way of confirming their status, not of a municipal elite all seeking a further military career[159]. While, as we have seen, there was no established pattern of office-holding, or of an equestrian military cursus, nevertheless it is clear that junior officers in the Augustan period were often experienced men, if not exclusively military men.

Despite the close link between the junior officer positions and the equestrian order, junior officer positions were still held by those aiming for senatorial rank, the historian Velleius Paterculus being perhaps the best known example[160], along with men such as [39] L. Aquillius Florus Turcianus Gallus[161], [240] [--- Qu]adratus Maesianus Celsus[162], [101] [P. Corneli]us Orestinus[163], [42] M. Arrius M.f.

[155] Cf. Maxfield (1981) 216ff.
[156] Cf. ch. 7, pp.177-178.
[157] Saddington (1980) 28ff.
[158] Birley (1953) 137; Devijver (1974) 149; Demougin (1988) 319.
[159] It is worth noting that, assuming both offices were held for an equal length of time, only around 2/3 of military tribunes could go on to hold a cavalry prefecture (Devijver (1973) 550).
[160] Saddington (1980) no. 8. On the likelihood that many new Augustan and Julio-Claudian senators had a military career, see McAlindon (1957) 191ff.
[161] CIL 3.551.
[162] CIL 10.4749.
[163] CIL 6.41050.

Maximus[164], [210] C. Papirius C.f. Clu(stumina) Carbo[165], [208] Sex. Palpellius P.f. Vel(ina) Hister[166], [209] Sex. Papinius Q.f. Allenius[167], and [195] P. Numicius Pica Caesianus[168]; while [67] Sex. Campatius M.f. M.n.[169], [73] A. Castricius Myriotalenti f.[170] held more junior positions in Rome – only two of these men (Arrius Maximus and Numicius Pica Caesianus) did not hold the military tribunate. Moreover, while Velleius was of equestrian origin, men such as Numicius Pica Caesianus, Cornelius Orestinus, Passienus Rufus[171], Papirius Carbo, and Arrius Maximus were members of senatorial families: such positions, therefore, were sought by young men of high social status. Of the five men known to have held the XXVIvirate or XXvirate (as it had become by 20BC) in the Augustan period, four were also military tribunes[172]. Interestingly, as McAlindon points out[173], while it was not unknown for men of equestrian rank to accede to the Senate from the military tribunate without holding a position in the XXvirate, there are no examples of men from established senatorial families doing so in the early Principate. This suggests, perhaps, that there was some form of 'senatorial cursus' in place, with a position in the XXvirate preceding the military tribunate[174]. This, however, would mean that there was only a subtle difference in senatorial and equestrian military careers, in contrast to later developments in the Julio-Claudian period[175], and it is probably better to assume that there was not at the time a 'senatorial cursus' as such within the junior officer positions[176]. While the concept of the *militia equestris* was beginning to develop[177], it

[164] CIL 10.5911.
[165] CIL 6.1317.
[166] CIL 5.35.
[167] CIL 5.2823.
[168] CIL 6.3835.
[169] CIL 11.3610.
[170] CIL 14.2105.
[171] CIL 8.26580.
[172] Demougin (1982) 88 n.108; cf. [210] C. Papirius C.f. Clu(stumina) Carbo (CIL 6.1317); [58] Q. Caecilius Q.f. An[i(ensi)] (1) and [59] Q. Caecilius Q.f. An[i(ensi)] (2) (AE 1967, 55); [73] A. Castricius Myriotalenti f. (CIL 14.2105). The other is [67] Sex. Campatius M.f. M.n.
[173] McAlindon (1957) 192.
[174] Cf. McAlindon (1957) 194-195.
[175] Cf. Demougin (1988) 281.
[176] Chastagnol argues that Augustus' encouragement of the sons of senators to hold junior officer positions was inspired by a desire to build a senatorial *ordo* (Chastagnol (1973) 598), but this argument is somewhat weakened by the fact that, as Chastagnol observes ((1973) 599), there were not yet any 'senatorial' junior officer positions.
[177] Cf. [27] Q. Aemilius Secundus (CIL 3.6687) and [288] C. Velleius Paterculus, who suggests the phrase twice (Velleius 101.2-3, 104.3) and uses it once explicitly (Velleius 111.3: "Finita equestri militia, designatus quaestor"). It would be wrong, however, to envisage that there was a developed concept of an equestrian military career at this time: as we have seen, the relative status of the posts

was only in its infancy, and those of senatorial rank might hold any one of the officer positions with the exception, probably, of the post of *praefectus castrorum.* It is also worth noting that while we have no examples of young men from high-status families holding the military tribunate in the period 49 – 31BC, the status of the military tribunate appears to have been restored early in the Augustan period. Augustus's appointment of Tiberius in 26BC no doubt helped this, and it is worth noting that Papirius Carbo, who was probably related to the praetor of 62BC[178], held his military tribunate before 20BC. While it is tempting to link this development with either the Augustan settlement of 27BC or the resettlement of troops following Actium[179], it is very difficult to date any of Augustus' reforms to the junior officer positions precisely.

A further development of the Augustan period is the growing number of recorded junior officers who were from outside Italy. Of course, the vast majority of recorded junior officers from the Augustan period are Italian, and Italians make up 68% of all recorded junior officers until the Antonine period[180]: the importance of the Italian municipal elite in the make-up of the junior officer posts of the empire is evident and this, taken together with Augustus' attempts to encourage the development of the equestrian order in general, is discussed in chapter 8. However, a number of junior officers in the period came from outside the Italian municipal elite, with officers from the Eastern empire (e.g. [49] T. Aufidius T.f. Ani(ensi) Spinter[181], [99] [. ?Corne]lius Alexidis f. Cor(nelia) Menodor(us)[182]), from Gaul ([36] L. Aponius [---][183]) and at least four from Spain ([56] L. Blatius L.f. Serg(ia) Ventinus[184]; [179] L. Marcius Q.f. Gal(eria) Optatus[185], [173] Cn. Manlius Cn.f. Pa[p(iria)][186] and [127] L. Fuluius L.f. Lesso[187]). There is, however, a lack of officers from Africa, although a number of military tribunes are known to have served there (e.g. [212] Passienus Rufus[188]).

---

was by no means established, and an equestrian military career was not something pursued in contrast to a different kind of equestrian career (cf. Demougin (1988) 280-281, 354ff.).
[178] RE 18.3.1014ff, 'Papirii Carbones'; Broughton (1951-1986) 154; Demougin (1992) 63.
[179] Cf. Drinkwater (1978) 831; Demougin (1988) 286-293; Devijver (1995) 176.
[180] Devijver (1972) 112 (Table 8).
[181] CIL 3.399.
[182] AE 1993, 1479.
[183] CIL 12.4230.
[184] CIL 2.1176.
[185] CIL 2.4616.
[186] CIL 2.1477.
[187] CIL 2.3852.
[188] CIL 8.26580.

Curiously, a number of officers were from, or had family links to, the colony of Alexandreia Troas. Besides Aufidius and [Corne]lius Menodor(us), there was Aufidius' son [48] T. Aufidius T.f. Ani(ensi) Balbus, [115] C. Fabricius C.f. Ani(ensi) Tuscus[189], and [150] T. Iunius D.f. Ani(ensi) Montanus[190]). Moreover, they are also notable for having long equestrian careers: Montanus served for 14 years, Fabricius Tuscus for 16, Aufidius Spinter was a military tribune in the same legion for 8 years, and his son for 4. Devijver has shown that in the early Principate, officers from the Eastern provinces tended to serve in nearby provinces for 3-4 years[191]. However, such men generally held only the military tribunate, and the pattern is that of a municipal elite seeking to confirm their equestrian status rather than to further a military career[192]: this is not the case with Montanus or Fabricius Tuscus, who held multiple posts. Two examples, of course, are insufficient evidence to demonstrate that Devijver's exposition of a trend is wrong, but they are at least suggestive of alternative patterns.

Therefore, the junior officer positions of the Augustan period were held by a diverse range of men: promoted centurions, members of the municipal elite (from Italy and, increasingly, from elsewhere), as well as men from high-ranking equestrian, senatorial and even imperial backgrounds. With the exception of the former centurions, it should perhaps be noted that this range of backgrounds is similar to the junior officer corps of the last few decades of the Republic, despite the radical change in the junior officer posts themselves. Therefore, in order to better understand the junior officer corps of our period, we also need to look more generally at the men who held these posts, and their reasons for holding them.

As we have noted, the junior officer posts of the period all appear to have been of equestrian status, and it was the equestrian *ordo*, in particular those from the municipal elite, who were to form the majority of Rome's junior officer corps throughout the Principate. The importance of the junior officer positions to such men, and the way in which the holding of a junior officer position conferred status onto a junior officer and his family, are further examined in chapter 8. Moreover, we have not yet examined the reasons why men might seek to hold such positions. The

[189] AE 1973, 501.
[190] AE 1938, 173.
[191] Birley (1953) 137; Devijver (1974) 149.
[192] It is worth noting that, assuming both offices were held for an equal length of time, only around 2/3 of military tribunes could go on to hold a cavalry prefecture (Devijver (1973) 550).

motives which might induce a man to hold a junior officer position are examined in chapter 6, while the nature, and perceptions, of junior officer service – especially among the Roman elite – are examined in chapter 7.

Ch. 6: Motives for Service as a Junior Officer

This chapter examines the various motives that might induce an individual to serve as a junior officer. The first part examines the issue of professionalism: it examines what might be said to constitute professionalism, looks at how junior officers were trained and selected, and examines the possibility that a significant number of the junior officers of the Roman army in our period were professional soldiers. The second part looks at other possible motives for service, including pay, patronage, and enhancing the position of one's family.

Of course, these avenues of reward are not mutually exclusive, and many junior officers will have had several or all of them in mind upon entering service. Moreover, they are not by any means the whole story. Firstly, the concept of military service as a desirable thing in its own right was also important, and the desire for military glory and for experiencing military life emphasized by Harris was of course still present in the period 91BC – AD14: perceptions of service as a junior officer – both external perception and self-perception – are analysed in ch. 7. Secondly, the members of the municipal elite, both Italian and provincial, who made up the majority of the junior officer corps, had their own motives for service – a desire to seek status and recognition within wider Roman society, and the chance to develop their status, and that of their families, in their home towns and regions: the role, ambitions, and increasing importance, of the municipal elite within the junior officer corps are analysed in ch. 8.

Professionalism and the junior officer corps

In all the modern discussion of the junior officer corps of the Republican army, the question of professionalism, often structured as the identification or definition of "homines militares", has proved the most lively[1]. After all, if junior officers were untrained amateurs, why was the Roman army so successful?[2] A common view among modern authors is that the centurions were the experienced military leaders within the Roman legion, while the officers were gentlemen amateurs who let their

[1] See Syme (1939) 88, 395; Birley (1953) 133ff.; Smith (1958) 64ff.; Badian (1959) 90; Harmand (1967) 355; Gruen (1974) 66; Garlan (1975) 158; Gabba (1976) 35ff.; Nicolet (1979) 320, (1980) 138; Keppie (1984) 79, 97-99; De Blois (1987) 14ff.; Le Bohec (1994) 37; Goldsworthy (1996) 123ff.
[2] A question best put by Smith (1958) 59.

subordinates handle the difficult work[3]. This notion is partly based on the frequent descriptions of hard-bitten centurions, who fought to the last despite innumerable obstacles[4], while the junior officer corps of the late Republic is by contrast often seen as inexperienced. It is easy to compare, for example, the cowardly and weak junior officers who were afraid of the physical might of the Germans[5] with the indefatigable centurion P. Sextius Baculus, who, despite being grievously wounded, left his sickbed to hold the camp against the attacking Nervii[6].

This notion, however, is based upon the assumption that the primary role of all junior officers was to lead troops in combat. As we have seen, this was not the case for military tribunes. Moreover, it involves the assumption that because junior officers were not formally trained, and because, as we have seen, the service requirement described by Polybius had lapsed, junior officers were, as a body, untrained and inexperienced. The logic is then that, since the Roman army was so successful, another body of men must have provided the necessary experience and competence, and those men are identified as the centurions. This argument is not implausible in itself, but it does not take into account the nature of leadership and command during our period, nor does it allow for the many ways in which the abilities of junior officers could be exploited by their commanders.

On the other hand, there are those who argue that the junior officer corps was extremely professional. De Blois[7], Smith[8] and Gabba[9] have each argued that the junior officers of the late Republic were more-or-less professional soldiers, experienced men dedicated to their commanders and serving in the army for no other reason than the benefits and advantages of military service. Smith claims that amid the large numbers of military tribunes and prefects in the post-Marian army there must have been many who were there for no other purpose than to pursue a military career[10]. Those who consider that junior officers were professionals argue that young men were chosen for posts because of their military aptitude, with the possible

[3] Cf. Badian (1959) 90.
[4] E.g. Caesar, *B.C.* 3.53.3-5; Valerius Maximus 3.2.23; cf. [66] M. Caesius Scaeua.
[5] Caesar, *B.G.* 1.39.2-5.
[6] Caesar, *B.G.* 3.5.2ff.
[7] De Blois (1987) 14ff.
[8] Smith (1958) 62, 64ff.
[9] Gabba (1976) 35ff. Like Gabba, Gruen also speaks of "professional military men" comprising at least a sizeable part of the junior officer corps (Gruen (1974) 66).
[10] Smith (1958) 65-6.

exception of the elected military tribunes; that the money and status available to a professional soldier created a 'social stratum' of army families; and even that *legati* were very often career soldiers, who had entered the lower political ranks only to further their military career. Smith puts the argument in its most extreme form: "it is probable that some of them sought the praetorship only in order to…command an army"[11]. This argument also tends to assume that the junior officer corps was homogeneous (as we have seen, this was not the case) and that there was a fundamental decline in the social status of the junior officer corps during the late Republic (a problematic view, as shown above).

Both of these arguments are, in fact, often based on far too narrow a notion of the functions of the junior officer corps and the nature of professionalism. In attempting to assess the existence of 'professional' or specialist military commanders in the imperial period, Campbell[12] and Saller[13] have outlined two ways in which 'professional' soldiers might be identified: an established career path for 'professional' soldiers, which channelled talented men into the top military jobs[14]; and evidence that 'professional' soldiers were selected for posts by virtue of their military experience and achievements[15]. Campbell, in particular, has highlighted the danger of placing too much weight on the identification of "uiri militares" in this respect[16]. As Campbell argues, the term is imprecise and highly affected by literary convention: in our period, for example, Caesar, Pompeius Magnus and M. Antonius might all be described as 'military men', but only by a very broad definition could they be described as 'professional soldiers'. Instead, in keeping with the approach of Campbell and Saller, we should first attempt to understand what skills would be required of a junior officer, and how he might acquire them. We must then examine two factors that could be said to demonstrate the existence of professionalism: the extent to which an identifiable 'military career' existed, and the degree to which military abilities determined whether men were appointed and promoted.

The skills required by junior officers

[11] Smith (1958) 64-65.
[12] Campbell (1975).
[13] Saller (1980).
[14] Campbell (1975) 12ff.; Saller (1980) 45ff.
[15] Campbell (1975) 17ff.; Saller (1980) 48ff.
[16] Campbell (1975) 11-12.

As we have already seen, a wide range of roles could be assigned to junior officers – within the army hierarchy, within the camp, and within the commander's *cohors*. Each officer position required a different set of skills in order for it to be performed proficiently, and required different levels of experience and military ability. In order to assess what would make a 'professional' officer, we must consider each position individually, and note the way in which different skills and types of experience might enhance the performance of each role.

The military tribunate was, as we have seen, a role which required a great deal of administrative and organisational ability[17]. The military tribunes acted as intermediaries between the commander and the troops, and were responsible for overseeing the day-to-day running of the legion. Such tasks as maintaining discipline, keeping records of conduct and performance, and overseeing training and watches would require administrative and organisational skills, and attention to detail, and an understanding of military life, the same skills which would have been useful to *praefecti fabrum*. However, while military tribunes did, on occasion, perform an important role upon the battlefield, this was because an individual had been selected by his commander to do so, and was not necessarily an *ex officio* duty: a commander was normally free to chose any member of his officer corps to perform such duties. Thus a military tribune might be given an important role in a pitched battle, or the command of a vexillation, but this was not a necessary component of his position – although, presumably, a military tribune would be expected to lead in the absence of a senior officer if an emergency arose. Moreover, military tribunes were not assigned to any sub-unit of the legion, but acted as a college, sharing their duties between them.

In addition, because there were a number of military tribunes in a legion, a commander might give a tactical command to a particular military tribune while the rest of that legion's military tribunes – who might be less experienced – performed their regular duties. It is in this light that we should view Caesar's offer of a military tribunate with immunity from military duties to C. Trebatius[18]. The military duties of Trebatius' position would have been performed by the other military tribunes in his legion, and while this might have increased their workload somewhat, it would not have left a division of that legion without an officer.

[17] On the duties of military tribunes, see ch. 2, pp.46-50, ch. 3, pp.74-78.
[18] Cf. *C. Trebatius Testa*.

For most prefects, however, things were different[19]. In fact, the majority of military prefectures and the military tribunate can be seen as representing two fundamentally distinct types of junior officer position, one generally involving command of a discrete unit of troops, the other not. High-status cavalry commanders – those in charge of more than one *ala* of cavalry – still had administrative and organisational duties: they were responsible for overseeing the foreign levies under their command and ensuring that there was good communication between the general and the auxiliary cavalry. However, as the fraud perpetrated by the two Gallic brothers Raucilius and Egus shows[20], their administrative and organisational duties were comparatively light. It is hard to imagine that a centurion serving under military tribunes could have succeeded in committing such a fraud as the two Gauls serving under [307] Volusenus Quadratus committed against Caesar. The lower-status *praefecti equitum* who commanded individual *alae* from the Triumviral period onwards would have had more administrative duties in overseeing the day-to-day running of their units.

However, both kinds of equestrian prefects had a key role on the battlefield, and because they would have a direct role in combat, cavalry commanders would also have to know how to fight as a cavalryman. Moreover, while infantry combat was a comparatively static affair, cavalry combat was very fluid[21]. Individual cavalry commanders had to make tactical decisions based upon their own assessment of a situation when they had no way of consulting with their general[22]. The (unsuccessful) innovations of Pacideius during the African wars suggest that cavalry commanders might have a great deal of independence in the use of their troops[23]. The same is also true of garrison commanders and prefects placed in charge of vexillations: they had to be able to act independently of their commanders. They also had to provide leadership and oversee discipline. Such men, therefore, would have to have been able to command and lead troops, and to make relatively complex tactical decisions.

---

[19] The exception being *praefecti fabrum*: cf. ch. 3, pp.84-86. On the duties of cavalry commanders, cf. ch. 3, pp.79-80, ch. 4, pp.112-114; on naval prefects, cf. ch. 3, pp.80-81, ch. 4, pp.116-119. For garrison commanders, cf. ch. 3, pp.81-82, ch. 4, pp.114-116. For other military prefects, see ch. 3, pp.82-83, ch. 4, pp.119-120.
[20] Caesar, *B.C*. 3.59-60; cf. ch. 4, pp.110-111.
[21] Cf. Goldsworthy (1996) 168; Rosenstein (2005) 141.
[22] Gelzer (1968) 126; Gruen (1974) 114; Greenhalgh (1981) 88; Meier (1996) 260; cf. [158] P. Licinius Crassus.
[23] Caesar, *B.Afr*. 13.1, 78.4; cf. [205] Pacideius (1).

Naval commanders required even more military skill and experience. They acted completely independently of their commanders, often being located many days' travel from their commander's main force. Moreover, naval commanders would have needed a good understanding of war at sea, which was not a traditional strength of the Roman military system; perhaps it is for this reason that freedmen are commonly found as naval commanders during the Triumviral period. As we have seen, these posts carried a wide range of responsibilities, and, moreover, varied greatly in status. Some naval commanders are indistinguishable from *legati*, while some might be in charge of a small squadron of a few ships. Those naval prefects in charge of large fleets or of blockade operations would obviously need the same skills and experience as a legionary commander, with the addition of skill at the complicated business of fighting a war at sea. They would have to be effective leaders, as well as tactically astute. Those with fewer responsibilities would still have needed to be effective leaders, able to inspire their men and to command them in battle. However, naval prefects faced the additional complication that there were a number of high-status individuals serving beneath them: a cavalry prefect would have been in charge of a native commander (possibly more than one), but a naval prefect would have been in charge of a number of ship's captains, each of whom wielded considerable authority over his own men, as well as, on occasion, other prefects or military tribunes[24]. As a result, naval prefects would have needed good organisational skills in order to keep their fleets in order.

Thus, as we have seen, the junior officer corps was a heterogeneous body of individuals whose duties required a wide range of skills. However, all junior officers were required to be able to give and to follow orders effectively: no officer could do his job unless the troops under him followed his orders. All junior officers would also need organisational skills in order to deal with the day-to-day problems and demands of their positions, and, in particular, skill at speaking persuasively in order to exhort their men.

Training and experience

The perception of junior officers as amateurs rests partially upon the notion that they were untrained and inexperienced. This view is supported by the fact that there was no formal training or selection procedure for Roman officers, and no examination to

[24] E.g. Caesar, *B.G.* 3.11.5-16.4; cf. [149] D. Iunius Brutus Albinus.

pass. However, in a general sense members of the Roman elite can be described to some extent as prepared, if not precisely trained, to fulfil their duties. Many of the skills required to be a junior officer were present in the education of a young member of the elite.

Junior officers, regardless of their roles, had to be able to lead the soldiers they commanded, which might be especially difficult if, as was likely, those soldiers had been in service for a greater length of time than they had. However, as Goldsworthy points out, the ability to give orders was a fundamental part of the upbringing of a Roman of equestrian rank: such men would have been trained from birth to run their estates[25]. Dio, in a speech given to Maecenas, suggests that soldiers respected their commanders partly as a result of their social status[26]. Moreover, oratory was as important a skill in commanding troops as it was in persuading voters or jurors[27]: the ability of commanders to inspire and encourage the men under them would have been central both to command on the battlefield and for discipline in camp. The interaction between commanders and their troops is often portrayed by our sources as similar to the interaction between magistrates and the people[28], and inspiring speeches by officers are presented as having the ability to inspire great feats of heroism from the troops[29]. Furthermore, Roman officers were expected to lead by example on the battlefield, and the elite mentality encouraged among Roman youth must have prepared them, if not directly for combat, at least for the example that they were expected to provide. As Prag has shown, the gymnasium in the Hellenistic world provided a focus for the development of an elite military mentality[30], and it is perhaps significant that the young M. Antonius is reported to have spent time in Greece performing military exercises[31]. The Roman elite also took part in military competitions, both at home – such as those notably encouraged by Augustus[32] – and especially on campaign: the young Cicero is said to have participated in such games[33]; *contubernales* also might compete in military games, and their achievements might be

[25] Cf. Goldsworthy (1996) 121ff.
[26] Dio 52.8.4ff.; cf. Campbell (1984) 318.
[27] Goldsworthy (1996) 122.
[28] E.g. Sallust, *B.J.* 85.
[29] E.g. Sallust, *Iug.* 60; Lucan 4.462-581L; Florus 2.13.33.
[30] Prag (2007) 87ff.
[31] Plutarch, *Ant.* 2; cf. also the possible link between gymnasium culture and [60] Q. Caecilius Q.f. Atticus.
[32] Cf. ch. 7, pp.119-200.
[33] Cicero, *de Off.* 2.45.

rewarded with prizes[34]; Jugurtha impressed his peers by his displays of martial ability in games and competitions[35]; and Crassus is criticised by Plutarch for failing to institute athletic games for his troops before the Carrhae campaign[36]. Such games would have prepared young men for service as cavalrymen, but would also have helped to develop an elite service mentality. The importance of this mentality should not be underestimated. In his analysis of the qualities of junior officers at Waterloo, Keegan argues that this mentality was considered more important than "mere technical qualities"[37] in the British army of the time, and, indeed, that the notable courage and determination displayed by junior officers, particularly in their reluctance to abandon a position or to yield ground and in their willingness to accept dangerous orders and to see that those orders were carried out, formed a crucial part of their overall responsibilities[38].

In addition to such experience, there is evidence to suggest that military skill might have been acquired, at least in part, through study. A number of training manuals for soldiers were already in existence by the late Republic, and these would have provided a guide for a new junior officer[39]. In addition, there was clearly an acknowledged 'academic' side to learning how to command: this is made explicit by Cicero in the *de Oratore*, where Sulpicius asks if he would be better off learning civil law or military matters which, of course, required less dedication than oratory[40]. Similar statements are found elsewhere: Polybius describes three ways in which men learned to become commanders – through reading military memoirs, through instruction, and through personal experience[41]; Cicero describes Marius as acquiring his military skill through campaigns, but having been so successful that had he only read the accounts of his own battles, he would have learned the principles of war[42]; Marius is portrayed by Sallust as scorning those who had learned war from "acta maiorum et Graecorum militaria"[43], a sentiment echoed by Cicero[44]; and Cicero also describes Lucullus as learning to be a commander by reading books and by talking to

[34] Cf. Plutarch, *Cato Min*. 8, *Ant*. 3-4; Josephus, *A.J.* 14.86.
[35] On the importance of military games, see also Le Bohec (1994) 37.
[36] Plutarch, *Crass.* 17.5.
[37] Keegan (1976) 188ff.
[38] Cf. Campbell (1987) 23; Rosenstein (2005) 141.
[39] Le Bohec (1994) 37; Campbell (1984) 324ff.; Keppie (1984) 51; Phang (2008) 50.
[40] Cicero, *de Orat.* 1.131; cf. Campbell (1987) 23.
[41] Polybius 11.8.1-2.
[42] Cicero, *Balb*. 47.
[43] Sallust, *Iug*. 85.12.
[44] Cicero, *Font.* 43; *de Orat.* 1.131.

experienced men[45]. While these descriptions criticise those whose only experience of war was from books, they nevertheless suggest that certain skills might be learned, or at least initially taught, through handbooks and memoirs. Moreover, it is notable that junior officers are often praised for their military learning and knowledge[46], which suggests that there was more to being a good junior officer than exhibiting bravery or courage.

However, beyond the ways in which their upbringing and training prepared them for military service, experience on campaign was undeniably the most important 'training' that a junior officer could receive. Cicero, praising Pompeius' military character, emphasises the time he spent on campaign under his father, learning military discipline[47], and also suggests that Marius learned his military skill through active service[48]. While the service requirement for the military tribunate may have lapsed by the late Republic, young members of the elite still served as *contubernales*[49]. Service as part of the commander's *cohors* would have allowed young men to get a taste not just of military life in general, but of the day-to-day requirements of the junior officer positions in particular, in the same way that an orator's training was obtained in part by watching experienced orators at their work. It is perhaps significant that the younger Cicero served as a junior cavalry prefect for a time, during which service his father chose to praise him for his abilities in military games and camp life rather than any achievements on the battlefield, before being given a more important cavalry prefecture which involved independent command[50]. The younger Cicero had also accompanied his father in Cilicia, while Hortensius, Valerius Flaccus, Caesar and the younger Cato had all served as *contubernales* before they held a junior officer position. Moreover, *contubernales* might also be given minor tasks, such as overseeing guard duty for a short period, which would enable them to gain experience of command and responsibility, and gain a reputation. Both Caesar and Marius were, according to our sources, known to be exceptionally good soldiers before they were elected as junior officers[51]. In addition, Augustus' avowed aim, according to Suetonius, in encouraging the sons of senators to hold cavalry

[45] Cicero, *Acad.* 2.2; Cf. Campbell (1984) 325.
[46] Cf. ch. 7, pp.205-206.
[47] Cicero, *pro lege Man.* 28; cf. Phang (2008) 3-5.
[48] Cicero, *Balb.* 47, cf. Campbell (1987) 20.
[49] On elite attitudes to such service, cf. ch. 7, p.196ff.
[50] Cf. [278] M. Tullius Cicero.
[51] Caesar: Plutarch, *Caes.* 5; Suetonius, *Caes.* 5; Marius: Sallust, *Iug*. 63.4.

prefectures was to provide them with experience of camp life[52]. And the writings of Pliny[53] and Statius[54] reveal similar points of view.

Junior officers would also learn a certain amount about their roles as they fulfilled their responsibilities. As we have seen, military tribunes belonged to a college whose members did not individually have fixed duties, and prefects could be assigned duties which fitted their experience and abilities. There must have been considerable opportunity for those without prior direct experience of military command to serve as junior officers. Those officers who found that they enjoyed their roles, or that they were particularly suited to that sort of position, might go on to positions which required a greater level of responsibility and experience. As De Blois points out[55], a junior officer who joined Caesar's army in Gaul in the early 50s BC and who remained with it would have been an extremely experienced officer by the time of the civil wars.

A military career

As we have seen, the junior officers of our period were, in general, experienced and competent men. Moreover, as we shall see in more detail below[56], the concept of "homines militares" was not a phenomenon of the imperial period only, and a number of individuals in our period, some of them junior officers, are described as 'military men'. However, as Campbell notes[57], such identifications are generally broad literary definitions. In order to assert that the junior officers of our period were 'professional' officers, we need evidence that a professional career existed, and that men were appointed to these posts on the basis of military 'qualifications'.

Promotion was obviously available for junior officers in the pre-Augustan period. The military tribune [54] C. Baebius, for instance, was promoted by Octavian to a prefecture with responsibility for guarding the Spanish coastline[58], and [158] P. Licinius Crassus was promoted to an equestrian prefecture and given greater responsibilities by Caesar[59], as was [307] C. Volusenus Quadratus[60]. [215] M.

[52] Suetonius, *Aug*. 38; cf. Campbell (1975) 18.
[53] Pliny, *Ep*. 8.14.4-5.
[54] Statius, *Silu*. 5.2.164-165, 173, 180.
[55] De Blois (2000) 15.
[56] Cf. ch. 7, p.204ff.
[57] Campbell (1975) 11-12.
[58] CIL 11.623 = ILS 2672 = AE 1978, 335 = EDH HD005009 (Forum Liuii, Regio 8, Italia).
[59] Caesar, *B.G.* 1.5; 2.34; 3.7-11, 20-27; 8.46.
[60] Caesar, *B.G.* 3.5; 4.21, 23; 6.41; 8.23, 48.

Petreius, of course, was promoted from the military tribunate to a prefecture, thence to a legateship, and from there was elected to the praetorship[61]. [180] T. Marius Siculus was promoted to a prefecture from the military tribunate[62]. Moreover, some men, such as Velleius Paterculus' father, held more than one position repeatedly[63]. However, such promotions and extended careers do not suggest that there was at the time a 'career path', nor indeed that there was such a thing as a career at all. Few officers are known to have served for a long time: for example, even Volusenus Quadratus is only known to have served under Caesar between 56 and 48BC. As Dobson points out, the junior officer positions were relatively few, and in the early part of our period were all relatively short-term[64]. A command would probably last for only so long as a commander's term of office, and while, as we shall see, military experience was probably taken into consideration when a commander appointed his junior officers (and while, as the admittedly exceptional examples of Marius and Caesar suggest, military reputation might help a man to be elected as a military tribune), it would be difficult, if not impossible, for a man to make a career out of the junior officer positions. Moreover, the number of posts available might fluctuate wildly from year to year during the late Republic (in 71BC there were 40 legions in service, in 70BC only 18).

This particular limitation, however, began to change in the 50s BC, with the extended commands given to Pompeius and Caesar, followed later by those of the Triumvirs, which made extended service under a particular commander possible. While there is no clear evidence for this among the junior officers, a number of legates, such as Afranius, Petreius, Gabinius and Labienus, served in various campaigns over an extended period of time[65]. It is likely that a highly talented junior officer would have enjoyed the same opportunities for patronage and career advancement. However, the rewards available for loyalty during the civil wars and Triumviral period were balanced by risks, and in allying themselves to one side or the other, officers became dependent upon the success of their commanders for future rewards and prosperity[66].

---

[61] Sallust, *Cat.* 59.6.
[62] CIL 11.6058 (Uruinum Mataurense, Regio 6, Italia); cf. Valerius Maximus 7.9.2 (= 6.8.6).
[63] Velleius 2.104.3; cf. [288] Velleius.
[64] Dobson (1972) 195.
[65] Syme (1939) 88, 395; Smith (1958) 63-64; Gruen (1974) 380-382.
[66] However, *pace* De Blois ((1987) 17-18), it is not appropriate to think of junior officers as professionals (even in a limited sense) simply on the grounds that they were dependent upon their service as junior officers for their future livelihood.

Under Augustus, a centralised system for the appointment of all junior officers began to emerge[67]. This would have made it easier for individuals to enjoy extended careers as junior officers and, with the development of the procuratorial system and military prefectures involving the command of large areas, to aspire to more senior positions thereafter[68]. However, despite this, junior officer careers that extended over more than a decade appear to have been relatively rare, and men such as [201] Q. Octauius Sagitta or [115] C. Fabricius Tuscus are exceptions rather than the norm. It is also significant that there is no evidence of a firm hierarchy of junior officer posts, which suggests that even if men served for a considerable time as junior officers, there was no established career-path equivalent to the equestrian military cursus of the Flavian period for them to follow. This argument applies, of course, even more strongly to the period 91 – 31BC, and most junior officers in our period appear to have served only for a comparatively short time. However, there was one group of junior officers who did serve for a long time in the Roman army, and who can be thought of as 'career soldiers': promoted *primipilares*, the majority of whom held more than one junior officer position after their primipilate, which – given the lengthy service required to obtain the primipilate – is evidence of a long military career. In addition, their experience, acquired over many years of service, would have made them well suited to hold a junior officer post. Moreover, as we have noted, some positions (those of *praefectus castrorum* and *praefectus leuis armaturae*) appear to have been mostly held by promoted *primipili*, which suggests that the "centurionate" career of the later Principate (which involved the posts of *praefectus castrorum* and *primipilus bis*), was evolving in the Augustan period. However, as Campbell notes, many *primipilares* were promoted to ostensibly 'civilian' positions during the imperial period, which suggests that it was their reputation and experience of responsibility, rather than their military experience as such, which was the key factor in their promotion beyond posts, such as that of *praefectus castrorum*, for which former centurions would be particularly well suited[69].

---

[67] Statius, *Silu.* 5.1.94-98, Florus, *Verg. Or.* 3.5. On the appointments system of the Principate, cf. Saller (1980) 46; Demougin (1988) 289 n.76; Devijver (1995) 176; Deniaux (2000) 225ff.; Birley (2003) 1ff. It will have excluded elected military tribunes, if elections still existed, cf. ch. 4, p.127. It was also possible, as Birley and Cotton note (Cotton (1981b) 231; Birley (2003) 3; cf. Pliny, *Ep.* 2.13.2, 3.8) for governors to appoint military tribunes (although probably not prefects) directly, although such appointments would, presumably, have to be confirmed by the *ab epistulis*.

[68] Cf. Brunt (1983) 44ff.

[69] Cf. Campbell (1984) 408-409; cf. Speidel (2001) 60.

In addition, there is little direct evidence that military experience or ability was the decisive factor in appointment to junior officer positions. The surviving letters of recommendation, which appear to have been a key element (and perhaps the key element) in gaining appointment, rarely mention military qualities[70]. In one letter, Cicero even implies that Caesar did not mind who it was that Cicero recommended to him[71]. It seems, however, that despite his recommendation of Trebatius to Caesar[72], Cicero was aware of the incongruity of appointing men with little military aptitude to positions of command. Plutarch reports that when Domitius Ahenobarbus attempted to obtain a position for a man who was, perhaps, not a natural soldier, by promoting the man's prudence and temperance, Cicero is said to have joked that Domitius should have kept him as a guardian for his children[73]. Despite this, it is clear that some individuals could develop a reputation as competent officers. When selecting soldiers for the campaign against Jugurtha, Marius made a point of choosing volunteers who were known to him either by experience or by report[74], which suggests that such reports might be considered carefully: it is inconceivable that Marius would have taken less care in the selection of his junior officers than in the selection of his ordinary soldiers. If inexperienced commanders might choose legates with military experience to assist them[75], it seems logical that commanders expecting a tough war would look to stiffen their junior officer corps with experienced men. [91] P. Considius is described by Caesar as "rei militaris peritissimus habebatur et in exercitu L. Sullae et postea in M. Crassi fuerat"[76]. This suggests that Caesar knew of Considius' military reputation before Considius was appointed to travel with Caesar to Gaul. However, as Welch notes, there is a possible criticism of Sulla and, more importantly perhaps, of Crassus, in this description, as Considius failed in his task[77]: the early passages of the *de Bello Gallico*, therefore, attack not only the inexperienced junior officers with whom Caesar appears to have felt burdened[78] – which suggests that military experience was not a key factor in their appointment – but even

[70] Cicero, *ad Fam.* 13.12. On the role (and language) of such letters, see Saller (1980) 56; Cotton (1985) 333; (1986) 448; Deniaux (1993) 45, (2000) 225ff.; Birley (2003) 4ff., 12.
[71] Cicero, *ad Fam*. 7.5.2.
[72] Cicero, *ad Fam.* 7.5.1-3; cf. *C. Trebatius Testa*.
[73] Plutarch, *Cic.* 38.2.
[74] Sallust, *Iug.* 84.2.
[75] Cf. ch. 7, pp.204-205.
[76] Caesar, *B.G.* 1.21, cf. 22.
[77] Welch (1998) 101.
[78] Caesar, *B.G*. 1.39.2-5; cf. ch. 3, pp.93-94.

experienced men who had been recommended to him. Caesar was later to keep a tight rein on the appointment of his junior officers[79].

Thus men with an aptitude and a liking for war could find ways to be brought to the attention of a commander, even if patronage also played its part. Certainly a successful junior officer during the civil wars or the Triumviral period could almost certainly have expected another posting if he so desired. However, even men such as these should not be considered as exclusively career soldiers. To talk of a division within the equestrian and senatorial *ordines* between soldiers and politicians is to see a divide which, even in the Augustan period, simply did not exist[80]: it took over one hundred years of a developed equestrian military cursus before we start to find evidence of "military men" designated as such on their tombstones[81]. In addition, as Campbell notes, even among men who held multiple positions it is difficult to talk of a career, as such posts may have been separated by a number of years spent at home[82].

Therefore, while we can see individuals in our period who held multiple positions, and men with conspicuous military reputations, they were probably relatively few in number and appear to have been, as Sallust's description of Petreius' career suggests, an exception to the rule. Instead, we should probably see military service as belonging to the wider context of a political and civic career. For the young members of the Roman social elite, it was – along with the vigintisexvirate – the beginning of their public service. As we have seen, military service gave them the opportunity to demonstrate a wide range of talents and abilities. For men from the municipal elite, it offered the chance to rise further by demonstrating ability and making connections. During the late Republic, it was likely to be the final point of their public career, but during the civil wars and the Triumviral period, with the massive expansion in the numbers of junior officer positions and senatorial positions, it could be a way to further political and social status in Rome. Even simply being a *contubernalis* offered benefits for the civil careers of both social groups, providing valuable experience in administration and organisation[83]. We should not, therefore, see service as a junior officer as a career separate from the other roles and posts available to members of the Roman elite. Instead, we need to recognise that the Roman army and Roman civic life

[79] Cicero, *ad Q.f.* 2.14.3.
[80] Cf. Campbell (1975) 23ff., (1984) 329ff.; Saller (1980) 52-53; Brunt (1983) 47.
[81] Devijver (1970) 152-153.
[82] Campbell (1975) 22, (1987) 22.
[83] Cf. Gruen (1974) 116.

were, as Nicolet argues, deeply integrated[84], and that success in one could breed success in the other.

Therefore, while there must have been some junior officers who, like *primipilares*, had what might be termed a military career – men such as [115] Fabricius Tuscus, for example – they did so despite the lack of a career structure or system of appointment that especially rewarded military ability, and were exceptions to the rule. This is, after all, how men such as [91] P. Considius or [215] M. Petreius are presented in our sources – as exceptional – and Sallust even had to qualify his use of "homo militaris" to describe Petreius[85]. This is not to say that the majority of junior officers in our period were therefore 'amateurs' or incompetent – they clearly were not – but we should not attempt to see them as military specialists, career officers, or professionals.

Other motives for service

Service as a junior officer in the Roman army of course had its rewards. Officers were paid, and had many opportunities to advance themselves through their service. This section concentrates on four potential avenues of reward for junior officers that might have motivated them to engage in such service. The first is the way in which a junior officer could benefit himself by making personal connections, both with powerful members of the Roman elite and with other junior officers. The second is the opportunity available for a junior officer to enhance the position of his family. The third is the use of junior officer positions (and especially the military tribunate) to further a political career in Rome. The fourth is the opportunity for economic benefits from service as a junior officer, both direct benefits (such as pay and booty) and benefits which derived from the use of military service to engage in business dealings, and other economic activities, in the provinces.

Of course, these avenues of reward are not mutually exclusive, and many junior officers will have had more than one or perhaps all of them in mind upon entering service. Moreover, members of the municipal elite, both Italian and provincial, who made up the majority of the junior officer corps in the Principate, had their own motives for service, which are analysed in ch. 8.

Enhancing one's personal connections

[84] Nicolet (1980) 89.
[85] Sallust, *Cat.* 59.6.

When a junior officer took up his position, he joined the *cohors* of his commander. In doing so, he became a member of a sizeable contingent of high-status individuals, drawn from the political elite of Rome and the municipal elites of Italy and, increasingly in our period, the provinces. Membership of such a group obviously offered numerous opportunities to create and develop significant personal connections. The most important of these connections was, of course, that with the commander himself, and such a prominent individual could provide support both during and after military service. However, the commander was far from being the only person who could offer advancement to a junior officer: relationships with legates, fellow officers, and *contubernales* all provided opportunities for a junior officer to enhance his social and political status[86].

We can see the importance of a commander's patronage in Trebatius' motives for staying on with Caesar: "tantum moneo, neque amicitiae confirmandae clarissimi ac liberalissimi uiri ... magis idoneum tempus ... te esse ullum umquam reperturum"[87], Cicero points out to him. The dual motives of money and patronage are acknowledged elsewhere in their correspondence. Cicero, trying to placate Trebatius, asks him, "utrum superbiorem te pecunia facit an quod te imperator consulit?"[88]. Syme emphasises the influence of Caesar's patronage, and many of his junior officers went on to serve under him elsewhere[89]. That appointing a man as a junior officer was an act of patronage is made explicit by Cicero's description of [126] Fufidius' service as a military tribune: "ita se tractauit, ut accepisse ab eo beneficium uiderer, non dedisse"[90]. The significance of a commander's patronage can in fact be seen in the careers of many important individuals: the young A. Gabinius served twice under Sulla before reaching the tribunate and then the consulship later in life as an ally of Pompeius; and similar patterns of office-holding can be found among legates[91]. Moreover, the support a commander could offer did not have to be directly political. Cicero was active in support of one of his former military tribunes, recommending

[86] E.g. the relationship between [290] Velleius Paterculus and P. Silius, under whose father Velleius served as a military tribune (Velleius 2.116, cf. Saddington (2003) 28).
[87] Cicero, *ad Fam.* 7.17.3
[88] Cicero, *ad Fam.* 7.13.
[89] Syme (1939) 70-71, cf. Gruen (1974) 115-116; Welch (1998) 87.
[90] Cicero, *ad Fam.* 13.12.1.
[91] Gruen (1974) 115ff.; De Blois (1987) 14.

him to Brutus[92], and the former commanders of Plancius and Caelius lent support to their defences[93].

A relationship between junior officers and their commanders may, in fact, have already existed prior to their entering service. For example, the two Titii, brothers from Spain, were the sons of a man whom Caesar had promoted to the Senate[94]. A more famous case, that of [97] Cornelius Balbus, also shows how patronage was important in the selection of junior officers. Balbus was chosen by Caesar as his *praefectus fabrum*, comments Cicero, out of a large group of Caesar's friends and acquaintances[95]. Pompeius Trogus' uncle served under Pompeius, probably as a cavalry prefect, while Trogus' grandfather had also served in the *auxilia* under Pompeius and had been given citizenship by him[96].

However, commanders did not offer their support unconditionally. The loyalty expected of a junior officer in future life is made clear by Caesar, who criticised disloyal officers and centurions for being "neque bello fortes neque pace boni aut utiles"[97]. The importance to a commander of the loyalty of his junior officers, as we saw in ch. 4, can hardly be underestimated. The inference of Caesar's rebuke "nor loyal or serviceable in peace" shows that the relationship between officer and commander was not expected to end when the campaign finished, and a successful officer who remained loyal might well expect further benefits and support, perhaps long after his military service had ended. The importance of such links can also be seen in the way in which commanders such as Caesar appear to have jealously guarded the right to appoint their officers[98], and in the fact that Augustus appears to have taken almost complete control of all junior officer appointments[99].

Moreover, junior officers themselves could exercise patronage. This is best shown by L. Petronius, who served under P. Caelius as garrison commander at Placentia in 87BC[100]. Valerius Maximus records that it was Caelius himself who, as a result of their friendship, had elevated Petronius to the equestrian order. Petronius later

[92] Cicero, *ad Fam.* 13.12.
[93] Cicero, *Planc.* 28; cf. 27; *Cael.* 73.
[94] Caesar, *B.Afr.* 28; cf. [270] Titius (1).
[95] Cicero, *Balb.* 63; cf. 41, 43.
[96] Justin 43.5.11-12; cf. [227] Pompeius Trogus. The importance of such patronage to members of the provincial elite is discussed in ch. 8, pp.247-248.
[97] Caesar, *B.Afr.* 54.4.
[98] Cicero, *ad Q.f.* 2.14.3.
[99] Cf. Demougin (1988) 289 n.76; Devijver (1995) 176.
[100] Valerius Maximus 4.7.5; cf. [64] P. Caelius; [217] L. Petronius.

committed suicide after yielding to Caelius' request to end his life as the town fell. Moreover, military tribunes commanded a sizeable retinue, whose members could receive direct financial reward from the commander[101] and could take their friends and, as we shall see, family, with them. [239] Cato was able to take a number of his friends, and even some of his freedmen, with him on campaign[102], and the retinue of [50] C. Auienus was so large that he was (ostensibly) dismissed for using military transports to move their baggage[103] at a time when Caesar was short of troops. An officer's friends, by accompanying him, would gain an opportunity to develop connections, to take on prefectures[104], or to engage in business. The ability to confer such a favour was no doubt a great benefit of becoming a junior officer. Moreover, being present on the staff of a commander will have given a junior officer the chance of recommending friends for positions. At one level higher, we see the cases of two garrison commanders: [131] C. Gallonius, commander of Gades in 49BC[105]; and [187] C. Minucius Reginus, commander at Zeta in 46BC[106], who owed their positions – albeit held in a time of crisis – to their friendships with the commander's legates.

Enhancing the position of one's family

The second avenue of reward available to junior officers is the way in which they could use their position to directly enhance the status and position of their families[107]. Brothers can be found serving together in the army, including the two Pacideii, who served as junior officers against Caesar in Africa[108], and the two Titii. An inscription from Pompeii records two Tillii from Arpinum, military tribunes in the tenth legion[109]. It was by no means unusual for young Romans to serve alongside relatives. Before his own military tribunate, Cato had previously served in Gellius' army in the slave war, travelling (presumably as a *contubernalis*) with his brother [255] Caepio, who was a military tribune[110]. [221] Plancius accompanied both a relative of his

[101] Cicero, *ad Fam.* 5.20.7.
[102] Plutarch, *Cato min.* 9ff.
[103] Caesar, *B.Afr.* 54.1-3.
[104] Cf. ch. 7, pp.197-198.
[105] Caesar, *B.C.* 2.18.2; cf. 20.2-3.
[106] Caesar, *B.Afr.* 68.
[107] The use of junior officer positions and status to enhance the status of one's family is explored more generally in ch. 8, p.241ff.
[108] Caesar, *B.Afr.* 13.1, 78.4.
[109] Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 71; Castrén (1983) 93. For further examples, cf. ch. 8, p.241.
[110] Plutarch, *Cato min.* 8.1.

father-in-law and another relative on two campaigns as a *contubernalis*[111]; [281] L. Valerius Flaccus served as a *contubernalis* under his uncle before serving as a military tribune[112]; [90] P. Clodius served as a junior officer and as a *contubernalis* under a number of his relatives[113]; [275] C. Trebonius was presumably a relative of the legate of the same name[114]; and [86] L. Clodius, the *praefectus fabrum* of Ap. Claudius Pulcher, was presumably a relative of his commander[115]. Cicero took with him to Cilicia his brother (as a legate) and his son and nephew. While Q. Cicero took an active part in military life, commanding a legion along with Cicero against the Parthians, the two boys, neither of whom had put on the *toga uirilis*, were sent away during the fighting for safety. The *consilium* of Pompeius Strabo apparently shows a number of relatives serving together: there are three Pompeii besides Pompeius Strabo himself, one possibly a military tribune; three Aebutii, one possibly a military tribune; two Iunii, one possibly a legate; two Minucii, one probably a quaestor; two Otacilii; two Terentii; and two Nonii[116]. Taking relatives on campaign was a tradition, which continued into the Principate, and numerous inscriptions record sons accompanying their fathers[117], a practice no doubt encouraged by Augustus' taking Tiberius and Maecenas with him to Spain, with Tiberius serving as a military tribune[118]. In fact, as Kleijwegt argues[119], among the municipal elite it was normal practice in the Republic and the Principate for sons to accompany their fathers and relatives on campaign. Even the very young could attain military glory and renown: it is reported that M. Aemilius Lepidus, while still a boy, killed an enemy in battle, and a statue of him as a boy was placed on the Capitol in his honour[120]. During the Triumviral period it became common for relatives or freedmen to be placed in positions of responsibility. In addition to Pompeius' freedmen[121], M. Octauius (a relative of the future Augustus) served as a naval commander, possibly as a prefect (though more probably a legate),

[111] Cicero, *Planc.* 27.
[112] Cicero, *Flacc.* 6, 63, 101; Schol. Bob. 8; cf. Appendix: L. Valerius Flaccus.
[113] As a junior officer: Dio 36.14-18; Plutarch, *Luc*. 34.2-4; as a *contubernalis*: Cicero, *Harus. Resp*. 42.
[114] Caesar, *B.G.* 6.40.4; cf. 6.33; Cicero, *ad Q.F.* 3.1.9.
[115] Cicero, *ad Fam*. 3.8.5; cf. 3.4.1-2, 3.5.3, 3.6.2.
[116] Criniti (1970) 16-26 (for full references, see (e.g.) [5] [---] CIL 6.37045)). Note, however, that only in the cases of the Terentii and Nonii do all the holders of the same *nomen* belong to the same tribe.
[117] CIL 6.1682, 8.1873, 9.39. For a complete list, see Kleijwegt (1991) 194.
[118] Suetonius, *Tib.* 9.1; cf. Dio 53.26; Pliny, *N.H.* 14.64; cf. [83] Ti. Claudius Nero.
[119] Kleijwegt (1991) 193ff.
[120] Valerius Maximus 3.1.1; cf. Tacitus, *Ann.* 3.21; CIL 10.7257 = ILS 939 = EDH HD006236 (Eryx, Sicilia).
[121] Cf. ch. 4, pp.131-132.

at Actium[122]; and two of Caesar's relatives served under him as junior officers[123]. Josephus' mention of T. Ampius Menander, a freedman of the legate T. Ampius Balbus, among the *consilium* of Lentulus Crus[124] shows that this happened at a lower level as well.

The reasons for inviting a relative on campaign might go beyond simply enhancing the status of the family. No doubt a junior officer would be grateful for familiar faces on campaign: the scene described by Plutarch, where Cato's friends promise his fearful wife that they will take care of him on campaign and keep him safe, shows that such companionship was valued[125], and it is very likely that the support of family members would have been valued in the same way. However, it must almost always have been the case that someone given a formal posting would use the opportunity to benefit his own circle, and his family above all.

Furthering one's political career

Beyond the obvious advantages of the support of a powerful individual, there were other political benefits to be derived from service as a junior officer. Some of these were indirect benefits. Licinius Murena's *praefectus fabrum* gave seats at the circus or theatre to voting officials while *praefectus fabrum*, and the ensuing accusation of bribery suggests strongly that he saw this as a way in which to enhance his future career[126]. More respectably, Murena was, Cicero claimed, frequently mentioned in dispatches by Lucullus, and mentions such as these (in letters to the Senate) could only have advanced an individual's political career[127]. Caesar's histories of the Gallic and Civil Wars, as Welch notes, are particularly important in this regard[128].

Moreover, election to the military tribunate also provided its own advantages. As we have seen[129], there was little difference between the elected and appointed military tribunes[130] other than the manner of their appointment. In fact, in one respect it may have been a disadvantage to be elected to the military tribunate: a man seeking appointment to a military tribunate would in a sense have some choice over his

[122] Plutarch, *Ant*. 65.1-2; cf. *M. Octauius*.
[123] [143] L. Iulius Caesar: Caesar, *B.C.* 2.23.3; [144] Sex. Iulius Caesar: Caesar, *B.C.* 2.20.7.
[124] Josephus, *A.J.* 14.239; cf. Cicero, *ad Fam.* 13.70; cf. *T. Ampius Menander*.
[125] Plutarch, *Cato min.* 9; cf. Valerius Maximus 4.3.2.
[126] Cicero, *Mur.* 73; cf. [16] [---] (Cicero, *Murena* 73).
[127] Cicero, *Mur.* 20.
[128] Welch (1998) 87.
[129] Cf. ch. 2, pp.62-64.
[130] Cf. Nicolet (1969) 133-134.

campaign and commander, but elected military tribunes were selected by lot to serve in the consuls' armies[131]. Those standing for election as military tribune, who by that stage would know both the consular provinces to be appointed and the consuls who would go out to them, but not to which consul they would be assigned, might end up with the sheep tracks of southern Italy as an assignment, rather than a province with the opportunity of military glory or financial reward, or end up with a less-than-generous commander. Anybody who wished to enter the military tribunate in pursuit of these things might be better advised to apply directly to a commander. It is reasonable, therefore, to suggest that the competition for the elected post of military tribune might vary considerably from year to year, depending upon the commands that were at stake. Why, therefore, would a young Roman choose to stand for election? While it is probable that the elected military tribunes enjoyed a slightly higher status, I would suggest that in the late Republic there was, for ambitious members of the elite, a more immediate political purpose: it is likely that the prestige of election, and the visibility it provided, would be incentive enough to stand. The elected post of military tribune offered the opportunity to campaign for political office in Rome, and – for a short time at least – to take an active part in political life. In the second century there was normally a great number of candidates[132], and the post was contested keenly in the first century: L. Philippus failed in his quest to be elected to the position despite his merits and noble eloquence[133]. Caesar is portrayed as seeking election for political reasons. He had served in the army for a number of years with distinction under Thermus but returned to Rome and stood for election as military tribune: both Plutarch and Suetonius record that the motives for his return to Rome were political, Suetonius commenting that the revolt of Lepidus had stirred up the political system and offered prospects of a rapid advancement[134]. He was elected to the post of military tribune and participated in the agitation to undo Sulla's legislation and restore the powers of the tribunes of the *plebs*[135]. Caesar's election was clearly a popular one, as he was elected at the top of the poll ahead of C. Popilius, who was to become tribune of the *plebs* in 68BC[136]. At a time when *popularis* activity had been partially suppressed by Sulla, Caesar, as a military tribune (possibly as a military

[131] Polybius 6.19.
[132] Polybius, 6.35.4.
[133] Cicero, *Planc.* 52.
[134] Suetonius, *Caes.* 3; cf. Plutarch, *Caes.* 3.
[135] Suetonius, *Caes.* 5.
[136] Plutarch, *Caes.* 5.

tribune designate) was active in the lawcourts[137], and supported a law to return his brother-in-law, L. Cinna, from exile[138]. The status which being a military tribune conferred upon him may well have helped in his political campaigning. Standing for the military tribunate also gave Caesar a chance to stand for election for the first time. That it was remembered and noted that Caesar had been elected "top of the poll" shows that there was electoral competition, and that there was status to be gained not merely by being elected, but in particular by receiving the most votes. It is clear that Caesar did not seek election simply because he wanted a posting in the following year: with his record and status, he was practically assured of one, had he wanted it.

Marius' election is also described in the context of his political success in later life and his popularity with the people. Although Sallust suggests that it was his military prowess that won him his post, he also suggests that Marius stood for the post in order to win political kudos in Rome and make his mark with the electorate – an electorate which, Sallust comments, knew of his achievements but not his face: "plerisque faciem eius ignorantibus, factis notus per omnis"[139]. The younger Cato also enhanced his reputation by standing for the military tribunate and being the only candidate who did not use a nomenclator. In doing so, he enhanced his image as upright and moral, although, Plutarch reports, this brought discomfort to some[140]. Both the visibility of candidacy and the act of being elected may well have been important ends for many of the elected military tribunes in an age where visibility at Rome was crucial for a further political career.

Political activity by military tribunes in Rome is hinted at elsewhere. Cicero in the Verrine orations talks of three "tribuni militum designati" ([103] M. Crepereius, [72] L. Cassius, [276] Cn. Tremellius), who were men of principle and who could be relied upon by Cicero to give a just verdict[141]. However, we should note that L. Cassius was already a senator, actively involved in politics, not a young man just starting a political career (further evidence, perhaps, of the importance of the act of being elected to the military tribunate). We should not assume that, because we have few other mentions of military tribunes being politically active in Rome, this did not happen often. Caesar's activities are commented upon only by his biographers: those

[137] Plutarch, *Caes.* 3-4; Suetonius, *Caes.* 3-4.
[138] Suetonius, *Caes.* 5.
[139] Sallust, *Iug.* 63.5.
[140] Plutarch, *Cato min.* 8.2.
[141] Cicero, *Verr.* 1.30.10.

that did not receive a biography (or whose biographies have not survived) have almost all faded into obscurity. And even for those whose biographies do survive, we cannot argue from silence: it is a salutary reminder that while Sallust mentions Marius' military tribunate and describes his election in great detail, Plutarch makes no mention of it at all. The careers and political involvement of young men in general go largely unrecorded in our sources.

In addition, there were other electoral benefits that might stem from service as a junior officer. As we shall see[142], military experience and proven military ability were regarded as important qualities. Roman magistrates were, after all, also expected to be military commanders if necessary[143]. A man who had no military experience would therefore have been at a disadvantage against a candidate with military experience. This experience would have been important in preparing a senator for his first command[144], and this can be seen, according to Suetonius, in Augustus' motivations for encouraging the sons of senators to serve as junior officers[145]. Service as a junior officer, especially competent service, would, as Tacitus suggests[146], help an individual to obtain higher office during the Principate, such as L. Tarius Rufus, suffect consul in 16BC, who was "infima natalium humilitate consulatum militari industria meritus"[147]. In addition, equestrian junior officers who were not likely to obtain senatorial office would nevertheless have sought imperial favour for further promotion, such as procuratorships or, indeed, further junior officer positions[148].

Deriving financial benefits from military service

Members of the elite did not serve in the army without financial reward: even those who defend the notion of 'defensive imperialism' acknowledge that the financial benefits of victory were part and parcel of the Roman concept of war[149]. Soldiers received a significant amount of booty in victory, and officers gained far more than the common soldier, along with a higher stipend from the state. Exactly how much junior officers were paid is, unfortunately, unknown. The imperial period does give us

[142] Cf. ch. 7, pp.198-199.
[143] Cf. Rosenstein (2005) 139.
[144] Cf. McAlindon (1957) 194-195; Campbell (1975) 18ff.
[145] Suetonius, *Aug.* 38.2.
[146] Tacitus, *Agr.* 4.6.
[147] Pliny, *N.H.* 28.37; cf. Demougin (1983) 292.
[148] Cf. Brunt (1983) 44.
[149] E.g. Gruen (1984) 288; Sherwin-White (1980) 177.

some figures for officer pay[150], and Velleius Paterculus refers to the beginning of his junior officer service as the start of his *stipendia*[151], but it is unlikely that the imperial figures can be translated into their late Republican, civil war, or Triumviral equivalents. However, it is clear that both military tribunes and prefects usually received money from their commanders, since they are among those listed by Cicero as receiving the payments he has to detail to the Senate in respect of his proconsulship[152]. Moreover, Cicero also records, in a separate letter, that L. Gauius requested the "cibaria" of a prefect[153], and the term suggests, in some measure, that junior officers were paid a sum (or sums) of money. However, there is no evidence that these payments were standardised across the Roman world, nor that there was a regular pay structure. Indeed, the fact that Cicero had to account for these payments separately perhaps suggests that the amounts a commander paid were discretionary. It is worth noting in addition that Cicero also had to account for payments to *contubernales* – perhaps, in part, this is what Cicero alludes to when mentioning Caesar's generosity to Trebatius[154], and Caesar took care to portray himself as a generous commander, also claiming to have given money to non-Romans in his service[155].

Moreover, in the period 49 – 31BC, at least, some junior officers could expect rewards of money and land, similar to those expected by the troops they commanded. Military tribunes who had served under Caesar were awarded valuable land in the *ager Semurius*[156]; and Ofillius' rejection of honours in 36BC, stating that an appropriate reward for a soldier was land and money[157], suggests that this practice continued, or was expected to continue, under Octavian. The presence of former military tribunes in post-Actium colonies[158] is strong evidence that the practice continued into the early Augustan period at least, perhaps as a result of the new regime's fulfilment of an earlier promise. Significantly, however, there is no evidence that military prefects were rewarded in this way, or that similar payments were made

[150] Cf. Saller (1980) 45.
[151] Velleius 2.101; cf. Saddington (2003) 19.
[152] Cicero, *ad Fam*. 5.20.7; cf. Badian (1997) 16.
[153] Cicero, *ad Att.* 6.3.5; cf. *L. Gauius*.
[154] Cicero, *ad Fam.* 7.17.3.
[155] Caesar, *B.C.* 3.59; cf. Drinkwater (1978) 826; for an example the resentment an ungenerous commander might create, see Catullus on his service under Memmius in Bithinya: "praesertim quibus esset irrumator / praetor, nec faceret pili cohortem" (Catullus 10.9ff.; cf. 28).
[156] Cicero, *Phil*. 6.14, 7.17; Macrobius, *Sat*. 1.10.16.
[157] Appian, *B.C.* 5.128; cf. Dio 49.13; cf. [202] Ofillius.
[158] Cf. ch. 8, pp.230-231.

to military tribunes at other times – further evidence, perhaps, of a decline in status in the military tribunate during the period 49 – 31BC.

Service in the army had other financial benefits besides pay. Cicero wrote to his brother, serving as a legate under Caesar in Gaul, as follows:

> "Whether you are to hurry home, as we had discussed, or remain where you are, if there is any reason for doing so, in order to extricate yourself from your difficulties ... I prefer the course you yourself think preferable. I, too, consider these things to be of great importance – plentiful funds for yourself and extrication from your burden of debt"[159].

Here Quintus, serving as a legate under Caesar, is shown as wanting to remain with the army in Gaul for the sole purpose of extracting himself from financial debt. The statement Cicero makes is clear: service in the army was a profitable thing, and especially so for a legate. Junior officers, and even *contubernales*, could hope to benefit similarly[160]. The profitability of such service is made even more explicit in a series of letters from Cicero to Trebatius Testa, who was serving along with Quintus in Gaul under Caesar. Cicero writes: "[if Caesar is acting in your interests or you think he is going to,] by all means keep going in your military service and stay. I shall console myself for my loss of you by the hope that it will be to your benefit. But if, on the other hand, things are not paying with you, come back to us ... if you hold a position for yourself worthy of my introduction, you should put up with the loss of my company and further your own career and wealth"[161]. It is clear that the main reason for Trebatius, who, unlike Quintus, was a young man at the start of his career, to be in Gaul was to further his legal career and to gain wealth. The connections that Trebatius would be able to make are presented as important, but the opportunities for financial gain are also made explicit: "I give you this warning, that you will never find a better opportunity, if you let this slip, either of securing the friendship of a most illustrious

[159] Cicero, *ad Q.f.* 2.15b.2-3: "utrum aduoles ut dixerimus an ad expediendum te, si causa sit, commorere ... quod putas magis e re tua. nam illa etiam magni aestimo, ἀμφιλαφίαν illam tuam et explicationem debitorum tuorum".
[160] Cf. Cicero, *de Orat.* 2.269; Braund (1998) 12.
[161] Cicero, *ad Fam.* 7.11.2: "perfer istam militiam et permane; ego enim desiderium tui spe tuorum commodorum consolabor; sin autem ista sunt inaniora, recipe te ad nos ... [si istic] tuam dignitatem obtinebis, perferas nostri desiderium, honestatem et facultates tuas augeas".

and liberal man, or of enjoying a wealthier province"[162]. That Trebatius was there to make a profit is explicitly stated: wealthy provinces were something for young men to enjoy and exploit. Cicero in fact goes even further than this:

> "At times you appeared to me – if you'll pardon the expression – to be light-minded in your longing for the city and its life, at others lazy, at others timid in undertaking military work, and often even – which is alien to your nature – rather presumptuous. *For it was as though you had [in joining Caesar in Gaul] brought a bill of exchange, and not a letter of recommendation, to your commander*, and you were in a hurry to take your money and return home" (my emphasis)[163].

The statement that Trebatius may have looked upon his posting as a "bill of exchange" to be cashed in as soon as possible shows us not merely that military service was extremely profitable, but that it could be looked upon as a cash-cow: Trebatius expected that his mere presence in Caesar's entourage would reap sufficient financial rewards for him to return quickly to Rome a richer man.

Cicero provides us with a great deal of evidence regarding the links between Roman officials and the world of business. Cicero's association with businessmen began even before he reached Cilicia. In Samos and Ephesus he was greeted by *publicani* "as though I had come with *imperium*", and he informed Atticus that "I took care of your little business affairs at Ephesus, and although Thermus before my arrival had been most generous in his promises to all your people, I still introduced Philogenes and Seius to him"[164]. It is clear from this that Cicero's behaviour here is unexceptional, given that another Roman official – Minucius Thermus, the propraetor in Asia – was also happy to aid Atticus. In fact, Cicero frequently "introduced" Roman businessmen or their agents to provincial officials[165]. M. Anneius, Cicero's legate, was even allowed to leave his province to pursue business dealings in Sardis[166]. It was only

---

[162] Cicero, *ad Fam.* 7.17.3: "tantum moneo, neque amicitiae confirmandae clarissimi ac liberalissimi uiri neque uberioris prouinciae neque aetatis magis idoneum tempus, si hoc amiseris, te esse ullum umquam reperturum".
[163] Cicero, *ad Fam*. 7.17.1: "quod mihi interdum (pace tua dixerim) leuis in urbis urbanitatisque desiderio, interdum piger, interdum timidus in labore militari, saepe autem etiam, quod a te alienissimum est, subimpudens uidebare. tamquam enim syngrapham ad imperatorem non epistulam attulisses, sic pecunia ablata domum redire properabas".
[164] Cicero, *ad Att.* 5.13: "tua negotiola Ephesi curae mihi fuerunt, Thermoque, tametsi ante aduentum meum liberalissime erat pollicitus tuis omnibus, tamen Philogenem et Seium tradidi".
[165] Cf. Cotton (1985) 331ff.; (1986) 445ff.
[166] Cicero, *ad Fam.* 13.55.

when the Parthians began to invade Syria, and Cicero felt the need of a capable officer at his side, that Cicero wrote to Minucius Thermus asking for his legate to come back[167]. Anneius was a capable soldier and a man of such considerable military experience that he might be numbered among the *homines militares*, yet he was also active in business: the roles were mutually compatible.

While Cicero and Anneius were, of course, both high-ranking individuals, the business activities and concerns of those at a lower level are also attested. In respect of a slightly earlier period, Sallust comments that, when Marius began to campaign for the consulship:

> "All this talk [of ending the war swiftly] appealed more strongly to the men of business ... In this way Marius (but to a greater extent the hope of peace) persuaded [a Numidian rebel] and the Roman *equites*, both those who were in the army and those who were doing business in the town (*milites et negotiatores*) …" (Sallust, *Iug*. 64.6-65.4)[168].

Thus it is clear that, in Sallust's view, there were many equestrians among Metellus' army who were "greedy" for the war to end, as they were losing money – presumably through the interruption of trade. Their presence in the army would have given them authority and allowed them many privileges – especially the right to travel freely in the province and to requisition supplies and lodgings. For this reason many businessmen obtained nominal prefectures before travelling to a province, and such prefectures were, it seems, willingly handed out by many governors. Cicero writes to Atticus that Brutus would be allowed to give his agents in the region prefectures so long as they were not actively on business in his own province"[169]. However, this was as a result of Cicero's own view on the matter, not the requirements of the law, as Appius Claudius – Cicero's predecessor – had allowed men doing business in his province to take up prefectures[170].

We find other evidence of junior officers and *contubernales* engaging in business. Cicero, in defending Caelius, comments that, "he went into Africa, as a comrade of Quintus Pompeius the proconsul, one of the most temperate of men, and one of the

[167] Cicero, *ad Fam*. 13.57.
[168] In any case, it was customary for a number of businessmen to accompany the army to buy booty from soldiers for ready cash: see Polybius 14.7.2-3; Livy 34.9.12; Appian, *Lib*. 115.
[169] Cicero, *ad Att*. 6.1.3.
[170] Cicero, *ad Att*. 6.2.8.

most attentive to every duty. And as his paternal property and possessions were in that province, he thought that some experience of its habits and feelings might be usefully acquired by him"[171]. While it is not explicitly stated that, while the *contubernalis* of a strict general, he engaged in business, this is surely implied; it is rather unlikely that Caelius examined his estates but did no actual business. Similarly [237] Cato, when he travelled to Macedon as military tribune, was accompanied by fifteen slaves, two freedmen and four of his friends[172]: it seems somewhat unlikely that he would have needed so large an entourage just to fulfil his military duties. It is worth noting that military tribunes were granted two months of leave, and the same may also have been true of *praefecti fabrum*[173], during which they could have engaged in business. We know from Cicero that it was common practice for the elite to send freedmen into the provinces to engage in business on their behalf, and this is probably the reason for the presence of some of the freedmen in Cato's entourage. Moreover, just as soldiers could be businessmen, so businessmen could become soldiers, if necessary. During the civil war, Caesar placed the town of Gades and six cohorts in the charge of [131] C. Gallonius "a Roman knight, the friend of Domitius, who had sent him to look after an inheritance of his"[174]. It is worth noting too that former junior officers can be found as *publicani*[175]. The analysis of Nicolet suggests that more than one in six known junior officers were primarily businessmen[176].

The legitimate opportunities for those stationed in a "wealthy province" such as Gaul were many. The opportunities for those prepared to break the law were even greater, and corruption was rife: two of Caesar's cavalrymen were punished for stealing pay and for appropriating booty[177]. Caesar, complaining that the administration of Caecilius Scipio in Syria was corrupt and harsh, writes:

> "Not only in cities, but almost in villages and in single little fortresses, men were put in independent command, and extremes of atrocity or cruelty on their part earned them the name of being good men and the best citizens. The province was full of official attendants and

[171] Cicero, *Cael.* 73.
[172] Plutarch, *Cato Min.* 9.2.
[173] Military tribunes: Plutarch, *Cato min.* 10.2; *praefecti fabrum*: Cicero, *Murena* 73.
[174] Caesar, *B.C.* 2.18.
[175] See Nicolet (1969) 150-152.
[176] Nicolet (1969) 150-152; cf. McCall (2002) 133-135.
[177] Caesar, *B.C.* 3.59 .

commands, it was packed with *praefecti* and collectors, who took for themselves as well as collecting the money that was demanded"[178].

Cicero might boast that the careful conduct of his legates, tribunes and prefects had saved the province a great deal of money, but it is an obvious implication that this was not usually the case[179]. Many of these prefects, of course, were civilian prefects, but not all of them will have been civilian. In the Republic, prefects were not covered by the Gracchan *lex repetundarum*, and their actions would be difficult to prosecute – a major incentive for less than ethical prospective officers.

Cicero's own conflicts with unethical businessmen are well known: Brutus' prefect, [248] M. Scaptius, used Roman cavalry to attempt to force the Salaminians into paying exorbitant interest on a debt that they owed to Brutus, keeping the Salaminian senators shut up in their senate-house for so long that some died of hunger[180]. This may seem an extreme example, but Scipio's prefects in Syria were also using military force for financial benefit. Of course, the writings of Cicero, Caesar and Sallust sometimes show others in a bad light because it was convenient for the author to blacken an individual or a cause. Yet in all our evidence there is nothing which implies that there was anything unusual about soldiers' engaging in corrupt business dealings (let alone in legitimate business). It is clear that junior officers were perfectly free to engage in business dealings in their provinces while in service, and that many took the opportunity to do so.

[178] Caesar, *B.C.* 3.32.4: "Non solum urbibus, sed paene uicis castellisque singulis cum imperio praeficiebantur. Qui horum quid acerbissime crudelissimeque fecerat, is et uir et ciuis optimus habebatur. Erat plena lictorum et imperiorum prouincia, differta praefectis atque exactoribus: qui praeter imperatas pecunias suo etiam priuato compendio seruiebant".
[179] Cicero, *ad Att*. 5.17.
[180] Cicero, *ad Att.* 6.2.8.

Ch. 7: Perceptions of Service as a Junior Officer

The importance of the junior officer positions cannot be properly understood without attempting to assess how Romans perceived them. As we have seen, the names and positions of only the barest fraction of the total number of junior officers from our period have survived, and the validity of the picture they present is heavily compromised by the nature and survival of our sources.

The first section of this chapter assesses the extent to which military service was a normal part of the upbringing of members of the senatorial and equestrian elite, the extent to which members of that elite were obliged – either by law or custom – to serve in the army, and the concepts of a 'military reputation' and of "homines militares". The second section of this chapter analyses how service as a junior officer was described and depicted in our surviving sources (particularly the literary, epigraphic, and iconographic sources): the first part of this section examines the way in which the junior officers and their roles are represented by others, while the second part looks at the way in which individuals used junior officer positions in self-representation.

Elite military service in the period 91BC – AD14

As we have seen, it has been claimed that the first century saw a dramatic decline in the numbers of young members of the elite serving within the army, an alternative career-path being provided by the law courts and the minor civilian magistracies of Rome[1]. The decline in the martial character of the elite of the late Republic, as tabulated by Suolahti, is sometimes taken for granted[2], but this view ought to come under challenge, and in the first part of this section I attempt to show that military service was still normal for members of the Roman elite, and an important way in which young men could establish a good reputation, while in the second I examine the significance of the notions of having a military reputation and being a "homo militaris" as they pertain to junior officers.

Service requirements, conscription, and military service as a contubernalis

[1] Cf. ch. 1, p.13.
[2] E.g. Gruen (1974) 116, Smith (1958) 60.

There is evidence that, by the first century BC, the service requirements of the second century BC had lapsed to some extent. As noted above[3], the service requirement for military tribunes appears to have been dropped, and many members of the Roman elite, such as Cicero, did not serve in the army for an extended period of time. However, it is worth noting that the only high-profile individual who is said *not* to have served in the army before his political career is Sulla, who is described as "rudis...et ignarus belli" by Sallust[4]. However, this passage should not be taken too literally, and it is worth noting that Lucullus' military inexperience, as portrayed by Cicero, was due not to his not having performed military service, but to his not having seen active combat[5]. Velleius – perhaps keen to emphasise his own military background – draws a distinction between the leisure of camp life in well-established legion bases and the discipline of active service on campaign, where luxuries were few[6]. In addition, we should expect, had many men attained high office with no military experience at all, that the accusation would frequently be flung in their faces by their detractors.

Military service did not, of course, have to involve service as a junior officer. Those members of the elite who wished to serve in the army, but who were either unable or unwilling to hold a junior officer post, had the option of accompanying the commander or a friend as a *contubernalis*. *Contubernales* are described by Polybius as those who had chosen to go to war out of friendship with the commander, although, as we have seen[7], men of other ranks could take a retinue with them as well. They were generally young men, although this was not always the case, and Livy records that 80 senators, or those who had held political office and would have been senators at the next censorship, died at Cannae after joining the army as volunteers, probably as *contubernales*[8]. The large *consilia* of Pompeius Strabo and Domitius Ahenobarbus[9] show how many young members of the senatorial and equestrian elite might accompany a commander on campaign.

Service as a *contubernalis* did not simply mean that one participated in camp life, or took part in military games. Four young "equites Romani", one the son of a senator,

[3] Cf. ch. 2, p.62; cf. Rosenstein (2005) 143.
[4] Sallust, *Iug.* 96.1.
[5] Cicero, *Acad.* 2.2.
[6] Velleius 2.117.2.
[7] Cf. ch. 6, pp.182-183.
[8] Livy 22.49.6.
[9] Cf. ch. 1, pp.34-36.

were killed under Caesar in 48BC[10], while Cato's son led a unit of aristocratic young men, including Cassius' son, at Pharsalus – a battle which also claimed the sons of Lucullus and Hortensius[11]. Notably, Cato's son is depicted as fighting on foot, which suggests that young members of the elite did not necessarily fight as cavalry, although it is likely that most did serve as cavalry, perhaps as part of the small contingent of cavalry attached to the legion[12]. This, presumably, is what is meant when a member of the Roman elite is described as having served as a "miles": Cicero records that [138] Hortensius served as a military tribune in his second year of service, having been a "miles" in the previous year[13]; Cato joined his brother [256] [Q. Seruilius] Caepio – who was a military tribune in the army of Gellius during the slave war against Spartacus – and fought as a *contubernalis*[14]; and [281] Valerius Flaccus probably served under his uncle as a *miles* in 82BC[15]. That *contubernales* might be involved in combat is also implied by the military reputations obtained by Caesar and Marius before their election to the military tribunate[16]. The practice of serving as a *contubernalis* continued well into the Principate. In the Augustan period, for example, Maecenas was probably a *contubernalis* under Augustus[17], while Velleius records the valiant death of Coelius Caldus, a man of consular and recent senatorial ancestry, who was probably a *contubernalis*[18].

Moreover, *contubernales* might be given a prefecture or a military tribunate, and might have previously held junior officer positions: [290] Velleius Paterculus joined Tiberius' army in Germany after his military tribunate, but before his equestrian prefecture[19]. *Contubernales* could also perform other important roles within the camp: not every role, or every job, was a prefecture. We see this distinction in Cicero's request for a place on Caesar's staff for Trebatius ("huic ego neque tribunatum neque

[10] Caesar, *B.C.* 3.71; cf. *Tuticanus Gallus*, *C. Felginas*, *A. Granius*, *M. Sacratiuir*.
[11] Appian, *B.C.* 4.135; cf. Velleius 2.71.2; Plutarch, *Brut.* 49.5, *Cato Min.* 73-74; Zonarius 10.20; cf. [238] M. Porcius Cato (2).
[12] Cf. Breeze (1969) 50ff.
[13] Cicero, *Brut.* 229, 304.
[14] Plutarch, *Cato Min.* 8.1. It is worth noting that [34] Antonius was initially invited by Gabinius to serve as a *contubernalis* – the word used by Plutarch is ἰδιώτης, meaning "private soldier" (Plutarch, *Ant.* 3.1; cf. LSJM 'ἰδιώτης').
[15] Cicero, *Flacc.* 63; cf. Badian (1989) 87ff.
[16] Cf. ch. 6, p.187.
[17] Suetonius, *Tib.* 9.1; cf. Dio 53.26; Pliny, *N.H.* 14.64.
[18] Velleius 2.120.6; cf. Saddington (2003) 23. There is no evidence, despite Saddington's suggestion, that Caldus (PIR(2) C1242) was a junior officer.
[19] Velleius 2.104; cf. Saddington (2003) 19.

praefecturam neque ullius benefici certum nomen peto"[20]), and an example of the latter is surely the role ascribed to the father of the historian Pompeius Trogus: "sub C. Caesare militasse epistularumque ac legationum, simul et annuli curam habuisse"[21]. If a man was given a responsibility that lay within the camp, and with the commander, then the responsibility might well not be a prefecture.

I would disagree with Suolahti's suggestion that those individuals of high status who served as junior officers did so because of a conspicuous, and unusual, respect for tradition. A number of young men from important families in the late Republic are attested as serving as junior officers: the young [90] P. Clodius Pulcher for example, not traditionally seen as the greatest respecter of aristocratic tradition. Moreover, P. Licinius Crassus, Caesar, the younger Cato, and Hortensius all served as military tribunes, and M. Antonius served as a prefect. As we have seen, most of them had also served as *contubernales*, as did Brutus and Marius. It is plausible to maintain that, in fact, the political elite of the late Republic all had some level of military experience. The junior officer posts were, however, so much less important than consulships or praetorships that they were unlikely to be recorded in our sources unless there was a specific reason to do so. Significantly, most of our evidence of the early military careers of the Roman political elite comes from Plutarch's biographies, and, as is seen in the case of Marius, he did not always think that a junior officer post was worth mentioning. As we have seen, senators did indeed hold junior officer positions in the late Republic. If the military tribunate still appealed to senators such as [72] L. Cassius[22], it is hardly likely that it had entirely lost its appeal to senators' sons.

We should also recognise that many of the systemic pressures identified by Harris in the second century existed in the first: in particular, military success, and military service, were still important ways in which a young man who wanted a future political career might distinguish himself. A young man serving as a junior officer, and even as a *contubernalis*, might still win fame and renown: Sertorius won fame and promotion fighting the Teutones and Cimbri in Gaul, perhaps as a cavalryman, and as a military tribune he made his name known throughout Spain for his daring defence of

[20] Cicero, *ad Fam.* 7.5.3.
[21] Justin 43.5.12.
[22] Broughton (1951-1986) 3.50.

Castulo[23]; both Marius and Cato also won renown for their military daring while young men[24]. Junior officers could also gain a reputation for military achievements by being decorated by their commanders. [34] M. Antonius was awarded *dona* for bravery as a junior officer[25], as was [102] Faustus Cornelius Sulla[26]. While the opportunities to win *gloria* may have faded, the chance to demonstrate *uirtus* and *disciplina* remained[27]. Military service may not have been as lengthy as it had once been, but experiencing it still appears to have been normal practice for young members of the elite. Moreover, Cicero's claim in the *pro Fonteio* that military studies had become obsolete among the young[28] is contradicted in other works. In the *pro Murena* he claims that military service was the primary route to a political career[29], and a far better route to success than oratorical skill. In the *de Officiis*[30] he argues that, *despite popular perception*, affairs in war were not more important than the affairs of the city. The cumulative evidence of his work suggests that in fact martial values and military study were alive and well in the Rome of the late Republic. Indeed, Cicero's joke to Domitius Ahenobarbus that one of the men he was recommending as a junior officer would be better suited as a guardian[31] suggests that, like Trebatius, even those who were possibly ill-fitted to military service nevertheless sought junior officer positions. In addition, the youth of Rome still practised military manoeuvres upon the *Campus Martius*[32], and still saw themselves as the heirs of their military forefathers; education in military matters remained a standard part of the education of the young Roman[33]. While extended military service may no longer have been necessary in practice, it is clear that, as Rosenstein suggests[34], military service still played an important part in the upbringing of the young elite of Rome and Italy, and was an important factor in determining their future success.

[23] Plutarch, *Sert.* 3.
[24] Plutarch, *Cato min.* 8.1, 9.2ff., *Mar.* 5.
[25] Plutarch, *Ant*. 3; Josephus, *A.J.* 14.86.
[26] Josephus, *A.J.* 14.73. For junior officers awarded *dona* in the Augustan period, see, for example, [115] C. Fabricius Tuscus and [292] M. Vergilius Gallus Lusius; cf. Maxfield (1981) 210-211, 213.
[27] Cf. Brunt (1971) 159; Harris (1979) 19; Goldsworthy (1996) 169.
[28] Cicero, *Font*. 42-43.
[29] Cicero, *Mur.* 21.
[30] Cicero, *de Off.* 1.121.
[31] Plutarch, *Cic.* 38.2.
[32] Cicero, *Cael.* 12.
[33] Harris (1979) 14, 17-19.
[34] Rosenstein (2005) 144.

The period of the civil wars and the Triumvirate, however, appears to have lessened the desire of young members of the senatorial elite to perform military service. Augustus appears to have taken steps to encourage young members of the elite directly to serve in the army – taking Tiberius and Maecenas with him to Spain (Tiberius as a military tribune)[35], restoring the "Troy game"[36], and encouraging the sons of senators to serve as cavalry commanders[37], for example – and while the speech given to Maecenas by Dio should probably be seen as more of a commentary on Dio's own time than the Augustan era[38], Maecenas' stress on the importance of ensuring that a suitable number of young men from the highest levels of the elite were adequately prepared for command makes perfect sense for the age of Augustus. There is no direct evidence as to why the sons of senators might be beginning to avoid military service, but the decreased opportunities to win recognition and fame, and the lessening of direct electoral competition that came from Augustus' domination of the political system, might be seen as sufficient reasons. Nevertheless, young men who wished to rise in the Augustan Senate would still, as Campbell argues[39], have required some military experience, and we should be careful not to assume that ambitious young men from the senatorial elite avoided military service.

Nor should we see the junior civilian magistracies or a career in the lawcourts as representing an alternative route for a young man desiring political success[40]. It is often supposed that, in the first century, these became the preferred routes to political success in place of dangerous and unrewarding military service. Such arguments do not hold up to scrutiny: the civilian magistracies and the lawcourts were not a first-century invention, and a civilian career was no bar to a military career. Moreover, the junior magistracies were part of the Roman political system during the entire second century, and the lawcourts were an essential part of any young politician's life in that period. There would be nothing at all to prevent a young man from being one of the *tresuiri capitales* one year and military tribune the next, and given the political advantages of a junior officer post it would have been foolish for an ambitious young man to shun one. Cato the Elder spent much of his early life winning renown in the

[35] Suetonius, *Tib.* 9.1; cf. Dio 53.26; Pliny, *N.H.* 14.64.
[36] On this, and the revival of military games throughout Italy in the Augustan period in general, see Devijver (1995) 177ff.
[37] Suetonius, *Aug*. 38.
[38] Dio 52.8.4ff.; cf. Millar (1964) 104; Saller (1980) 46ff.
[39] Campbell (1975) 23ff.; cf. McAlindon (1957) 194-195; Kleijwegt (1991) 191-196.
[40] Cf. Suolahti (1955) 34-35.

courts[41], and the young Scipio Aemilianus' seeking fame in hunting and in proving his manliness rather than in the lawcourts is presented as a notable exception to the normal activities of a young politician[42]. Among the talented orators of the *Brutus*, Pupius Piso won renown for his military and oratorical skills[43], as did Hortensius[44], and the young Caesar made a name for himself in the courts as well[45]. We should not take Cicero's career as a text-book case: Cicero was not merely a talented orator, he was the greatest orator of his generation and, as such, an exception to the rule, and it should be remembered that, after military success in Cilicia, he was eager for the glories of a triumph and for military honours. It should also be remembered that he had seen military service much earlier in life during the Social War. For other young men, the lawcourts would only have been part of the process of acquiring status and a reputation, and the junior officer posts were a prime opportunity for them to build contacts, to demonstrate their character, and to make money[46].

Indeed, there is evidence to suggest that the requirement to perform military service remained in force during the late Republic, if only in theory[47]. Pompeius, upon being elected consul for 70BC, was formally asked if he had, in fact, completed his military service: Plutarch also describes Pompeius' participation in the *transuectio equitum*[48], a ceremony where *equites*, presumably the *equites equo publico*, led their horses before the censors and affirmed that they had undertaken their proper military service: Pompeius had, of course, done so, and as an *imperator*[49]. This suggests that, for the *equites equo publico* at least, military service was still a *de iure* requirement. As Harris points out, even where exemption was technically available (as we know it was in the case of the sons of pontiffs and augurs), it must have been taken very rarely

[41] Plutarch, *Cato mai.* 1.
[42] Polybius 31.29.8-11.
[43] Cicero, *Brut*. 236, 308.
[44] Cicero, *Brut*. 229, 364.
[45] Plutarch, *Caes.* 3.
[46] For the 'career options' open to the sons of the senatorial elite in the Principate, see Kleijwegt (1991) 191-196; cf. Earl (1961) 62.
[47] Brunt (1971) 391, 401; Nicolet (1969) 132.
[48] Cf. Valerius Maximus 2.2.9; on the *transuectio equitum*, which traditionally took place on 15 July, and its resurrection under Augustus, see Veyne (1960) 100ff.; Demougin (1988) 150ff.; Wiseman (1995) 11ff.; Rebecchi (1999) 194ff.
[49] Plutarch, *Pomp.* 22.

indeed, and we do not hear of it among the Roman political elite of the late Republic[50].

During the civil war, Cassius Longinus, Pompeius' legate in Spain, attempted to levy local *equites* who were there on business as *negotiatores*. Their response was not enthusiastic: they did not wish to be drawn into a civil war or to serve in the army abroad, as they were very afraid of military service (presumably as cavalrymen) overseas. Longinus instead offered them the opportunity of buying themselves exemption from service, which was probably his aim all along; their response was angry, and they hatched a plot to kill him[51]. Clearly, the *equites* did not expect to be levied, and saw an attempt to conscript them as an attempt at extortion[52]. Nevertheless, it also shows that Longinus did have the legal right to levy them, and the sons of the provincial elite would certainly not have been immune from the levies of the civil wars. In addition, Suetonius records that Augustus sold into slavery an equestrian "quod duobus filiis adulescentibus causa detrectandi sacramenti pollices amputasset"[53]. The story itself is somewhat suspect, and it lacks any indication of historical context. Augustus appears to have been wary of conscription, even among non-equestrians, and it is difficult to believe that the sons of equestrians were regularly conscripted into the ranks of the Roman army. If the account of Suetonius is correct, then it perhaps belongs in the context of the crises of the Pannonian revolt or the defeat of Varus[54]. However, the passage in Suetonius is directly concerned with military discipline: it begins with restrictions on the senatorial elite (commanders being discouraged from returning to their wives except in winter), continues with this passage concerning equestrians, and then goes on to discuss disciplinary measures enforced on the rank-and-file, thereby providing an example of Augustus' strictness towards all three *ordines*. This story, which, suspiciously, contains a 'happy ending' (Augustus finally relented and allowed the man to live out his life freely), should probably not be considered historically accurate, despite the suggestion of Brunt to

[50] Willingness to serve despite immunity: Harris (1979) 36-37; immunity for the sons of pontiffs and augurs: Mommsen (1887-1888) 3.242-243.
[51] Caesar, *B.Alex*. 56.4ff.
[52] It is worth noting that this reluctance was not necessarily a first-century phenomenon: Livy (*Per*. 58) implies that some *equites* sought to evade the levy in the second century.
[53] Suetonius, *Aug.* 24.
[54] Brunt (1971) 414; Carter (1982) 118.

the contrary[55]; it is, however, further evidence that young members of the elite were liable for conscription.

One aspect of service as a junior officer that is often missed, and is, perhaps, hardest to analyse, is that, for many, it was enjoyable. The freedom from responsibility at home, as well as, perhaps, the chance to indulge in behaviour – especially sexual behaviour[56] – which would be frowned upon in Rome, provided junior officers with an incentive to serve. The most famous depictions of the 'party atmosphere' that could exist in camp come from Catullus, whose poems describing the licentious activities of Mamurra are well known[57]. However, while these verses are, by their nature, extreme in their depiction of scandalous behaviour, there are other sources which corroborate them to some extent: C. Gracchus is said to have prohibited excessive drinking, prostitutes and catamites among his *cohors*[58]; Horace fondly recalls the nights he spent drinking with his friend while on service under Brutus and Cassius; and Surena sought to present an image of the Romans as especially licentious when he captured two men who were in possession of salacious literature – even on campaign, he is said to have claimed, the Romans could not take their minds from lewd thoughts[59]. Admittedly, such passages are normally written to condemn such behaviour but they do, nevertheless, suggest that military service provided an opportunity to let one's hair down, away from the control of family and wider society[60]. It would be strange, in fact, if members of the Roman elite did not engage in activities usual to soldiers serving far from home, and it is likely that, away from the battlefield, drink and entertainments were plentiful. This was the case even in the early part of the second century, when the elder Cato criticised M. Nobilior and L. Quinctius Flamininus for including within their *cohors*, respectively, a poet and a young man of dubious reputation[61]. The lure of military glory and of camp life in a foreign land has always appealed to young men, and growing up in the martial society of Rome can only have helped to foster such ambitions. In fact, only once do we hear that the youth of Rome disdained military service: in 151BC there were not enough candidates for the military tribunate to fill the posts, although previously many times

[55] Brunt (1971) 391.
[56] Cf. Braund (1998) 14ff.
[57] Catullus 57; cf. 29, 94, 105, 113-114. See also Velleius 2.117.2.
[58] Gellius, *N.A*. 15.12.
[59] Plutarch, *Crass.* 31.3, 32.3-5.
[60] Cf. Braund (1998) 12ff.; Phang (2008) 1ff.
[61] M. Nobilior: Cicero, *Tusc. Disp*. 1.3; L. Quinctius Flamininus: Livy 39.42.8-12.

too many candidates suitable for the post had come forward[62]. This suggests that there was normally a surplus of young men willing to fight: only in a year when even legates refused to serve was there a shortage of military tribunes[63].

A military reputation – the "homines militares"

In addition to the general military ethos of the late Republic, there were, as literary sources clearly attest, individuals described as "military men". The prime example in our period is [215] M. Petreius, who was conveniently on hand to command the battle against Catiline when Antonius (a man with no attested experience of command) developed gout and was unable to lead his army. Petreius is described by Sallust as "homo militaris", because he had served in the army for more than thirty years with great glory as a tribune, prefect, legate, or praetor[64]. He went on to serve under a number of commanders, most notably under Pompeius, and he died in his sixties after nearly fifty years of military service[65].

Petreius was certainly an experienced soldier, one who had been promoted through successive officer ranks until he reached the praetorship and became a Pompeian legate in charge of legions. Elsewhere in Sallust's *Catiline* we find two other men described as "homines militares" – the two praetors who, on Cicero's orders, were detailed to guard the Mulvian bridge and arrest the conspirators by arrangement. Sallust here draws a distinction between Cicero and the military-minded praetors: "he fully explained why they were sent, but left the general course of action to their discretion"[66]. Cicero, like his consular colleague, left the actual soldiering to experienced men. In fact, we know a little of the careers of the two praetors, [281] L. Valerius Flaccus and C. Pomptinus, who had both served for a long time in the army (the former also being known to have served as a junior officer) before entering political life. Pomptinus was to accompany Cicero to Cilicia as a legate[67]. Appian reports that Cinna, possibly afraid of a confrontation with Sulla, sent Flauius Fimbria – who was, says Appian, skilled in military affairs – to the East along with the forces

[62] Polybius 6.35.4.
[63] Livy *Per.* 48; Polybius 6.35.4; Orosius 4.21.1; Valerius Maximus 3.2.6; cf. Nicolet (1969) 151-153; Cadiou (2009) 33ff.
[64] Sallust, *Cat.* 59.6.
[65] Velleius Paterculus 2.48.1; Caesar, *B.C.* 1.66.3; cf. Gruen (1974) 380.
[66] Sallust, *Cat.* 45.1-2: "Rem omnem aperit cuius gratia mittebantur, cetera, uti facto opus sit, ita agant permittit. Illi, homines militares ...".
[67] Gruen (1974) 381.

led by Valerius Flaccus (the suffect consul of 86BC[68]) in 85BC, because Flaccus was inexperienced in military matters[69]. The choice of [128] Fuluius Postumus to accompany Lentulus Marcellinus, on account of the latter's ill health, might be viewed as a similar sort of appointment[70]. Sallust also speaks of the need of the Roman army for experienced men: in his speech of candidacy to the Roman people, Marius is represented as deriding those of noble descent but no military experience who are appointed as military commanders but immediately search around for someone to command them[71]. In this context, it is worth noting that in Sallust's account, Sulla (not merely a noble, but a patrician), who went to Numidia as Marius' quaestor, is described as "with no previous experience and ignorant of war [rudis antea et ignarus belli]"[72] on leaving Rome.

Other senior commanders, such as Q. Marcius Crispus[73], are also described as experienced military men[74]: for example, Lucullus served under Sulla in the Social War and gave "many proofs of courage and understanding"[75]. These men were, of course, legates, magistrates, or promagistrates – although it is worth noting that a number are known to have been junior officers, and that part of Sallust's justification for his description of Petreius is that he had served as a junior officer. However, a number of junior officers are also identified as military men. While, as argued above[76], this does not necessarily make such men professional or career officers, it is nevertheless important to recognise that junior officers could obtain a significant military reputation. Caesar recruited into his army one [91] P. Considius, a man who "rei militaris peritissimus habebatur et in exercitu L. Sullae et postea in M. Crassi fuerat"[77]. Other young men are similarly described: [68] D. Carfulenus, an officer in Caesar's army, was "et animi magnitudine et rei militaris scientia uirum praestantem"[78]; [123] Flauius Gallus, an officer serving under Antonius, who was killed against the Parthians, was "efficient and able"[79]. [33] D. Antonius, placed in

[68] Also the father of [281] L. Valerius Flaccus; cf. RE 'Valerius' 178.
[69] Appian, *Mith.* 51.
[70] Caesar, *B.C.* 3.52.4.
[71] Sallust, *Iug.* 85.10-11.
[72] Sallust, *Iug.* 96.1.
[73] Cicero, *Pis.* 54; cf. *Q. Marcius Crispus*.
[74] On "homines militares" in the Principate, cf. Campbell (1975) 11ff.
[75] Plutarch, *Luc.* 2.1-3.
[76] Cf. ch. 6, p.168.
[77] Caesar, *B.G.* 1.21.
[78] Caesar, *B.Alex.* 31.
[79] Plutarch, *Ant.* 42.2.

charge of a levy of veterans, is described by Cicero as "uirum fortem mihique in primis probatum"[80]; [43] Q. Atius Varus, a *praefectus equitum* under Caesar, was "singularis et animi et prudentiae uir"[81]. In addition, three Romans – Volumnius, Gratus and Rufus[82] – were appointed to significant positions of military command under Herod, and it is likely that they too were experienced officers[83]. However, *uiri militares* are generally presented as exceptional, something that is suggested by Cicero's question in the *pro Fonteio* about whether his audience think that the Roman People has an abundance of military men[84]. In general, therefore, the young elite of the our period were neither dedicated military men nor complete strangers to military service: both extremes are presented in our sources as exceptions to the rule.

Representations of service as a junior officer

The ancient pieces of evidence for the depiction and representation of the junior officer positions in our period can be divided into two broad groups. The first group consists of depictions of junior officer service by 'others' – more particularly by those who were not seeking to use the status of a junior officer or the holding of a junior officer position for an act of self-representation; the second group consists of evidence which was created, or probably created, as part of an act of self-representation. The latter group need not have been created by the junior officer directly concerned: it covers, for example, depictions of junior officer service by those commemorating a family member.

The first group consists largely of literary evidence, and the second group of material evidence – particularly epigraphy and iconography – and, in addition, is also divided chronologically: the majority of the literary evidence relates to individuals from the period 91 – 31BC, while the majority of the material evidence is from the Principate. As a result, the general tendency of literary evidence to discuss junior officers of comparatively high status[85] means that the first part of this section necessarily focuses on young members of the elite – the sons of either senators or prominent members of the equestrian *ordo*, while the relatively low importance attached to mention of the junior officer positions within the overall careers of men who had achieved high

[80] Cicero, *ad Fam*. 3.6.5.
[81] Caesar, *B.G*. 8.28.2.
[82] Josephus, *B.J.* 1.535, *A.J.* 16.332; cf. *B.J.* 1.538, 542, *A.J.* 16.280, 354, 369; cf. *Volumnius*.
[83] Cf. Gracey (1986) 314; Shatzman (1991) 209.
[84] Cicero, *Font.* 19.43.
[85] Cf. ch. 1, pp.19ff.

office means that the second part of this section focuses on men from the municipal elite.

The representation of junior officers and their roles by others

The importance of service as a junior officer is, unfortunately, rarely described by ancient authors, and the nature of those descriptions that do survive varies widely. In order to understand the way in which junior officers are depicted in our sources, we must separate the sources themselves: those sources which were, most probably, intended to be private documents paint one picture of military service; those sources which might have a direct effect upon the future career of a junior officer present a different image; and the remaining sources present different images again. The first category consists of the letters that passed between Cicero and other leading Romans of his time. The second category is more varied, and should be taken to include forensic speeches, the Caesarian corpus, and other contemporary accounts. The third category includes the writings of biographers, historians, and others.

The accounts of Cicero's letters suggest that junior officer positions were valued for their economic and social benefit. There is a great deal in Cicero's letters to Trebatius about gain and reward, but nothing about duty[86]: the advantages of both patronage and financial reward are explicitly spelled out. The letters also suggest that the acquisition of a junior officer position was, indeed, important, particularly in gaining a powerful patron. Cicero's letters of introduction, as previously noted[87], also suggest that patronage and loyalty, rather than military experience, were generally the most important factors in gaining appointment.

It is worth noting, moreover, that Cicero's letters also provide us with many of the practical details about the lives of junior officers. It is from him that we know that they were paid, that their retinues were also paid, and that the pay of officers had to be accounted for separately from that of centurions[88]. His letters also show, for example, the use of junior officers to gather intelligence[89]. However, except during his time in Cilicia, Cicero was generally in Italy and a civilian: we would not expect, therefore, to see long descriptions of military matters, nor descriptions of the military actions of a given junior officer. His mentions of junior officers in his letters tend to indicate the

[86] Cf. ch. 6, pp.190-191.
[87] E.g. Cicero, *ad Q.f.* 2.13.3, 3.1.10; cf. [104] M. Curtius Postumus; cf. ch. 6, p.178.
[88] Cf. ch. 2. p.52.
[89] Cf. ch. 4, p.121.

importance of patronage precisely because many of these letters were acts of patronage themselves[90]. His letters to his son during his son's service as an equestrian prefect, for instance, might have illuminated a completely different aspect of service as a junior officer, as his letter on a battle fought by Bibulus in Syria suggests[91].

The more public descriptions of junior officers that we find in the second category of sources differ greatly from these private statements. In those sources which could have directly affected an officer's future career (in particular the speeches of Cicero and Caesar's writings), there is no direct mention that junior officer positions were pursued for gain: the only statement which comes close to this is Caesar's withering description of some members of his *cohors*[92]. Friendship appears as a significant notion in some contexts, notably Cicero's statement that [97] Balbus was chosen as *praefectus fabrum* from Caesar's many friends[93], but it is not presented as an explicit motive for service as a junior officer. Where a close relationship is presented as a motive for junior officer service, it is generally in the context of the service of a family member or an existing friend of the family[94]. Instead, Cicero's forensic speeches seek to enhance the audience's impression of the character of the individual involved, and military service is used as a demonstration of worth, particularly of self-control and discipline[95], perhaps reflecting the importance of camp life in instilling such discipline[96], and echoed by Plutarch's depiction of Cato's service as a junior officer (on which see below). A further echo of this is found in Ovid, where an anonymous military tribune boasts that his status was earned fighting under Caesar, rather than sitting on the board of ten in Rome[97]: service as a junior officer, therefore, was proof of hardships suffered and merit earned through discipline. Interestingly, service as a junior officer or as a *contubernalis* is used as a demonstration of an individual's reliability, with the former commanders who were present at the trial or who sent representatives to the court providing character witnesses[98]. In the forensic speeches, service as a junior officer is used to show how an individual might be

[90] Cf. ch. 6, p.178.
[91] Cicero, *ad Att.* 5.20.4; cf. [161] Sex. Lucilius, and below.
[92] Caesar, *B.G.* 1.39.2-5; cf. ch. 3, pp.93-94.
[93] Cicero, *Balb.* 63.
[94] E.g. Cicero, *Planc.* 27; cf. [221] Cn. Plancius.
[95] E.g. Cicero, *Sest.* 7; *Flacc.* 101; *Verr.* 1.30.
[96] Cf. Phang (2008) 3ff.
[97] Ovid, *Fasti* 4.378-384; cf [17] [- - -] (Ovid, *Fasti* 4).
[98] Cicero, *Planc.* 28; cf. 27; *Cael.* 73.

virtuous and obedient, or, by contrast, disloyal, as in the case of [90] Clodius Pulcher's behaviour as derided in *De Haruspicum Responsis*[99].

The Caesarian corpus, however, depicts a different side to the junior officer corps. As seen above, individuals are here more likely to be praised for their judgement and learning than for their character or loyalty. While disloyalty is condemned – and punished – by Caesar, he appears to have been more eager to emphasise the skills of his junior officers. Equally importantly, he is often keen to stress the youth of those involved, and a number of officers are explicitly described as *adulescentes* – repeatedly so in the case of D. Iunius Brutus Albinus[100]. This difference, between what is seen as praiseworthy in the forensic speeches of Cicero and what is seen as praiseworthy in the Caesarian corpus, is probably due to the nature of the sources involved. Cicero was making speeches in defence of individuals, and therefore sought to highlight their moral conduct and reliability: persuading the jury of a defendant's intelligence might not have served to sway the jury in his favour. Caesar by contrast was seeking to highlight the skills and talents of his junior officers in order to promote both their image and his own. While Cicero was defending a client's past, Caesar sought to enhance an officer's future reputation, and therefore selected attributes which suggested that an individual was promising and capable of great things, qualities that might well appeal to an electorate.

The third and final category of sources includes, among other things, biographical accounts. Cato the younger is described as serving as a *miles* "for the sake of his brother", and the accounts of Cato's retinue, and of his leaving for service, in Plutarch's biography[101], emphasise the importance of friendship and camaraderie while serving as a junior officer. Close relationships between friends are displayed as particularly important also in the works of Valerius Maximus[102] and Velleius Paterculus[103], both of whom describe the suicides of junior officers after the deaths of their commanders. The grief of Iunius Brutus at the loss of his *praefectus fabrum* is a further example of this[104]. Friendship of a different kind is displayed in Plutarch's

[99] Cicero, *Harus. Resp.* 42.
[100] Cf. Caesar, *B.C.* 3.71 (C. Felginas).
[101] Plutarch, *Cato Min.* 9-11; cf. [237] M. Porcius Cato (1).
[102] Valerius Maximus 4.7.5 (cf. [64] P. Caelius).
[103] Velleius 2.76.1 (cf. [88] C. Velleius).
[104] Plutarch, *Brut.* 51.2; cf. [121] C. Flauius.

biography of [34] M. Antonius, where his relationship with Ahenobarbus is the mechanism for his appointment as a cavalry prefect.

Biographical accounts also stress the importance of character, which is generally, as Hillard notes, more prominent than military detail in such accounts[105]. The eminence of [142] Caesar, [237] Cato, [34] Antonius and Sertorius as junior officers is used to highlight their courage and early leadership qualities, a clear foreshadowing of what was to come. In Sallust's monograph on the *bellum Iugurthinum*, his depiction of Marius also demonstrates his early qualities[106], but concentrates more upon his practical experience and pragmatism, a counterpoint, perhaps, to his portrayal of the senatorial elite and to the situation in his own time. However, the biographical accounts of individuals known to have served as junior officers do not always mention their military service, and it seems that being a junior officer was not, perhaps, felt worthy of mention in its own right, but was more useful as an example of character and a demonstration of early ability. Plutarch's description of the younger Cato's service as a junior officer, which was probably, as Hillard notes, drawn from the work of Munatius, who travelled with Cato[107], is a good example of the way in which self-control, and other moral qualities, might be depicted in an account of junior officer service.

Livy, as we have seen, creates a deliberate and perhaps idealised image of junior officers in his writings on the second century, but other historical writers do not often deal with the character of junior officers. Where later historians, such as Appian or Dio, do mention the character or influence of a junior officer, it is usually on the occasion of his performing a noteworthy action. A contrast is to be found in the speech of [308] C. Vulteius Capito[108] in Lucan (also found at length in Florus), where his nobility and bravery are highlighted. However, this episode, which led to the massacre of Vulteius Capito and his soldiers, is used more to depict the great tragedy of the civil wars, and the Vulteius Capito of the *Pharsalia* is clearly a romanticised figure. Caesar may perhaps have been attempting a similar effect when listing the dead from a fight at Dyrrachium, where four young Roman *equites* are listed

[105] Hillard (1987) 23.
[106] Sallust, *Iug.* 63.
[107] Hillard (1987) 32.
[108] Lucan 4.462-581; cf. Florus 2.13.1-33; Schol. Bern. 137, 154 Usener.

separately from the junior officers[109], the centurions, and the soldiers, thereby further emphasising the tragedy of the battle.

It is worth noting, however, that the depictions of junior officers, and of junior officer service, all portray them as equestrians and distinct from the rank-and-file. The language used to praise junior officers, as noted above, generally concentrates upon their learning or intelligence, rather than their martial character. As Welch notes, only one junior officer – [307] C. Volusenus Quadratus[110] – is praised for his *uirtus,* and it is centurions, and not junior officers, who are praised by Caeasar for their *fortitudo*. This comparison is illustrated by Cicero, who records the death in battle of "centurionem ... primi pili nobilem sui generis Asinium Dentonem ... et Sex. Lucilium, T. Gaui Caepionis locupletis et splendidi hominis filium, tribunum militum"[111]. The link between equestrian status and the junior officer positions is examined further below[112].

Self-representation and the junior officer positions of the Roman army

The study of self-representation is not simply a matter of looking at the way in which junior officers represented their own status. For a start, it can be difficult to separate self-representation by junior officers from self-representation by the family or friends of junior officers. We cannot ordinarily assume that the monuments of junior officers necessarily depict an act of self-representation by the officers concerned. Instead, as with epigraphic evidence, we are often witnessing a representation of a man's junior officer service which has actually been created by a relative or heir, and this is, of course, an act of self-representation by the relative or heir concerned.

The use of junior officer status, and of the holding of junior officer positions, in self-representation is evident in the writings of a number of ancient authors. Both [290] Velleius Paterculus and [227] Pompeius Trogus provide a history of their ancestry which features one or more junior officers. For both of them, their family history is an ascending sequence, rising from the status of non-Roman to that of Roman citizen, thence to that of junior officer, and from there to the high status enjoyed by the author himself. Moreover, both emphasise the close relationships enjoyed by their relatives with prominent members of Roman society: Velleius boasts of the close ties between

[109] Caesar, *B.C.* 3.71.
[110] Caesar, *B.G.* 8.48; Welch (1998) 89.
[111] Cicero, *ad Att.* 5.20.4; cf. [161] Sex. Lucilius.
[112] Cf. ch. 8, pp.236ff.

his uncle and a number of members of the Roman elite[113], and Pompeius Trogus takes care to mention that two generations of his family had commanded cavalry under Pompeius, and that his father was in charge of letters for Caesar[114]. Therefore, both authors use the junior officer positions to convey the fact that one of their ancestors had achieved a (comparatively) distinguished status, and both emphasise the relationships these ancestors had enjoyed with powerful Romans. We show elsewhere how holding a position as a junior officer could be used to enhance the status of one's family[115], and these passages show how that advantage could extend to future generations. However, it is interesting to note that Cicero chose not to mention the position held by his uncle while he was serving under M. Antonius in 100-99BC, although he notes with pride that his uncle "cum Antonio in Ciliciam profectus una decesserat"[116]. It is only from a recently published inscription that we learn that his uncle was, in fact, a *praefectus*[117]. What is significant about this passage is that Cicero is describing the close relationship he and his family enjoyed with the famous orator, and he therefore emphasises his family's connection to this great man by seeking to highlight the friendship between the two men, rather than any military or civil post which his uncle may have held, Cicero shows us that, in certain contexts, the holding of a prefecture was less important than the status conveyed by being the friend of a great man.

Velleius Paterculus' depiction of his own junior officer service, however, is more interesting. While he makes much of his relationship with Tiberius[118], he introduces his junior officer service with the phrase "initia stipendiorum meorum"[119], a deliberate echo of the way in which the rank-and-file measured their service[120], and, perhaps, an attempt to portray his military career as an act of duty, and thereby deflect accusations of self-aggrandisement. Horace's account of his junior officer career is somewhat different. He presents his military service as an extraordinary honour for the son of a

[113] Velleius Paterculus 2.76.1.
[114] Justin 43.5.11-12.
[115] Cf. ch. 6, pp.183ff., ch. 8, pp.241ff.
[116] Cicero, *de Orat*. 2.2, cf. 3.
[117] AE 2001, 1741a (Samothracia, Thracia); cf. Clinton (2001); we do not, of course, know if this prefecture was a military one.
[118] E.g. Velleius 2.104; cf. Saddington (2003) 19.
[119] Velleius 2.101.
[120] Cf. Saddington (2003) 19-20. As Saddington notes, the phrase is echoed in a similar statement given to Caecina Seuerus, a distinguished general, by Tacitus (*Ann*. 1.64).

freedman[121] and, far from dwelling on his military glory, notes that he threw away his shield ("relicta parma") after Pharsalus[122]. As Fraenkel notes, however, this should not be taken literally, and is instead symbolic of the fact that he put both his military career, and, more importantly, his allegiance to the Republican cause aside[123]. Nevertheless, probably as a result of his background, Horace clearly took great pride in having held a junior officer position.

However, these accounts are the only surviving literary depictions of an author's own service as a junior officer, and in each case, the author was to rise in status beyond the junior officer positions. To examine the depiction of junior officers for whom their service in this role was among the high points of their careers, we have to turn to epigraphic and archaeological evidence. The depiction of junior officer status and of junior officer careers in epigraphic evidence is considered further below, in the context of the discussion of the importance of these for the municipal elite[124], but a number of monuments to junior officers, of considerable iconographic and architectural interest, are relevant here. The monuments of junior officers in the late Republic and early Principate have already received extensive analysis from Devijver and van Wonterghem[125], and the purpose of this section, therefore, is to analyse only those pertaining to officers who belong to our period.

As Keppie has highlighted[126], there are a number of factors to take into consideration when considering evidence of this type: the wishes of the deceased, available funds, the wishes and aspirations of the family, the availability of materials and of a suitable location, and the artistic traditions of the stonemason and of the surrounding monuments. In addition, as we shall see, the depiction of junior officer posts formed only one part of the message such monuments were designed to convey. Thus we have to be careful to avoid overemphasising one element of a monument, especially if – as is frequently the case – only parts of the monument survive. However, a few general observations should be made.

[121] Horace, *Sat*. 1.6.4ff.; cf. Fraenkel (1957) 10ff.; [137] Q. Horatius Flaccus.
[122] Horace, *Odes* 2.7.
[123] Fraenkel (1957) 11-12.
[124] Cf. ch. 8, pp.236ff.
[125] Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990); Devijver (1992b).
[126] Cf. Keppie (2003) 41.

The first is that almost all of the monuments to junior officers discussed below belong in a civilian, rather than a military, context[127]: they are from, or near, municipalities, rather than military cemeteries[128]. This affects our analysis to some extent, in that the artistic traditions, and, indeed, the iconography used, lack the standardisation of military cemeteries[129], and therefore, with the exception of certain general features, it is often unwise to make close comparisons between monuments from different areas. In addition, we know that monuments to junior officers, as we would expect given their comparative status, were often expensive. Using figures from the pre-Claudian period, the cheapest monument for which we have a figure cost 10,000HS, and the most expensive 50,000HS[130]. As we note below[131], junior officers tended to come from families at the top of their local elites, and therefore they or their families would have had considerable freedom in the location and styling of their monuments.

Some of the iconographic evidence for junior officer positions, however, comes from monuments of a somewhat lower status. The link between the social status of a junior officer and the status of his broader *familia* can be seen in two of the so-called "freedman reliefs" from the city of Rome[132]. The relief commemorating L. Appuleius and his two *liberti* is a good example of this[133]. The image shows a military officer, with parade cloak and sword, flanked by a freedman and a freedwoman, who are turned to face him. The inscription names him as "L. Appuleius / tr(ibunus) mil(itum)"[134], and his military dress is in strong contrast to the civilian dress of the two *liberti* on either side of him. However, this contrast only serves to emphasise Appuleius' status, which, in turn, serves to emphasise the status of his two *liberti* as the freedman and freedwoman of an important man. A probably earlier relief, possibly dating from the middle of the first century BC[135], also uses military iconography to

[127] For the exceptions, cf. [218] Cn. Petronius Asellio and [150] T. Iunius Montanus, below.
[128] Although monuments to officers in the Augustan era are found in military cemeteries, e.g. [192] L. Nasidienus Agrippa (CIL 13.8270 (Colonia Agrippinensium, Germania Inferior); cf. La Baume (1973) 337; Demougin (1992) 157), the practice appears to have been rare.
[129] Cf. Keppie (2003) 38.
[130] 10,000HS: [14] [- - -] M.f. Fal(erna) [- - -] (CIL 10.3888 (Capua, Regio 1, Italia); cf. *P. Aufidius L.f.* (CIL 11.1217) (Placentia, Regio 8, Italia)); 50,000HS: *[- - -] T.f. Libo* (AE 1954, 47 (Spoletium, Regio 6, Italia)); cf. Duncan-Jones (1982) 166-171, 242-243; Devijver (1992b) 421.
[131] Cf. ch. 8, p.235.
[132] Cf. Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 99-101, figs. 1-4; Kockel (1993) 101-102 (C1), 108-109 (D1), 155-157 (J1), 182-183 (L9).
[133] Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 61; Kockel (1993) 108-109 (D1); Keppie (1997) 4-5; cf. [37] L. Appuleius L.f.
[134] CIL 14.3948 (Nomentum, Regio 1, Italia).
[135] Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 64-65; Kockel (1993) 101-102 (C1); Keppie (1997) 4-5.

display status: the central figure, [251] L. Septumius L.f. Arn(ensi), is depicted in the dress of a military officer, and is described as "eques" on the accompanying inscription[136], which also mentions his position as civilian magistrate (or possibly that of the man assumed to be his father), *mag(ister) Capitolinus quinq(uennalis)*. Unlike the relief depicting Appuleius, the two individuals on either side of Septumius are freeborn citizens, probably his father and his wife. In both cases, the probable junior officer status of the central figure, rather than any particular rank held, were what those who commissioned the monument wished to emphasise most. It is important to note, however, that such reliefs were generally secondary monuments to the deceased, rather than the tomb itself, and therefore the imagery and language are more likely to reflect the wishes of the dedicators alone. It is also worth noting, as Keppie points out, that conspicuous military iconography, such as armour and weapons, has been found on the tombs of men who cannot have served as soldiers[137], and we should be somewhat careful of ascribing junior officer status to men based solely on depictions of them in uniform, especially as they may have served as *contubernales*.

An example of a similar composition from a monument of higher status is provided by a tomb in Pompeii[138], for which no inscription survives. On the monument, two elderly togate figures, a man and a woman, are turned to face a central, younger, man dressed in military uniform, wearing an officer's cuirass and parade-ground cloak, all three being full-length statues. As Keppie notes[139], the tombs of ordinary soldiers usually depict the deceased in military dress when he died while still in service. It is possible, therefore, that monuments such as this depict individuals who died while serving as junior officers, which would provide a dual incentive for the dedicators to depict the deceased in the dress of a junior officer. A near neighbour to this tomb is another monument which names junior officers, the two Tillii[140], military tribunes in the 40s BC[141]; and a *tribunus militum a populo*, [78] L. Cellius[142], was also buried nearby. No pictorial imagery survives on the monument to the Tillii, while it appears

[136] ILLRP 697 (Roma).
[137] Keppie (2003) 33-35, fig. 2.
[138] D'Ambrosio and De Caro (1983) 13OS; cf. Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 69-71.
[139] Keppie (2003) 38.
[140] D'Ambrosio and De Caro (1983) 17OS (Pompeii, Regio 1, Italia); cf. Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 71-72; [267] [?L.] Tillius C.f. Cor(nelia) and [268] C. Tillius C.f. Cor(nelia) Rufus.
[141] Cf. ch. 8, pp.241-242.
[142] Ambrosio and De Caro (1983) 4EN = I.Pompei 4EN (Pompeii, Regio 1, Italia); Castrén (1975) 97; Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 92; Mouritsen (1990) 101.

that Cellius' tomb, a *tholos*-type monument that is relatively well preserved, did not display conspicuous military iconography or statues. These tombs, all from the Porta Nocera necropolis, therefore show the different ways in which junior officer positions might be monumentalised, one using a full-length statue of an individual in military dress, another, roughly contemporary, relying on the text of the inscription to convey the deceased's junior officer service. Without any further background to the unknown junior officer depicted in military dress, it is difficult to tell what lay behind these choices, although it is interesting to note that [78] L. Cellius is the only known Pompeian *tribunus militum a populo* who did not hold the quinquennial duovirate, and may, therefore, have been of comparatively modest status, despite the marriage of his son into a leading Pompeian family[143].

Other monuments to junior officers from our period display examples of military iconography. The monument to [218] Cn. Petronius Asellio[144], from Mogontiacum, displays a *parma equestris* with crossed *hastae*, the significance of which is discussed below. Asellio, probably from Arretium[145], served as a military tribune, a *praefectus equitum* and a *praefectus fabrum* to Tiberius, and the use of equestrian military iconography on a tomb in a military context is, perhaps, unsurprising. The general style of the tomb, however, echoes civilian monuments found throughout Italy[146], and contains a significant amount of architectural decoration. Also from a military context is the monument from Emona in Pannonia of [49] T. Iunius Montanus[147], who was, probably, originally from Alexandreia Troas[148]. The monument, which was probably a cenotaph, displayed a *corona*, perhaps the *corona ciuica* or *aurea*, as well as a *parma*, probably the *parma equestris*, over crossed *hastae*. Montanus, like Asellio, was military tribune, *praefectus equitum* and *praefectus fabrum*, before promotion to the post of *pro legato*[149]. He held each of the first two posts six times, and the latter two twice, which is evidence for an exceptional military career. His long career is explanation enough for the presence of a cenotaph in Pannonia, but it is nevertheless significant that he, or his heirs, chose to erect a monument there: it is, perhaps, the

[143] Castrén (1975) 97; Demougin (1992) 142; cf. ch. 8, p.235.
[144] CIL 13.6816 (Mogontiacum, Germania Superior); cf. Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 94 n.195; Devijver (1991) 252ff.
[145] Cf. Devijver (1976-2001) 2.633, (1991) 252; Demougin (1992) 128.
[146] Cf. Keppie (2003) 36-37, fig. 4.
[147] Devijver (1992c) 66.
[148] Demougin (1992) 227; Devijver (1992c) 67ff.
[149] AE 1938, 173 = AE 1939, +261 = AE 1992, 687 = EDH HD022326 (Emona, Pannonia Superior).

strongest evidence we have that some junior officers saw themselves primarily as 'military men'.

A number of relevant monuments from Italy also contain military iconography. An honorific inscription to [284] Vecilius Campus displayed a *parma equestris* above the dedicatory inscription[150], which recorded the construction, with his own money, of an amphitheatre and surrounding enclosure in honour of Augustus and the colonists of Luceria[151]. In this context, the use of the *parma equestris*, even more than the details of his military career which are given as part of his cursus (he was *praefectus fabrum* and then twice military tribune), is a conspicuous display of junior officer status in an otherwise civilian, and civic, context. A notable frieze, possibly belonging to a monument dedicated to [133] Q. Gauius Pedo[152], also displays a *parma equestris*, the bust of a male figure possibly in uniform, and a cornucopia and oak wreath. The funerary monument of [293] Verginius Paetus, a *tribunus militum a populo* from Sassina, also contained a *parma equestris* with crossed *hastae*[153]. The monument, a cube-shaped carved block standing on a monumental base, also contained non-military iconography: the opposite face to that decorated with the *parma equestris* displayed *fasces*, *subsellium* and *sella curulis*, indications of civic status, although the inscription makes no mention of municipal or other magistracies[154]. A similar mix of military and civic iconography is found on a monument possibly attributable to [114] Fabia[nus(?)] of Scansano[155], who is depicted both wearing a cuirass and togate with fasces, and on the monument to P. Fannius, who belongs to the pre-Claudian period, which displays an officer's cuirass and three *fasces*[156]. Fannius was a promoted *primipilus* who held the post of *praefectus equitum* and was a quattuoruir at Arusnates[157], and it is noteworthy that it emphasises his officer, rather than his long centurionate, career. By contrast, a monument to another former centurion, [239] Purtisius Atinas, emphasises both parts of his military career. A *primipilus* who held the posts of *praefectus fabrum* and *praefectus equitum*[158], Atinas is known from a funerary altar which is decorated on one side with *armillae* and *torques*, the *dona*

[150] Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 73-74.
[151] AE 1938, 110 = EDH HD022194 (Luceria, Regio 2, Italia).
[152] Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 80-81.
[153] Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 76.
[154] AE 1966, 120 = AE 1967, +6 = AE 1980, 411 (Sassina, Regio 6, Italia).
[155] Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 82; Demougin (1992) 49.
[156] Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 83, figs. 23-24; cf. *P. Fannius M.f.*
[157] CIL 5.3366 (Arusnates, Regio 10, Italia).
[158] CIL 11.624 = Cenerini (1992) (Supp.It. 10) 46 no. 624 (Forum Liui, Regio 8, Italia).

normally given to centurions, and on the other side with *coronae aureae* and *hastae purae*, the *dona* normally given to equestrian officers[159]. Clearly Atinas, promoted from the centurionate and decorated during both parts of his military career, wished to emphasise both honours. Other officers who may belong to the Augustan period display similar iconography: the monument of L. Fannius was probably decorated with a *parma equestris* and crossed *hastae*[160]; while a fragment of a monument from Brescia belonging to an unidentified individual, probably a junior officer, depicts an eagle standard[161].

Notably, therefore, there are no direct depictions of combat, and even depictions of armour are comparatively rare[162] (the *parma equestris* appears to have been used only on the parade ground[163]). Instead, most military iconography takes the form of the *parma equestris*, with or without crossed *hastae*[164]. This iconography is particularly significant in the context of Augustus' development of the equestrian *ordo* and the 'appointment' of C. and L. Caesar as *principes iuuentutis*[165]. The two were presented with *hastae* and *parmae* by the equestrian *ordo*, and a coin issue of the mid-Augustan period depicts the two princes with *hastae* and *parmae equestres*, with the legend "C. [et] L. Caesares, Aug(usti) f(ilii) co(n)s(ules) desig(nati) princ(ipes) iuuent(utis)"[166], while *parmae equestres* can be seen above the Doric frieze of the mausoleum of Augustus above the inscription to C. Caesar[167]. Further evidence for this association comes, perhaps, from an Augustan-era scabbard, which appears to depict the two princes either side of their mother, dressed as junior officers[168]. The links between equestrian status and the junior officer positions are discussed below[169], but the success of Augustus' measure can be seen, in part, by this use of what was to become,

[159] Susini (1972) 352 Fig. 1; Maxfield (1981) 162, Plate 7b; Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 83-84, figs. 25-27.
[160] Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 80; cf. *L. Fannius C.f. Tro(mentina)*.
[161] Keppie (2003) 42-43, fig. 9.
[162] Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 60ff.
[163] Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 73-74.
[164] Keppie's suggestion ((1997) 6-7) that this symbol in fact indicates participation in the *transuectio equitum* (on which see above), rather than service as a junior officer, would put a different slant on its use, linking it less to service as a junior officer than to Augustus' revival of the equestrian *ordo* and promotion of equestrian military service in general. However, the standard iconography connected to the *transuectio equitum* depicts mounted riders who are togate and carrying a wreath, possibly an olive wreath (Veyne (1960) 103ff.; Rebecchi (1999) 194ff.), rather than a *parma* or *hasta*.
[165] Cf. Devijver (1995) 177.
[166] BMC I CXVI, 88.513-516 pl. 13; Zanker (1988) 219; Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 94 n.195, (1991) 252ff.
[167] See von Hesberg (1988) 246, 249 n.113; cf. Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 94 n.195.
[168] Zanker (1988) 219, fig. 172.
[169] Cf. ch. 8, pp.236-237, p242. .

as Devijver puts it, "the symbol par excellence of the *ordo equester*"[170] on a number of monuments dedicated to junior officers in the Augustan period.

However, a number of the above monuments also contain non-military iconography. Given the incompleteness of the majority of them, it is difficult to ascertain the exact prominence of military iconography within the entire monumental setting. A number of monuments to junior officers in our period are also known with civic, religious or decorative, but no extant military, iconography: the inscription commemorating [245] Sabinus (2)[171], a probable equestrian prefect in the Triumviral period, sat below a frieze containing religious imagery; both of the figures in the inscription recording the military tribune [279] [?L. Va]leri[us] L.f. Cor(nelia), a husband and wife, are togate[172], and, indeed, the inscription appears to have been re-cut to add Valerius' military rank[173]; and the funerary inscription to [22] Asiaticus, a *tribunus militum a populo* from Falerii Noui[174], is decorated with rosettes and a lion's head[175]. Of a probably later date, the inscription to the two Volumnii Seueri[176] is decorated with religious iconography, while the monument to Clouatius, a military tribune from Pompeii in the pre-Gaian period[177], was probably decorated with images of gladiatorial games[178].

In addition to the iconography employed, the style of a monument could also be significant. A number of junior officers in our period were buried in an Augustan-style mausoleum. Three of these officers held what might be considered "typical" junior officer careers for members of the municipal elite in the Augustan period, and no military iconography survives from their monuments – the military tribune and *praefectus fabrum* [112] C. Ennius Marsus[179]; and two *tribuni militum a populo*, [57] Q. Caecilius[180] and an individual whose name is lost[181]. In contrast, however, [292] M. Vergilius Gallus Lusius, who was a *primipilus*, cavalry prefect, a *praefectus*

[170] Devijver (1991) 252.
[171] CIL 1.1295 = CIL 9.4503 = ILS 2488 = ILLRP 500 (Amiternum, Regio 4, Italia): image at http://www1.ku-eichstaett.de/epigr/uah-bilder.php?bild=PH0002080.
[172] AE 1991, 708 (Parma, Regio 8, Italia).
[173] Menella (1991) 421.
[174] 11.7494 = AE 1907, 115 (Falerii Noui, Regio 7, Italia).
[175] Gatti (1906) 142.
[176] CIL 14.2495, 2495a (Tusculum, Regio 1, Italia); cf. *L. Volumnius Seuerus*; *L. Volumnius Verus*.
[177] CIL 10.1065 (Pompeii, Regio 1, Italia); cf. *[C]n. Clouatius Cn.f.*
[178] Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 92.
[179] See van Wonterghem (1982) 120; Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 87.
[180] Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 88.
[181] See van Wonterghem (1982) 99ff.; cf. Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 87-88; cf. [13] [---] (CIL 9.3159).

fabrum, a tribune in command of a praetorian cohort and who was also awarded equestrian *dona*[182], was an experienced soldier whose mausoleum displayed crossed *orcae*[183]. The choice of an Augustan-style mausoleum, however, demonstrates a deliberate identification with Augustus himself, and, perhaps, is a display of loyalty to the imperial house[184], an example of which would be the tomb of C. Iulius Victor, military tribune and *praefectus fabrum* in the Tiberian era[185]. However, it is as likely that this style of monument was chosen simply because it represented a high-status and conspicuous tomb. A number of other factors might affect the choice of monument design, such as a desire to be close to a town, or to associate with (and compete with) the monuments of men of similar status, such as the three known tombs commemorating junior officers from the Porta Nocera in Pompeii, or an act of local 'patriotism', such as the traditional Etruscan-style tomb of [52] L. Aurelius at Tarquinia[186].

Not all monuments, of course, were funerary. A number of officers in our period are known to have been awarded public statues: [69] C. Caristanius Fronto Caesianus Iulius claimed to be the first man so honoured by the citizens of the colony of Antiocha Pisidia[187]; the military tribune [222] Cn. Pollienus appears to have received at least one statue at Thermae Himeraeae[188]; while [164] M. Lucretius Decidianus Rufus in Pompeii[189] and [55] P. Baebius Tuticanus[190], both of whom were *tribuni militum a populo*, received public statues. None of these statues has survived. However, a possible clue to their appearance comes from a powerful image of a junior officer from our period that has survived – the cuirassed statue of [136] M. Holconius Rufus from Pompeii. Holconius Rufus was from a local family prominent in the Julio-Claudian era[191] which had a strong link to the imperial cult: his brother was *duouir*, *duouir quinquennalis* and *sacerdos Diui Augusti*[192], and a M. Holconius Macer was

[182] CIL 10.4862 = ILS 2690 (Venafrum, Regio 1, Italia); Maxfield (1981) 161-162.
[183] Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 88.
[184] On the importance of imperial connections, and the links between junior officers and the imperial house, see below, ch. 8, pp.243-246.
[185] Maurin (1994) 124; cf. *C. Iulius Cognometodubni f. Acedomopatis n. Volt(inia) Victor*.
[186] Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 92.
[187] AE 2001, 1919 (Antiocha, Pisidia); cf. Cheesman (1913) 254.
[188] Wilson (1990) 38; Demougin (1992) 63; Bivona (1994) 126.
[189] Nicolet (1957) 38; Pesando (2000) 171.
[190] Alföldy (1984) 132 no. 216.
[191] Nicolet (1967) 41; Castrén (1975) 97, 176; Mouritsen (1988) 119; cf. [136] M. Holconius M.f. Rufus.
[192] CIL 10.833-834, 840, 943-946; Castrén (1975) 97, 176.

praefectus iure dicundo in place of Gaius Caligula[193]. M. Holconius Rufus himself was *sacerdos Augusti Caesaris* and *flamen Caesaris Augusti*[194]. His cuirassed statue from near the Stabian baths depicts him in full military dress[195], and is strongly reminiscent of the famous statue of Augustus from Prima Porta. The iconography on the cuirass, notably griffons, recalls the cult statue of Mars Ultor from the Augustan temple in Rome[196]. Griffons are also found on the tomb of the probably Augustan-era military tribune [114] Fabia[nus(?)] at Scansano[197]. The statue, interestingly, depicts him wearing *calcei senatorii*, not *calcei equestres*, and perhaps even holding a symbol of *imperium* which, as Devijver argues[198], is probably intended to demonstrate both his role as a junior officer, the highest post in his career, and his role as a leading politician in Pompeii itself. While this statue may appear grandiose, it is made especially significant only by its survival: it was probably not even the only such statue in Pompeii. Indeed, it is likely that such images, which used the junior officer positions to convey local power, military standing, and a connection to the Augustan system, were prominent in the Italy of the Augustan period.

[193] CIL 10.796, 904.
[194] CIL 10.830, 10.838; on the dating of these priesthoods, cf. Castén (1975) 68; contra, Nicolet (1967) 40.
[195] CIL 10.830; Devijver (1989) fig. 7.
[196] Simon (1962) 773-780; Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 82 n.124, 82-83 n.124.
[197] AE 1931, 95 (Scansano, Regio 7, Italia).
[198] Devijver (1989) 432.

Ch. 8: The Municipal Elite

As we have seen, the Roman senatorial elite was not large enough to provide the Roman army with all of its junior officers even in the late third century BC[1]. The manpower demands of the Hannibalic war, along with the high number of casualties in defeats such as Cannae, meant that a large number of equestrians, from Rome and outside, would have served as junior officers. Many of these would have come from important equestrian families in Rome: the elder M. Porcius Cato for example, or L. Pompeius and T. Iuuentius[2]. Men from this elite group of equestrians continued to serve as junior officers throughout our period, and can be found even as military tribunes in the period 49 – 31BC, when the status of the military tribunate appears to have declined, as in the examples of [117] M. Feridius, a military tribune and the son of a friend of M. Caelius[3], and [184] M. Mindius, the son of a knight and nephew of a senator[4]. However, many junior officers would have come from a comparatively modest group of equestrians, the municipal elite.

While, as we have seen, the junior officer corps was composed of men from many different backgrounds, and with differing reasons for service, the importance of the municipal elite stands out: the growing influence of its members is one of the few consistent features of the junior officer corps within our period. While they may have formed only a part of the junior officers corps of the second century BC, the municipal elite, both from Italy and the provinces, formed the backbone of the Roman junior officer corps in the imperial period. The Italian elite were particularly important, providing 68% of Rome's attested junior officers until the Antonine period[5]. The purpose of this chapter, therefore, is to analyse the growing role of the municipal elite in the period 91BC – AD14, to assess the importance to the municipal elite of service as a junior officer within both local politics and higher Roman society, and to analyse the significance of service as a junior officer to a man's status, and the status of his family.

---

[1] Cf. ch. 2, p.67.
[2] Livy, 42.65.6, 33.22.8; cf. Suolathi (1955) 113.
[3] Cicero, *ad Fam*. 8.9.4; CIL XI 6721.
[4] AE 1925, 93 = EDH HD025816 (Velitrae, Regio 1, Italia); cf. Demougin (1983) 296.
[5] Devijver (1972) 112 (Table 8); cf. Birley (2003) 11.

As a result of a relative lack of epigraphic evidence for the early part of our period[6], it is not possible to calculate with any certainty what proportion of the junior officer corps were from the municipal elite at any given time. The changing nature of our evidence, as well as the comparative scarcity of named junior officers, makes it difficult to compare the evidence of the second century BC (largely that of Livy), that of the period 91 – 50BC (largely that of Cicero and Caesar), and that of the period 49 – 31BC and beyond, which becomes increasingly epigraphic). This makes any estimates of the relative numbers of men from the municipal elite serving as junior officers extremely difficult. However, as the number of junior officers in service rose, the number of men from the municipal elite serving as junior officers would also have risen. This assertion is partly based upon a lack of possibilities for any other source of junior officers: we have no evidence in the late Republic for promotion from the ranks, and there were only a finite number of young members of the senatorial elite available.

Moreover, even if the junior officer corps of the second century BC was dominated by the senatorial elite (either senators or young men from senatorial families), the demand for manpower would have meant that the municipal elite played an important role. An example of such men can be seen in T. Turpilius Silanus from the small town of Collatia[7], a *praefectus fabrum* and commander of a significant force, including military tribunes, at Vacca during the Jugurthine War; another, perhaps, in Cicero's uncle, a member of a minor equestrian family from Arpinum[8]; and in another Arpinate of equestrian origin, the military tribune C. Marius. The large number of such men serving as junior officers, and accompanying the Roman elite to war, can also be seen in the military tribunes, and other equestrians, among the *consilium* of Pompeius Strabo[9].

In addition, the elite of the *Latini* and Italian *socii* also played an important role in the Roman army of the second century BC and earlier, albeit not as junior officers. An example of such men is provided by Bantius, a young Nolan persuaded not to rebel after the disaster at Cannae. Bantius is described by Livy as "a spirited young man"

[6] Cf. Suolahti (1955) 126.
[7] Badian (1997) 15ff.; cf. Sallust, *Iug*. 66-67; Appian, *Num*. 3; Plutarch, *Mar*. 8; ch. 3 pp.83-84.
[8] If a military prefect; cf. Clinton (2001) 27-28.
[9] Cf. ch. 1, p.35ff.; cf. Suolahti (1955) 126-127.

and "just about the most noble *eques* among the *socii* at that time"[10], and Marcellus in praising him makes frequent mention of his military abilities and courage, which he had heard about from those who had fought with him. It was, therefore, at least plausible to Livy that the military abilities even of a young Italian cavalryman would not go unnoticed. In Livy's account, Bantius is given a horse (he may well have lost his own at Cannae), 500 *bigati* and, significantly, as much access to Marcellus as he wanted: the close attentions of a Roman noble were a valuable gift.

As we have seen[11], the Italian elites had a significant role as the commanders of their own contingents, and while they may have resented being forced to serve or to provide troops, it is important to realise that for many members of the Italian elites, military glory and status would have been as much a part of their own political systems as they were a part of the Roman system[12]. The competence of the Italian forces during the Social War demonstrates how experienced such men were[13]. As McCall suggests, many of the members of Italy's elites would have been eager for the opportunity to serve as a junior officer[14]. When these men became Roman citizens, it is clear that they would have actively competed for officer positions within the army. While we may lack the evidence for their integration within the Roman military system that we have for the later provincial elite, on which see below, that later evidence may provide an analogue for the Italian elite: service as a junior officer was an important way in which loyalty might be rewarded, and social advancement and integration achieved[15]. Moreover, their proven military competence, and the relationships developed with Roman commanders during the pre-Social War period, would have made it easier for a member of the newly enfranchised Italian elite to obtain a junior officer position. The lack of epigraphic evidence makes identifying such men from the pre-Augustan period difficult, but in the Triumviral and Augustan periods men from such families can be found – [243] C. Rosius Sabinus, whose family appears to have acquired Roman citizenship after the Social War[16]; and [183] Post. Mimisius Sardus, who held a military tribunate on his way to a proconsulship,

[10] Livy 23.15: "iuuenis acer et sociorum ea tempestate prope nobilissimus eques".
[11] Cf. ch. 2 pp.58-62, ch. 4, pp.108-109.
[12] Dench (1997) 43ff.; contra, Harris (1984b) 91.
[13] It is worth noting that Insteius Capito, an Italian commander during the Social War, was possibly related to the two Insteii ([140] and [141]) who served under Sertorius (Suolahti (1955) 275; cf. Broughton (1951-1986) 2.95, 3.104; Criniti (1970) 150-151).
[14] McCall (2002) 9.
[15] Cf. Demougin (1983) 282.
[16] Eck (1979) 108-111; Demougin (1992) 28.

and whose family were prominent in Assisium, in Umbria, in the second century BC[17].

Moreover, it is very likely that the newly enfranchised municipal elite would have been eligible to hold junior officer positions immediately after enfranchisement. The evidence of Cicero confirms that, while registration at a census confirmed one's citizenship, one could be a citizen without presenting oneself at a census[18]. More importantly, there is no mention of separate allied or Latin forces from Italy following the Social War[19]. Perhaps between 88 and 87BC there would have been confusion as to how one might levy troops from individual cities that had not yet passed the local statutes required to take up Roman citizenship, but it is hard to see how they could have served as anything other than Roman citizens. In these circumstances, it seems reasonable to believe that former *Latini* and Italian *socii* will have been eligible to serve as junior officers immediately following the end of the Social War. While Brunt[20] suggests that Q. Oppius "had no Italians under his command in Cilicia [in 88BC]", the passage he cites suggests only that there was no Italian cavalry: it is silent on the location of the Roman, and any other, infantry[21]. However, we do not know what happened to members of the Italian elite who were serving abroad at the time of the Social War (up until the point at which they became Roman citizens). The fact that Rome used provincial levies in foreign wars during the Social War suggests that it was not entirely confident of the loyalty of conscripted Italian troops[22], but it would have been an even greater risk to send them back to Italy. Unfortunately, there is little evidence that might help decide this particular question, and it is not likely that this issue will be resolved.

Many of the factors that would have encouraged members of the municipal elite to seek to serve as junior officers in the period 91 – 50BC, and the way in which their service was portrayed, were the factors that affected other social groups represented within the junior officer corps. However, the role of members of the municipal elite in particular is shown in a number of interesting passages which display both the way in

[17] Wiseman (1971) 241; Gaggiotti and Sensi (1982) 262.
[18] Cicero, *Arch*. 7ff.
[19] For earlier examples of this, see Livy 39.20.1, 38.10, 42.31.1-9, 35.4-7; cf. Sherwin-White (1973) 98-118; Lomas (1996) 36-37.
[20] Brunt (1971) 435.
[21] Appian, *Mith*. 20.
[22] As Mouritsen points out (Mouritsen (1998) 159); contra, Salmon (1969) 361.

which they were often dependent on the Roman elite for advancement, and the growing importance of junior officers from the municipal elite within Roman politics.

The relationship between the Roman elite and members of the municipal elite serving as junior officers is illuminated by a letter sent by Cicero to his brother. The letter names, and recommends to Quintus' attention, its bearer, one M. Orfius, a military tribune in Caesar's army, 'hominem domi splendidum, gratiosum etiam extra domum'[23]. Such influence "extra domum" may well have been one of Orfius' main motives for military service. As is clear from the epigraphic evidence of later periods, service as a junior officer enabled members of the municipal elite to gain connections and a status beyond their own *municipium*. In a further example from 91 – 50BC, [217] L. Petronius, probably a *praefectus fabrum* under [64] P. Caelius, was "humili loco natus", but was able to obtain status through his military service and his close relationship with Caelius[24].

However, Cicero's letter to Quintus demonstrates the social gap that existed between men from the municipal elite and their commanders: Quintus would, says Cicero, find Orfius "gratum hominem obseruantemque". It is also notable that Cicero felt the need to tell his brother that Orfius was serving as a junior officer under Caesar: the size of Caesar's junior officer corps probably meant that Quintus did not know all of the men within it. This is suggestive of the number of members of the municipal elite within the Roman military system, and its consequent dependence upon them.

Significantly, Orfius was from Atella, a town of which Cicero was a patron[25]. Cicero's links with *municipia* can also be seen in the case of his *praefectus fabrum* of 63BC, [300] Vibius Sicca, who may have been from Arpinum[26], and at least one of Cicero's military tribunes in Cilicia, [126] Q. Fufidius, had close connections with Arpinum – he was part of a delegation from the town sent to Gaul to oversee the collection of rents[27]. Such patronage, and relationships, can also be seen in the large number of men from Picenum in the *consilium* of Pompeius Strabo, and although we know the names of few of Pompeius Magnus' junior officers, the legions which he raised to join Sulla will not have been the only ones he was to command in the late

[23] Cicero, *ad Q.f.* 2.14.2; cf. [204] M. Orfius.
[24] Valerius Maximus 4.7.5.
[25] Cicero, *ad Q.f.* 2.14.2; cf. Brunt (1988) 397.
[26] Münzer, RE 2A.21866; cf. Badian (1997) 5.
[27] Cicero, *ad Fam.* 13.12.1, cf. 13.11.

Republic which contained significant numbers of men from his region of origin. Roman commanders with similar links to towns or regions, such as the Antonii, linked with Bononia[28], might well have selected men from such regions to serve as their junior officers.

It is important to note, however, that the somewhat patronising treatment of M. Orfius by Cicero comes in a letter which passed between members of the Roman elite, and one where Cicero may well have been 'showing off' his authority and his municipal connections. Caesar, in the *de Bello Ciuili* in particular, appears to use the number of men from the municipal elite serving in his army to generate political sympathy within Italy[29]: listing the casualties from Dyracchium[30], Caesar names only four men, as well as the cities from which they came, and all four were Italian equestrians; the description of the execution of the two Titii might well have been intended to generate the same effect in Spain[31]. In the *de Bello Gallico*, the four "praefectos tribunosque militum"[32] under Caesar who were captured by the Gauls in 56BC are collectively referred to as "equites Romani"[33], presumably in an attempt to generate sympathy from Caesar's readership, and perhaps a municipal readership in particular.

We can, perhaps, glean more information about the areas from which known junior officers came. The onomastic analysis of Suolahti[34] suggests that the majority of junior officers of 'equestrian descent'[35] came initially from those areas closest to Rome (Latium, southern Etruria, and northern Campania), and therefore those areas which were more likely to have strong links with the Roman system and with the Roman elite. Suolahti's analysis suggests that during the late Republic officers from areas slightly more removed from Rome (northern Etruria, Umbria, and Picenum in particular) began to become more common, but that it was not until the civil wars, the Triumviral period, and finally the Augustan period, that junior officers from areas such as Apulia, Lucania, and Bruttium begin to appear with any regularity. Even during the Augustan period, the local origin of known junior officers is far from

[28] Suetonius, *Aug*. 17; cf. Brunt (1988) 395ff.
[29] Cf. Gruen (1974) 63; Welch (1998) 87ff.
[30] Caesar, *B.C*. 3.71.
[31] Caesar, *B.Afr*. 28.
[32] Caesar, *B.G*. 3.7.2-4; cf. [259] T. Silius.
[33] Caesar, *B.G*. 3.10.2.
[34] Suolahti's overall results are presented in a series of maps, Suolahti (1955) 409, 411.
[35] The term 'equestrian descent' is used by Suolahti to define junior officers from a *gens* with no known senatorial ancestry.

evenly distributed across Italy, and the majority still appear to have come from Rome, Latium, Campania and Etruria[36]. This trend is perhaps reflected in the evidence of epigraphic findspots. The findspots of inscriptions that name junior officers can be assigned to one of five groups: the 'established' areas of Roman influence – Latium, Etruria, and Campania (Group 1); those areas slightly more removed from Rome – Umbria, Picenum and Samnium (Group 2); the rest of Italy, including Cisalpine Gaul (Group 3); the Greek-speaking provinces (Group 4); and the 'Western' provinces, including Africa and the Danube (Group 5). Of the inscriptions recording officers who probably served in the period 49 – 31BC[37]: 19 are from Group 1; 9 from Group 2; 5 from Group 3; 6 from Group 4; and none from Group 5, a ratio of, approximately, 4:2:1:1:0. Of the inscriptions recording officers who probably served in the Augustan period: 43 are from Group 1; 9 from Group 2; 11 from Group 3; 11 from Group 4; and 10 from Group 5, a ratio of, approximately, 4:1:1:1:1. It is notable, perhaps, that while the number of inscriptions recording junior officers is much higher for the Augustan period, the proportions between the five groups are not vastly different. This suggests that those areas which had close connections with Rome, and possibly those *municipia* with particular connections to prominent Roman commanders, were likely to furnish more junior officers than areas which had fewer connections with Rome.

Of course, with such low numbers, small variations play a big part. Moreover, as we have argued above, the sample of data is affected by the way in which it has survived, as well as by the spread of the 'epigraphic habit'; the lack of attestation of Gallic and Spanish officers from the period 49 – 31BC, in particular, might be partially explained by this. In addition, both the Republican faction and M. Antonius (especially after 36BC) would have found it difficult to recruit officers in Italy, and this would surely have brought more men from the Eastern provinces into the junior officer corps. This can perhaps be seen in the recruitment at Athens of [137] Horace, who was of comparatively low status, by Brutus in 43-42BC[38].

The period 49 – 31BC was, as we have seen, one of significant change within the junior officer corps. The vast manpower demands of the period, and the need to recruit troops, meant that equestrians might be threatened with conscription, and that

[36] Suolahti (1955) 149-156.
[37] I.e. including those officers whose service probably, although not certainly, predated Actium.
[38] Cf. Fraenkel (1957) 9ff.

some, such as Horace, might be swept into service in the Roman army[39]. Further examples of such men who were caught up in events are provided by [131] C. Gallonius, whom Caesar describes as "equitem Romanum, familiarem Domitii, qui eo procurandae hereditatis causa uenerat missus a Domitio oppido Gadibus praefecit"[40], and, perhaps, by [117] M. Feridius, known from a Perusine sling bullet[41], the son of a friend of M. Caelius[42]. However, there is also possible evidence that the municipal elite sought to avoid serving as junior officers in the period. Octavian, seeking to quell the Sicilian mutiny, is said to have offered the military tribunes and centurions incentives including, among other things, the dignity of a *duouir*[43]. If such an honour would represent an incentive to a military tribune, then this would seem to imply that most of Octavian's junior officers were not from the municipal elite, and that the status of the junior officer positions had fallen below that of the duovirate. However, this conclusion should not be drawn too quickly, for a number of reasons.

Firstly, it must be remembered that the Sicilian mutiny was the 'high water mark' of the rebellious displays made by Octavian's junior officers and centurions[44], and that Octavian's offer was made both to military tribunes and to centurions: the offer of duoviral status may well have appealed to men who had worked their way up from the ranks. Secondly, as we have seen[45], in the period 49BC – AD14 two thirds of junior officers from non-senatorial families did not hold municipal office before serving as a junior officer (and the equestrian status of such men is assured). If we restrict our analysis to junior officers from non-senatorial backgrounds who probably served in the period 49 – 31BC, the figures are only slightly different, with 44% holding municipal office first[46], 22% after their junior officer career, and 33% holding no municipal post. If anything, this suggests that more members of the established municipal elite, not fewer, served as junior officers in the period 49 – 31BC. However, this also suggests that most of Octavian's military tribunes had probably not held a duovirate, and many must have been young men not yet old enough to hold

[39] On the conscription of equestrians, cf. ch. 7, p.201-202.
[40] Caesar, *B.C.* 2.18.2.
[41] CIL 11.6721 no. 25 = ILLRP 1115 (Perusia, Regio 7, Italia); cf. Cicero, *ad Fam.* 8.9.4.
[42] Cf. Demougin (1988) 27.
[43] Appian, *B.C.* 5.128; cf. Dio 49.13.
[44] Schmitthenner (1958) 106.
[45] Cf. ch. 1, p.31ff.
[46] The percentages are those of the 18 officers who probably belong to the period and whose cursus is sufficiently well preserved. On the municipal and equestrian careers of junior officers in the Triumviral period, see also Demougin (1983) 296-298.

the duovirate; and while the status of a *duouir* would, of course, mean more to a centurion (especially if he was not from the higher centurionate ranks), it would still have been an advantage for young members of the municipal elite looking to return to their home towns.

Finally, it is likely that many of Octavian's junior officers, and junior officers in other armies, were ambitious men who, while of a relatively high status, were not the leading men in their home towns (a possible parallel can be found, as we shall see, among some Gallic *nobiles* serving under Caesar). [180] T. Marius Siculus was probably one such man, raised, says Valerius Maximus "ab infimo militiae loco"[47] by his relationship to Augustus via his military service. [108] Cn. Dupilius, whose father held no municipal office, might also be viewed in the same light[48], as might the military tribune [243] C. Rosius Sabinus, who, as noted above, was the son of a man who appears to have been granted Roman citizenship only after the Social War[49]. In addition, while there is no evidence that he held a junior officer position, L. Tarius Rufus, suffect consul in 16BC, earned recognition through military service[50]. While some members of the municipal elite, particularly, perhaps, those past middle-age, might have wished to avoid military service[51], the money and the possibilities for social advancement that might come from such service would, as De Blois argues, have given many men a previously unavailable opportunity[52]. Such men are personified, perhaps, by the unnamed military tribune of Horace, *Epodes* 4 – a former slave, who now had the opportunity to command troops as a military tribune[53], a position held by Horace himself, although he was the son of a freedman[54].

This can also be seen in those junior officers who elected to settle in new *coloniae* alongside the men they had commanded[55]. While this might have been a strange choice for men whose families had long-standing status in their local towns, it would

[47] Valerius Maximus 7.9.2 (= 6.8.6); cf. Saddington (1990) 67-68; Demougin (1992) 38-39.
[48] CIL 14.2169 = ILS 6193 (Aricia, Regio 1, Italia).
[49] Eck (1979) 108-111; Demougin (1992) 28.
[50] Pliny, *N.H.* 28.37; cf. Demougin (1983) 292.
[51] Cf. ch. 7, pp.201-202.
[52] De Blois (2000) 26-27.
[53] Cf. [285] (?Vedius Rufus).
[54] On Horace's military tribunate and *Epodes* 4, see Mankin (1995) 99ff. and Demougin (1983) 283. Cf. [37] L. Appuleius L.f., who may have been the son of a freedman (Demougin (1983) 296).
[55] Cf. Keppie (1983) 107, 109; (2000a) 253; for examples of such men, see particularly [40] C. Aqutius (?Aclutius) L.f. Teret(ina) Gallus; [60] Q. Caecilius Q.f. Atticus (CIL 11.4650); [118] L. Firmius L.f. (CIL 10.5713); [156] C. Lacontius L.f.; [252] L. Sergius L.f. Lepidus (CIL 5.50); and [284] M. Vecilius Campus (AE 1938, 110).

make perfect sense for men who had not been from the top stratum of their local elite. In the new *colonia*, men such as C. Aqutius Gallus would have been the most important men in the town[56]. Further support for this interpretation of Octavian's offer of duoviral status to military tribunes and centurions comes from the fact that Aqutius' colleague as *quinquennalis*, C. Attius P.f. Bucina, was probably a former centurion[57], while L. Sergius Lepidus, military tribune in Legio XXIX, was the son of a Caesarian colonist, and his family were among the new town's elite[58]. Such men might, of course, also achieve status and recognition from sources other than the men they had previously commanded: [222] Cn. Pollienus, who was probably one of the original colonists at Thermae Himeraeae, was honoured at the colony by both the citizens of the colony and by the citizens of Athens[59]; and [56] L. Blatius Ventinus was honoured by both the colonists and inhabitants of Hispalis[60]. Moreover, as we have seen[61], *coloniae* such as Alexandreia Troas appear to have produced a large number of junior officers in subsequent periods, further highlighting the importance of a tradition of military service, and close relationships with Roman commanders, in obtaining junior officer positions. As Demougin argues, the period 49 – 31BC offered great opportunities to those members of the lower echelons of the municipal elite who were prepared to take their chances in the civil wars – providing, of course, that they backed the right side[62].

However, while such men came from comparatively modest origins, it must be remembered that they were nevertheless men of considerable local status[63]. Even the military tribune whose opposition to Octavian's offer cost him his life, [202] Ofillius, was probably from Terventum, where other inscriptions recording equestrian-ranked Ofillii have been found[64], suggesting that his origins were not completely humble. In fact, other members of the municipal elite serving as junior officers in the period were of relatively high local status: [79] M. Cincius L.f. Hor(atia), who may have served in a Pompeian legion, was from a prominent family in Falerii, whose members included

[56] Cf. Demougin (1983) 289.
[57] CIL 11.4652-4653 (Tuder, Regio 6, Italia); cf. Keppie (1983) 177.
[58] Degrassi (1942-1943) 673ff.; Keppie (1983) 203ff.; Demougin (1983) 297, (1992) 45.
[59] Bivona (1994) nos. 13-14.
[60] CIL 2.1176 (Hispalis, Baetica, Hispania).
[61] Cf. ch. 5, pp.163-164.
[62] Demougin (1983) 283.
[63] Demougin (1983) 282ff.
[64] Demougin (1992) 31; cf. CIL 9.2599 (Terventum, Regio 4, Italia).

the probably contemporary *patronus municipii* Q. Tullius Cincius Priscus[65].

The municipal elite might have been useful to Roman commanders beyond providing junior officers. Schmitthenner[66] has drawn attention to the possible role played by land commissioners, responsible for the initial settlement of veterans, in encouraging veteran soldiers to re-enlist[67]. The municipal elite of the new colonies may well have also played a similar role: [118] L. Firmius, who was probably a former *primipilus*, appears to have played a role in the recruitment of Legio IIII Sorana[68] from Campanian veterans, and was promoted to the military tribunate. Firmius was to become the first pontiff of the colony of Sura – a high status for a man who had served in the ranks, and an example of the high municipal status that might be achieved through service as a junior officer in the period.

The close relationship between military tribunes and their men in the period 49 – 31BC can also be seen in the number of inscriptions which record the unit in which a junior officer served. As we have seen[69], this is comparatively rare for inscriptions in the pre-Claudian period, and it is especially rare, as Saddington notes, in the Augustan era[70]. However, the majority of military tribunes known from the period 49 – 31BC do identify the legions they served in. Admittedly, it is generally their service in such legions which allows us to date them to the period, but this practice nevertheless stands in strong contrast to the normal epigraphic practices of the Augustan, and indeed, Tiberian periods.

Moreover, of those known from epigraphic evidence to have probably served in the period 49 – 31BC[71], most served under Octavian, or in legions closely associated with Caesar: the two Tilii from Pompeii ([267] and [268]) served in Legio X Equestris (although [267] C. Tilius served in the legion when it was just Legio X)[72]; [54] C. Baebius T.f. Clu(stumina) served in, probably, Legio XX, one of Octavian's legions[73];

---

[65] CIL 11.3125 = ILS 3111 (Falerii, Regio 7, Italia); cf. Devijver (1976-1993) 1493; Demougin (1992) 37.
[66] Schmitthenner (1958) 73.
[67] Cf. Keppie (1983) 25ff., (1984) 200, (2000a) 252.
[68] Keppie (1983) 26-27, 136; cf. Dobson (1978) 165; Demougin (1988) 589; contra, Ritterling, RE 12.1564.
[69] Cf. ch. 1, pp.26-27.
[70] Saddington (2003) 25-26.
[71] Including those who may also have served in the period immediately following Actium, but excluding [117] M. Feridius and [166] L. Maenius, known from sling bullets.
[72] D'Ambrosio and De Caro (1983) Pompeii 17OS.
[73] CIL 11.623; cf. Schmitthenner (1958) 88, 120.

[252] L. Sergius L.f. Lepidus was a military tribune in Legio XXIX, a Caesarian legion which appears to have joined Octavian at an early stage[74]; [273] M'. Titius M'.f. Fab(ia) served in Legio VIII, one of Caesar's Gallic legions whose veterans were recalled to the standards by Octavian in 43BC[75]; and [114] Fabia[nus(?) --- S]ab(atina) M.f. served in a Legio VI and Legio XXIX[76]; and while the inscription does not explicitly identify the unit he served in, [118] L. Firmius should probably be added to this list.

This is not to say that men were necessarily ashamed of having fought for the 'wrong side'[77]. Horace, as Fraenkel notes[78], does not appear to have been ashamed of his participation at Philippi, and similar attitudes can be seen in some inscriptions from veteran colonies: [60] Q. Caecilius Atticus was honoured by the veterans of Legio XXXI at Tuder[79], and may have fought under M. Brutus, and [156] C. Lactonius, held his military tribunate in Legio XXVII in Macedonia[80], and therefore probably fought for the Republicans during the Philippi campaign[81]: both were probably settled with their legions. However, it is likely that in the examples above we see an echo of the proud boast of the anonymous military tribune [17] [---] (Ovid, *Fasti* 4), whose seat at the games was earned under Caesar at Thapsus ("sub quo meruisse tribunus / glorior")[82].

Even if they were not settled with their men, the relationship between troops and their officers did not necessarily end once an officer left the army, or once troops

[74] CIL 5.50; cf. Schmitthenner (1958) 13, 33, 45.
[75] CIL 5.2163; cf. Schmitthenner (1958) 25-26.
[76] AE 1931, 95; presumably not the future Legio VI Ferrata, which was an Antonian legion, given his service in Legio XXIX, which was probably Octavian: it is likely that this legion is the future VI Victrix, which was one of Octavian's legions (cf. Schmitthenner (1958) 69).
[77] In addition, there are a number of individuals who served in unidentified legions: [243] C. Rosius C.f. Arn(ensi) Sabinus, military tribune in an unidentified Legio IIII (AE 1981, 363; Devijver (1976-2001) 4.1708; Demougin (1992) 28); [40] C. Aqutius (?Aclutius) L.f. Teret(ina) Gallus was a military tribune in a Legio Prima and a Legio Secunda (possibly Legio II Sabina, raised by Pansa in 43BC and one of Octavian's first legions: CIL 10.4876; cf. Devijver and Van 'T Dack (1982-1983) 168; Keppie (1983) 26-28, 29 n.23, 107, (2000a) 253; Demougin (1992) 34); [79] M. Cincius L.f. Hor(atia) was a military tribune in an unidentified Legio Gemella (AE 1895, 153; possibly a Pompeian legion, cf. Devijver (1976-2001) 1.237; Demougin (1992) 36); while [291] Q. Veranius, whose military tribunate may date from the 30s BC, was a military tribune in an unidentified Legio IIII (AE 1981, 824; cf. AE 1981, 824 adnot.; Balland (1981) 85, Devijver (1976-2001) 4.1766).
[78] Fraenkel (1957) 12, 360.
[79] CIL 11.4650; cf. Devijver (1976-2001) 1.192; Keppie (1983) 26-27, 28, 176-177; Broughton (1951-1986) 3.35; Demougin (1992) 54.
[80] AE 1986, 154; cf. AE 1986, 154 adnot.
[81] On Legio XXVII, which was raised by Caesar, fought under him in North Africa, and was subsumed by Cassius, see Schmitthenner (1958) 21; Keppie (1983) 25ff., (1984) 200, (2000a) 252.
[82] Ovid, *Fasti* 4.378-384.

completed their terms of service[83]. Junior officers might also participate in veterans' organisations, such as [296] Q. Veturius Pexsus, who was a member of the *collegium uirtutis*[84], and [24] [- - -]us T.f., a member of the *conlegium honoris et uirtutis* as well as a *duouir* twice in the colony of Arelate. Interestingly, the two men had rather different careers and backgrounds, suggesting that a close relationship between junior officers and veterans need not depend on a long military career: while [- - -]us T.f. appears as a model career soldier, and held five separate junior officer positions following his primipilate, Veturius Pexsus was a military tribune and then a *praefectus fabrum*, and came from a relatively important municipal family[85].

As we have seen, the period 49 – 31BC still saw equestrians of high standing holding junior officer positions, including the military tribunate. However, the Augustan period appears to have seen a concerted effort by Augustus to link the junior officer positions in general, and the military tribunate in particular, with the municipal elite. The period 49 – 31BC was, as we have seen, marked by a decline in the status of the military tribunate, and, perhaps, a rise in the number of adventurers, such as Ofillius, in the junior officer corps. Perhaps as a result, there appears to have been a deliberate Augustan policy to raise the status of the junior officer positions. Freedmen are no longer found holding junior officer positons, and, as we have seen, the sons of senators were encouraged to hold such positions[86]: Augustus' appointment of Tiberius as a military tribune as early as 26BC appears to have set an example. In particular, the post of *tribunus militum a populo* was created, says Suetonius, "Ac necubi aut honestorum deficeret copia aut multitudinis suboles"[87], a policy linked, in Suetonius, with Augustus' attempts to give the *municipia* of Italy a dignity and status of their own.

This policy, to encourage the higher levels of the municipal elite to serve as *tribuni militum*, appears to have been successful. As we have noted, *tribuni militum a populo* generally came from the higher levels of the municipal elite: in Pompeii, for example,

---

[83] *Praefecti ueteranorum*, prefects responsible for time-expired veterans who were retained as reservists, probably belong to the Tiberian era: cf. Keppie (1973) 8ff; *[- - -] (AE 1926, 82)* (Antiocha Pisidia, Asia).
[84] Pflaum (1978) 196; Christol and Demougin (1982) 147-148; Devijver (1976-2001) 4.1821; Demougin (1992) 170. A possible parallel exists between these organisations and the probably Tiberian *praefecti ueteranorum*, on which cf. Keppie (1973) 8ff; cf. *[- - -] (AE 1926, 82)* (Antiocha Pisidia, Asia).
[85] Cf. Duncan-Jones (1965) 242 no. 575; Demougin (1990) 170; Devijver (1992b) 420-421.
[86] Cf. McAlindon (1957) 191ff.
[87] Suetonius, *Aug*. 46. On the post of *tribunus militum a populo*, cf. ch. 5, p.153ff.

tribuni militum a populo such as [136] M. Holconius Rufus, [164] M. Lucretius Decidianus Rufus and [88] A. Clodius Flaccus belonged to the very top of Pompeian society, and only one attested Pompeian *tribunus militum a populo* was not a *duouir quinquennalis*[88]. Similar examples can be found elsewhere, such as [174] M. Manlius Pollio at Caere, [57] Q. Caecilius at Placentia, and [55] P. Baebius Tuticanus at Arusnates[89]. Further evidence can be found in the fact that more *tribuni militum a populo* appear to have held municipal office before their equestrian careers than other junior officers[90], suggesting that Augustus was to some extent attempting to bring established members of the municipal elite into the junior officer corps.

However, we need not take Suetonius' somewhat vague statement, nor the position of *tribunus militum a populo*, as necessarily implying that the junior officer positions had lost importance to members of the municipal elite: many of the military tribunes of the Augustan period who were not *tribuni militum a populo*, as well as those who held other junior officer positions, came from the very highest stratum of municipal society: [163] P. Lucilius Gamala at Ostia[91]; [208] Sex. Palpellius Hister at Pola[92]; [20] [---]lius Clemens at Carsulae[93]; [306] L. Volusenus Clemens from Sestinum[94]; or [112] C. Ennius Marsus at Beneuentum[95], for example. Moreover, the position of *tribunus militum a populo* itself appears to have been only short-lived, belonging solely to the Augustan period, and probably only to the mid-Augustan period. Its disappearance might, of course, be put down to its success. If the municipal elite had been content to withdraw into their own communities in the early-Augustan period, then Augustus was successful in encouraging them to serve as junior officers: the municipal elite was to provide the backbone of the junior officer corps throughout much of the early imperial period. However, this initiative should not necessarily be taken as evidence that the municipal elite had withdrawn from the junior officer corps. As noted above, even men such as Ofillius appear to have held considerable status in

[88] [78] L. Cellius L.f. Men(enia); cf. Castren (1975) 97.
[89] On Manlius, cf. Torelli (1969) 322; Eck (1982) 292 n37; Demougin (1992) 155; on Caecilius, cf. Demougin (1992) 140; on Baebius, cf. Alföldy (1984) 132 no. 216; Demougin (1992) 138.
[90] Cf. ch. 1, p.31.
[91] Meiggs (1973) 501-502; Demougin (1992) 102.
[92] Wiseman (1971) 248-249; Demougin (1992) 439.
[93] Gregori (1989) 31; Demougin (1992) 63.
[94] Demougin (1992) 205-206.
[95] See van Wonterghem (1982) 120; Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 87; Gaggiotti (1991) 495-500; cf. *L. Octauius L.f. Cam(ilia) Rufus* (Devijver (1976-2001) 2.613; Forni (1982) 52; Duthoy (1984-1986) 146 no. 264; Demougin (1992) 158); and [211] C. Papirius Masso, a member of a prominent equestrian family (RE 18.3.1062, 'Papirii Masones').

their home towns, and if Augustus was attempting to recruit from only the very highest ranks of the municipal elite, as opposed to those of equestrian status (or the sons of equestrians), then he was making a fine distinction indeed. Moreover, the advantages of holding a junior officer position were considerable: why would men from the municipal elite shy away from such a post? More likely, therefore, the initiative had a different function.

This can, perhaps, be seen in the fact that Suetonius' mention of Augustus' initiative refers not to the status of the junior officer corps, but to the equestrian class in general: Augustus was perhaps seeking not to reinforce the status of the junior officer corps, but to augment the numbers and status of the equestrian *ordo*. Suetonius links the symbols of equestrian status awarded to [28] Albius Tibullus with his military *dona*[96], which would, as Maxfield has shown, have been those reserved for individuals of equestrian rank[97], while [194] [---] Niger was "castrensibus ... summis equestris ordinis honoribus", which is, as suggested in ILS, a reference to a promotion, perhaps an honorific one, to a junior officer position[98]. The link can also be found in iconography where, as we have seen, crossed *hastae* and the *parma equestris* are used to signify equestrian military service, and therefore by implication equestrian status. It is significant, therefore, that *hastae purae* were part of the standard *dona* for equestrian officers, thus reinforcing this connection.

Moreover, as Demougin argues[99], the census was only intermittently completed between 70BC and the Augustan period. During this period, it would have been difficult for men of equestrian status to distinguish themselves as equestrians through designation by the censors; indeed, during the Triumviral period, equestrian status appears to have become the gift of powerful men[100]. Holding a junior officer position, on the other hand, was a clear public designation of equestrian status[101].

The purpose of the military tribunate *a populo*, therefore, was perhaps to reinforce further the Augustan conception of the equestrian *ordo* by providing a way for the upper levels of the municipal elite to demonstrate their status as members of it, thereby combining the concepts of equestrian status, membership of the municipal

[96] Suetonius, *de poetis, uita Alibi Tibulli* 1-5; cf. Albius Tibullus.
[97] Maxfield (1981) 161.
[98] ILS 2682 adnot.; cf. Devijver (1976-2001) 2.959.
[99] Demougin (1983) 289ff.; cf. for example, Broughton (1951-1986) 2.157, 179, 215.
[100] Cf. Cn. Pompeius Menodorus; Suetonius, *Aug*. 74.2; Appian, *B.C*. 5.80; Dio 48.45.8.
[101] Cf. Nicolet (1969) 147; Brunt (1983) 43.

elite, and service as a junior officer. These concepts are combined, as we have seen, in the cuirassed statue of M. Holconius Rufus[102]. The strength of this link between junior officers and the equestrian order was such that, as Demougin and others remark, service as a junior officer came to designate an individual as equestrian, even if he had not previously been formally recognised as part of the *ordo*[103]. The most important posts in this regard appear to have been the military tribunate and the post of *praefectus fabrum*. The military tribunate was, as we have seen, the post most often held as the only junior officer position in the imperial period, and the administrative nature of the two posts meant that those with little practical military experience could still be effective officers. It is not for nothing, therefore, that modern authors are inclined to view the military tribunate as the defining mark of the equestrian order[104]. The creation of the post of *tribunus militum a populo*, which is not found outside of Italy, had the further advantage of binding the holders of the title more closely to the new order in Rome, and developing an equestrian elite in Italy loyal to Augustus[105]. This can be seen most clearly, perhaps, in the links between *tribuni militum a populo* such as [277] M. Tullius[106] and [136] M. Holconius Rufus[107] and the imperial cult. Moreover, it is also significant that *tribuni militum a populo* were recommended for the office by their own *municipia*. The title therefore conveyed an explicit recognition of both aspects of their status – as equestrians, and as men conspicuously honoured by their own communities.

Most individuals from the municipalities appointed to junior officerships, as we have seen, would probably not yet have held office in their home towns. It has often been assumed that this was not the case. Most modern authors have adopted Birley's classification of three groups of junior officers[108]: young members of the senatorial elite (and the sons of high-ranking equestrians) who held junior officer positions in their 20s before advancing to senatorial office; members of the municipal elite, who held junior officer positions in their mid- to late-30s after holding municipal office; and promoted centurions, who held junior officer positions from their mid-40s

[102] Devijver (1989) 432; cf. ch. 7, pp.220-221.
[103] Demougin (1983) 291, (1988) 356ff; cf. Nicolet (1966) 146, Harmand (1967) 349ff.
[104] Devijver (1972) 108-112, esp. 112 (Table 1); Anderson (1984) 8; Demougin (1988) 356ff. On the importance of the role of *praefectus fabrum*, particularly among non-Italian communities, see below.
[105] Cf. Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 99; Deniaux (2000) 232-233.
[106] Castrén (1975) 231; Mouritsen (1988) 120.
[107] Castrén (1975) 68.
[108] Cf. Birley (1953) 137-139; Devijver (1974) 149; Holder (1980) 72-73; Anderson (1984) 8; Davies (1989) 37; Le Bohec (1994) 38-41.

onwards. The members of the municipal elite who held junior officer positions were, it is sometimes assumed, men who had already completed the local cursus, and who sought to hold junior officer positions as a means of confirming their holding of equestrian status before returning to their home towns[109].

However, as we have seen[110], epigraphic evidence suggests that only one third of junior officers from the municipal elite had held prior municipal office in the Augustan period. This suggests that, in fact, the majority of Augustan junior officers would have been in their 20s and early 30s, and at the start of their public careers. While such men would, of course, have sought the distinction that came with equestrian status, they were not necessarily as ready to return to their home towns as might be assumed. In fact, as we have seen, nearly half of all military tribunes in the Augustan period went on to hold a further junior officer position[111], and the majority of junior officers in the Augustan period held more than one post.

Many, of course, were promoted beyond the junior officer positions, holding either more senior military positions, such as the post of *pro legato*[112], junior magistracies in Rome[113], procuratorships[114], and, of course, senatorial positions. While it is often difficult to determine whether a junior officer who went on to senatorial office was from an equestrian or senatorial family[115], a number of equestrians did go on to high office following their junior officer career. Cornelius Balbus and Velleius Paterculus are, of course, prime examples of this, but others can be adduced: the military tribune [211] C. Papirius Masso was probably of equestrian origin before his aedileship[116]; [208] Sex. Palpellius Hister, from a notable family in Pola[117], was a military tribune

---

[109] Birley (1953) 137; Devijver (1974) 149.
[110] Cf. ch. 1, p.31.
[111] Cf. ch. 5, p.161.
[112] Cf. [55] P. Baebius P.fil. Pobl(ilia) Tuticanus; [150] T. Iunius D.f. Ani(ensi) Montanus; [291] Q. Veranius. See also the *idiologos* [292] M. Vergilius M.f. Teret(ina) Gallus Lusius, and [306] L. Volusenus L.f. Clu(stumina) Clemens, who held a number of important civic positions, including assisting in the census, before being sent to Egypt "ad iur(is) dict(ionem)" (Pflaum (1982) 120; Firpo (1985) 21ff.; Fitz (1987) 256), as well as [89] T. Clodius C.[f. ?C.n.] Pro[culus], "ab Imp(eratore)] Caesare Augu[sto misso pro] censore ad Lus[itanos - - -]" (Magalhaes (2003) 144 no. 13 (fig. 57) = CIL 10.680 (Surrentum, Regio 1, Italia)).
[113] Cf. [58] and [59] Q. Caecilius Q.f. A[nien(si)] (1) and (2); [67] Sex. Campatius M.f. M.n.; [73] A. Castricius Myriotalenti f.; McAlindon (1957) 191ff.
[114] Cf. [154] P. Iuuentius Rufus; [201] Q. Octauius L.f. C.n. L.pron. Ser(gia) Sagitta. [99] C. Cornelius Gallus, *praefectus Aegypti*, might also be mentioned here.
[115] See, for example, the discussion of [209] Sex. Papinius Q.f. Allenius (McAlindon (1957) 192; Demougin (1982) 97; (1992) 208), or of [183] Post. Mimisius C.f. Sardus.
[116] Wiseman (1971) 179.
[117] Wiseman (1971) 248-249; Demougin (1992) 439.

and *comes* of Tiberius in AD11 and, like [291] Q. Veranius, he must have gained greatly from his close relationship with the imperial house: he was directly adlected to the plebeian tribunate, and was consul in AD43[118]; [162] C. Lucilius Benignus Ninnianus probably held an aedileship following his service as *tribunus militum a populo*; [240] [--- Qu]adratus Maesianus Celsus was probably equestrian before his quaestorship; the proconsul [297] M. Vibius Balbinus was probably of equestrian rank before beginning his public career[119]; and the praetor [232] C. Pontius C.f. Paelignus may also have been from an equestrian family[120].

These careers, both within and beyond the junior officer corps, suggest that junior officer positions, far from being held by men at the end of their public careers, were held by ambitious young men who would have hoped for further career opportunities. Not only did service as a junior officer provide a man with status in his home town, but it offered a springboard to further promotion. Many of these new opportunities, of course, were the result of the Augustan system itself. The importance of patronage upon the appointment and promotion of junior officers has already been noted, but few commanders in the Republic held office for long enough that a junior officer could rely on his relationship with that commander to offer the possibility of promotion. However, the long commands given to Caesar and Pompeius would have offered men such an opportunity[121]. Dio notes that the sons of soldiers and freedmen were among Caesar's new senators in 45BC, and while this statement should be treated with some caution, it is not unlikely that some of those men were the sons of Caesar's junior officers[122]. Such opportunities can only have increased under Antonius and Octavian during the Triumviral period, and the Augustan era, with its consolidation of the armed forces under one man, and the development of the procuratorial system, meant that a man joining the army as a junior officer would have known that he had ample opportunities for promotion within and beyond the army.

Moreover, even if a junior officer did not reach the highest echelons of Roman

---

[118] Wiseman (1971) 100; Demougin (1992) 85.
[119] Wiseman (1971) 27; Chastagnol (1973) 598-599; Corbier (1974) 30-31; Birley (1978) 258; Saddington (1980) 22 n.13; Demougin (1992) 107.
[120] De Laet (1941) 270; McAlindon (1957) 192; Alföldy (1985) 400; contra Le Roux (1982) 312 (Demougin (1982) 97. See also L. Tarius Rufus (Pliny, *N.H.* 28.37 and above, p. 230).
[121] Cf. De Blois (2000) 26-27.
[122] Dio 43.47.3. Cf. Syme (1979) 31.

society, service as a junior officer provided a springboard for his descendants. Two such examples are well known: the father of Velleius Paterculus[123] gained his reputation as a *praefectus fabrum*; and [294] Vespasius Pollio, maternal grandfather of the emperor Vespasian, was a military tribune and *praefectus castrorum* whose son obtained senatorial rank[124]. It is also worth noting that junior officer positions offered senatorial families which might have fallen into decline, such as the Aquillii Flori, a chance to begin to rebuild their status[125]. Examples of this progression can be found throughout our period[126]: the recent inscription from Samothrace shows that Cicero's uncle served as a prefect in 101-100BC[127]; the progression of the family of Pompeius Trogus (on which see below) shows the importance of junior officer positions for the status of a family in the late Republican period[128]; and it may well have been his service as a military tribune in a Legio IV during the Triumviral period that brought [291] Q. Veranius to the attention of Octavian – his son accompanied Germanicus as, Tacitus tells us, both a legate and a friend[129], while his grandson was consul in AD49[130]. From the Augustan period, the *praefectus cohortis* [262] Sufenas Proculus was probably the ancestor of P. Sufenas Verus, *legatus pro praetore Lyciae et Pamphyliae* in AD124-133[131]; [214] Sex. Pedius Lusianus Hirrutus, a *primipilaris* who enjoyed a distinguished junior officer career, appears to have had consular descendants[132]; the son of [194] [---] Niger, who was awarded the honours of a junior officer position, received senatorial honours[133]; Salomies suggests that [225] Cn. Pompeius Proculus may have been the adoptive father of the consul T. Clodius Eprius Marcellus[134]; the son of [292] M. Vergilius Gallus Lusius, personally honoured by Augustus and Tiberius, had a successful equestrian career, and his daughter married a

[123] Cf. [289] C. Velleius; Velleius 2.76.1.
[124] Suetonius, *Vesp*. 1.3. Vespasian's paternal grandfather, and his father, were senior centurions, and appear to have obtained considerable status from their military posts (cf. Suetonius, *Vesp*. 1.2).
[125] On the Aquillii Flori, cf. [39] L. Aquillius Florus Turcianus Gallus; CIL 3.551 adnot.; Dean (1919) 165ff.; West (1931) 35; Groag (1939) 15-17; Syme (1964) 112-113; Wiseman (1971) 150 n.5; Cébeillac-Gervasoni (1972) 14; Syme (1986) 31 n.136; Amandry (1988) 106-107; Rizakis et al. (2001) 277. See also P. Lucilius P.f. P.nep. P.pron. P.abnep. Gamala, from a high-ranking equestrian family that may have suffered in the Triumviral proscriptions (Meiggs (1973) 493ff.; Demougin (1992) 101).
[126] Cf. Suolahti (1955) 114ff.
[127] Clinton (2001) 27-28.
[128] Justin 43.5.11-12.
[129] Tacitus, *Ann*. 3.10; Syme (1956) 272-273; Balland (1981) 83-84.
[130] Syme (1956) 272-273; Balland (1981) 94-95.
[131] Demougin (1978a) 622ff.; Devijver (1976-2001) 4.1728-1729).
[132] Dobson (1978) 175-176; Demougin (1992) 199.
[133] Syme (1939) 360 n.2; Demougin (1992) 174.
[134] Salomies (1992) 93.

senator[135]; while Asia[ti]cus , possibly from the Augustan period, was probably a relative of Valerius Asiaticus, consul of AD35 and AD46[136]. Service as a junior officer also allowed families new to Roman citizenship to confirm their status. Like Horace, men such as [37] L. Appuleius may have been eager to shake off their freedman ancestry[137], a distinction made more apparent by the fact that freedmen are no longer found as junior officers in the Augustan period.

The importance of a man's junior officer status to his entire family is seen in a number of inscriptions. One of the earliest such inscriptions (probably datable to the 40s BC), details a family who had recently moved to Pompeii, the Tillii[138]. The family was clearly on the move, in more than one sense: the father was a local magistrate in Arpinum and Verulae, and his two sons served as junior officers in Legio X Equestris (as well as holding local magistracies of their own, one in Verulae and one in Pompeii). The junior officer status of the two sons, as part of the whole monument, served to enhance the status of the entire family, especially a family not long established in Pompeii. As we have seen[139], a nearby monument contained a full-length statue of a junior officer, presumably a military tribune. Similar family groups to the Tillii can be seen in the inscription commemorating the Dupilii at Aricia[140]; the Rosii at Blera[141]; the Pompeii at Hasta[142]; the Caecilii at Placentia[143]; and the monumental arch to the Sergii Lepidi at Pola[144]; while the funeral monument of [88] A. Clodius Flaccus, *tribunus militum a populo* at Pompeii, was a conspicuous piece of display by his entire family, listing his parents, his daughter, and his son-in-law[145]. Similar inscriptions can be found from outside Italy – for example, the monument of the Tullii of Pergamum[146].

---

[135] Demougin (1992) 258.
[136] Pelletier (1997) 212; AE 2004, +888 adnot.
[137] Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 61; Devijver (1976-2001) 5.2006; Kockel (1993) 108-9 (D1).
[138] 17OS Pompeii, De Caro & Ambrosio (1983) (Pompeii, Regio 1); Castrén (1974) 6, (1983) 93, 226; Demougin (1992) 23.
[139] Cf. ch. 7, p.215.
[140] CIL 14.2169 = ILS 6193 (Arcia, Regio 1, Italia); cf. [108] Cn. Dupilius Cn. f. Hor(atia).
[141] CIL 1.3341a = Eck (1979) 108, no. 16 = AE 1981, 363 = EDH HD003307 (Blera, Regio 7); cf. [242] C. Rosius C.f. Arn(ensi) Sabinus.
[142] CIL 5.7566 (Hasta, Regio 9, Italia); cf. [222] L. Pompeius M.f. Pol(lia).
[143] CIL 11.6940 = NS 1899, 124 = AE 1983, 420 (Placentia, Regio 8, Italia); cf. [57] Q. Caecilius L.f.
[144] Degrassi (1942-1943) 673ff., pl. 2; Traversari (1979) 12ff.; Demougin (1992) 45; cf. [252] L. Sergius L.f. Lepidus. See also the inscription commemorating the Flaminii Histri at Aquileia (CIL 5.913; cf. *L. Flaminius L.f. Hister*).
[145] Nicolet (1967) 42-43; Sabbatini Tumolesi (1980) n.21; Mouritsen (1988) 119.
[146] CIL 3.399 (Pergamum, Asia); cf. [49] T. Aufidius T.f. Ani(ensi) Spinter.

Significantly, this form of status display was used by major families, such as the Caecilii and the Clodii, and more modest families, such as the Dupilii and the Rosii, thereby underlining the importance of junior officer status among families throughout all levels of the municipal elite. For the Tillii, however, emphasis on the junior officer status of two of its members served another purpose: the Tillii were a family new to Pompeii, having moved there recently, probably from Verulae. This can be seen elsewhere in Pompeii, where [231] T. Pompullius Labba, possibly originally from Umbria, was a *tribunus militum a populo* and a significant public donor[147]. A similar inscription commemorates the family of the *tribunus militum a populo* [20] [---]lius Clemens at Carsulae, whose voting tribe indicates that they were from another part of Umbria[148]. Elsewhere, as Demougin suggests, [151] M. Iunius Proculus needed to emphasise his junior officer status, and his imperial connections, in the monument he raised to Tiberius and Livia in Terracina, which was not his home town, and where he had held no municipal office[149]. While such families may have enjoyed considerable status in their original home towns, this status would not necessarily translate to a high status in their new homes, where they would have to prove themselves again. For such families, a demonstration of equestrian status, and membership of the broader Roman equestrian elite, via the holding of a junior officer position would be a significant step to establishing their elite position in their new homes.

The ability to demonstrate membership of a broader elite would also have been useful for *primipilares*. As we have seen[150], *primipilares* in the Augustan period appear to have held municipal office only after their military careers. Such men would have been largely absent from their home towns for many years, and would have returned as full members of the equestrian *ordo*, with a status in retirement that offered them the chance to enjoy a position among the highest rank of the municipal elite. This is aptly demonstrated by Horace's account of the harsh treatment that he, as the son of a freedman, received at school from the "pueri magnis e centurionibus orti"[151]. This can also be seen in the fact that *primipilares* who were not promoted to junior officer positions appear to have spent a comparable amount on their funerary monuments as

[147] Nicolet (1967) 37.
[148] Forni (1982) 30; Demougin (1992) 63.
[149] Demougin (1992) 261.
[150] Cf. ch. 1, pp.31-32.
[151] Horace, *Sat*. 1.6.71ff.; cf. Fraenkel (1957) 2-3.

duouiri and former junior officers[152]. *Primipilares* who had been promoted to junior officer positions would have held a higher status, as is shown by the case of [51] Sex. Aulienus, who held duovirates in both Forum Iulii, his home town[153], and Venafrum, where he retired, and where he also held a flaminate. Another *primipilaris* who enjoyed a long junior officer career, [24] [- - -]us T.f. Teret(ina), retired to hold municipal office at Arelate, while [214] Sex. Pedius Lusianus Hirrutus retired to Interpromium, possibly his home town, where he had a successful municipal career, serving as *quinquennalis* in place of Germanicus and engaging in significant public benefaction[154].

Pedius' service as a *praefectus* in place of Germanicus also highlights the way in which relationships to the imperial family, a development of relationships seen in earlier periods between men such as Cornelius Balbus and the 'dynasts', had become immensely important. For some junior officers, such as the anonymous individual who served, probably as *praefectus castrorum*, under Tiberius, C. Caesar and Agrippa[155], this connection – either obtained or reinforced through service as a junior officer – was probably the driving force of their careers, as in the cases of [291] Q. Veranius and [208] Sex. Palpellius Hister. [36] L. Aponius, a *praefectus equitum*, military tribune in two legions, and *praefectus castrorum*, who was *flamen Augusti* and *praefectus pro IIuiro C. Caesaris Augusti filii*[156], was probably a relation of the L. Aponius who served on Drusus' staff[157]; while [301] A. Virgius Marsus clearly enjoyed, and benefited from, his imperial connections – the explicit reference to both Augustus and Tiberius in his cursus was surely intended, in keeping with the dedication of five silver statues of (unidentified) members of the imperial house, to demonstrate his loyalty and close connections to the imperial family[158]. However, even for officers with a less intimate relationship with the Imperial house, service under Augustus, or his family, was something to boast about. [151] M. Iunius Proculus is named as "praefectus equitum diui Augusti"[159] on a monument to Tiberius and Livia, and the fact that the monument was conspicuously restored, probably by

[152] Cf. [14] [- - -] M.f. Fal(erna) [- - -]; Duncan-Jones (1982) 166-171; Devijver (1992b) 421.
[153] Dobson (1978) 165; Demougin (1992) 265.
[154] Torelli (1982) 186.
[155] Cf. [2] [---] AE 1964, 107 (Trebula Mutuesca, Regio 4, Italia).
[156] Dobson (1978) 169-170; Pflaum (1978) 195.
[157] Tacitus, *Ann*. 1.29; cf. Christol (1999) 15-16; Demougin (1992) 178.
[158] Keppie (1996) 109.
[159] CIL 10.6309 = CIL *11.00250(2b) (Tarracina, Regio 1, Italia); cf. Demougin (1992) 224.

his wife in the Claudian period, is further testament to the importance of junior officer status in raising the status of one's family. [51] Sex. Aulienus, who, like Iunius Proculus, needed to emphasise his status in a new town, is named as "praef(ecto) castr(orum) Imp(eratoris) Caesar(is) Aug(usti) et Ti. Caesaris Augusti"[160]. Other examples can be found: [306] L. Volusenus Clemens made much of his civilian appointments under Augustus and Tiberius, held after his military tribunate and equestrian prefecture; [292] M. Vergilius Gallus Lusius was presented with "hastis puris duabus et coronis aureis ab diuo Aug(usto) et Ti. Caesare Aug(usto)", although the inscription, set up by Vergilius' son, chose to emphasise his sister's status as the wife of a senator, naming her first and in the most prominent lettering, and naming himself as "frater" rather than as "filius"[161]; [217] Cn. Petronius Asellio was a *praefectus fabrum* under Tiberius[162]; [208] Sex. Palpellius Hister was a military tribune and, perhaps at the same time, "comiti Ti. Caesaris Aug(usti) dato ab diuo Aug(usto)"[163]; while Octauius Ligus, a military tribune in Legio VI (Victrix), set up inscriptions to honour L. Caesar and Agrippa Postumus[164], thereby also, perhaps, reinforcing the link between junior officer status and the *princeps iuuentutis*.

Like Iunius Proculus, a number of Italian junior officers raised significant monuments in honour of the imperial house. [71] L. Cassius Corneolus, a *primipilaris* as well as a former military tribune, raised an arch in honour of Tiberius at Arusnates[165]. [284] M. Vecilius Campus dedicated his significant public works in Luceria to Augustus. Perhaps as a local man in a town which had been resettled as an Augustan *colonia* he felt the need to give a conspicuous demonstration of his military background and his loyalty to Augustus[166], although [231] T. Pompullius Lappa, whose statue to Augustus decorated his public buildings, was a *tribunus militum a populo*, and therefore presumably an established figure, in Superaequum[167]. Other former officers[168], perhaps as a result of connections made during their service, or perhaps

[160] CIL 10.4868 = ILS 2688 (Venafrum, Regio 1, Italia).
[161] CIL 10.4862 = ILS 2690 (Venafrum, Regio 1, Italia); Maxfield (1981) 161-162.
CIL 13.6816 (Mogontiacum, Germania Superior).
[163] CIL 5.35.
[164] CIL 11.3304 = ILS 135; CIL 11.3305 = ILS 142 (Forum Clodii, Regio 7, Italia); cf. A. Octauius A.f. Ligus.
[165] Bandelli (2000) 152; Buonapare and Eck (1994) 713.
[166] Keppie (1983) 107, 165.
[167] Buonocore (1989) 99.
[168] E.g. [214] Sex. Pedius Sex.f. Ar[n(ensi)] Lusianus Hirrutus; [69] C. Caristanius C.f. Ser(gia) Fronto Caesianus Iulius; [230] T. Pomponius T.f. Pol(lia) Petra.

simply as the leading men in their communities, had the honour of holding municipal positions in lieu of members of the imperial house.

The close connections between junior officers and the imperial house are found among junior officers from outside Italy. Even more than their Italian counterparts, junior officers from provincial towns appear to have been extremely important within local (and provincial) politics, which is, of course, reflected in their role within the imperial cult, something also seen, as noted above, among *tribuni militum a populo* in Italy. During the early imperial period, more than one member of the Lusitanian Cornelii Bocchi served as a *praefectus fabrum* and military tribune, as well as holding the high status post of *flamen prouinciae*[169]. [49] T. Aufidius Spinter of Pergamum married into a family which produced a *sacerdos Romae et Salutis Augusti* and a *flamen Romae et Augustae* during the Augustan period, and his son served as a military tribune for many years[170]. In addition, [262] M. Sufenas Proculus was a significant figure in Cyrenae in Cyrenaica, and set up a statue to Tiberius[171]; while [69] C. Caristanius Fronto Iulius, possibly the son of an Augustan colonist, was an extremely prominent man in Antiocha Pisidia[172]. As in Italy, the holding of junior officerships was clearly a significant indicator of status, and, paralleling Q. Varius Geminus' claim to be the first Paelignian senator[173], [100] Cornelius Menodorus was proud to claim that he was the first military tribune from Asia[174]. The status was also important to families, as is shown by the re-cutting of an inscription to an anonymous military tribune in Crete[175], and the monument of the Tullii of Pergamum[176].

The cursus inscriptions of two Eastern officers, [147] Iulius Posidonius[177] and [127]

---

[169] Cf. *[?L.] C[orn]elius C.f. Bocchus (1)*; ILS 2921 adnot.; PIR 1337; Etienne (1958) 122-124; d'Encarnação (1984) 207; Saddington (1985) 534; Curchin (1990) 177; Le Bohec (1989) 136; Demougin (1992) 423-426; Devijver (1976-2001) 5.2079-2080.
[170] Habicht (1969) 164-165; Demougin (1992) 69. Cf. also the (probably not Augustan) military tribune *L. Antonius M. Antonii Polemonis filius Cor[nel]ia Zeno*, a priest in the imperial cult and a member of a powerful family in Asia descended from the man granted the throne of Pontus by M. Antonius (cf. Buckler and Calder (1939) 40; Devijver (1976-1993) 114, 1439; Ceylan and Ritti (1987) 86ff; Malay (1987) 74-75).
[171] Gasperini (1971) 5ff.; Demougin (1978) 620ff.; Reynolds (1979) 459; Laronde (1988) 1022; Luni (1991) 130-132.
[172] Cheesman (1913) 254; AE 2001, 1918 adnot.; Halfmann (1982) 645; Demougin (1992) 122-123.
[173] CIL 9.3306 = ILS 932a (Superaequum, Regio 4, Italia); cf. Syme (1939) 363.
[174] AE 1993, 1479 = AE 1997, 1436 (Ephesus, Asia).
[175] Cf. [1] [---] (AE 1933, 199 (Priansos, Creta et Cyrenaica)); Guarducci (1930) 87.
[176] CIL 3.399 (Pergamum, Asia); cf. [49] T. Aufidius T.f. Ani(ensi) Spinter.
[177] IGR 4.1626 (Philadelphia, Asia).

Fuluius Lesso[178], use the phrase "tribunus militum (diui) Augusti" a phrase which suggests that they were directly appointed by Augustus himself[179]. This has led to the suggestion that the title was, perhaps, a provincial equivalent to the Italian *tribunus militum a populo*[180], which, although intriguing, is unlikely to be correct, and is especially doubtful given that it is hard to date these examples conclusively to the Augustan period. The examples of Italian officers who served with, or were appointed by, members of the imperial house suggest that the phrase refers either to their appointment, or to the fact that they served in an army directly commanded by a member of the imperial family: as with the Italian officers, Iulius Posidonius and Fuluius Lesso were attempting to make the most of their Imperial connections.

Both in Italy and in the provinces, therefore, the holding of a junior officer position offered young members of the municipal elite a chance to gain wealth and connections, and to advance to even higher positions within the Roman system. Those who only held a junior officer position nevertheless obtained a high status within their own communities, and were often able to use their military status to set themselves apart from the rest of the municipal elite, especially if they had the good fortune, or connections, to serve directly under members of the imperial house.

Similar factors seem to have motivated, and influenced, the careers of men whose families had only recently acquired Roman citizenship. As noted above, we do not have much evidence for the process by which members of the newly enfranchised Italian elite joined the junior officer corps after the Social War. However, an analogue can be found in the incorporation into the junior officer corps of new Roman citizens from communities beyond Italy. The best example of this comes from the family of the historian Pompeius Trogus[181]. Pompeius Trogus' grandfather gained Roman citizenship under Pompeius during the war against Sertorius, commanding native Spanish cavalry. One of his sons, Trogus' uncle, was then a cavalry officer under Pompeius, and another son, Trogus' father, was a secretary to Caesar. Therefore, the advancement of the Pompeii Trogi, by Justin's account, owed itself to two major factors – their high status within their own community, with a tradition of military command, and a close relationship with powerful Roman commanders that originated

[178] CIL 2.14.336 = CIL 2.3852 = ELST 46 = IRSAT 52 (Saguntum, Hispania citerior).
[179] See also *L. Antonius M. Antonii Polemonis filius Cor[nel]ia Zeno*.
[180] CIL 2.3852 adnot.; Devijver (1976-2001) 1.388; Demougin (1992) 151.
[181] Justin 43.5.11-12; cf. [227] Pompeius Trogus.

in, and was strengthened by, military service. The importance of such links can also be seen in the two Titii, military tribunes under Caesar, whose father had been placed in the Senate by Caesar[182]. While we do not know the reason for Caesar's promotion of their father, it is tempting to see a parallel with another Spaniard, [97] Cornelius Balbus, whose service under Caesar as *praefectus fabrum* ultimately led to his consulship in 40BC[183]. The fact that both Caesar and Pompeius were actively promoting their links with the Spanish elite, both before and after the acquisition of citizenship, demonstrates the importance to the Roman elite of such patronage, as well as the opportunities available to members of the Spanish elite during the pre-Augustan period.

The need to court members of the provincial elite, and the opportunities presented as a result, can also be seen in the case of the Gallic elites. These elites, with a strong tradition of military leadership[184], were important for the supply of troops within Gaul and, once the civil wars began, in the battles for the control of Rome, as well as for keeping the peace in Gaul during and after the civil wars[185]. Initially, as with the grandfather of Pompeius Trogus, members of the Gallic elite were used to command troops from their own communities. One passage in Caesar is particularly revealing: two Gallic commanders of Aeduan cavalry are described as "Eporedorix Aeduus, summo loco natus adulescens et summae domi potentiae, et una Viridomarus, pari aetate et gratia sed genere dispari"[186]. A parallel might well be drawn between Viridomarus and men such as Marius Siculus – ambitious members of the equestrian *ordo* who sought further advancement through service as a junior officer. The 'low' status of Viridomarus should not, however, be overstated: Caesar makes a similar claim about Raucilius and Egus, two sons of an Allobrogan chief who commanded cavalry under the overall leadership of [307] Volusenus Quadratus[187]. Other such commanders can be found in Iulius Togirix, for example, whose later coins depict him in military dress, with the full Roman *tria nomina*[188]; and in Dumnorix[189] and

[182] Caesar, *B.Afr*. 28; cf. [270] Titius (1).
[183] Cicero, *Balb*. 63; cf. 41, 43.
[184] Drinkwater (1978) 827, 829; (1983) 10ff.
[185] Cheesman (1914) 12; Wightman (1976) 76ff., (1977) 106ff., 114; Drinkwater (1978) 828; (1983) 12ff.
[186] Caesar, *B.G*. 7.39; cf. Drinkwater (1978) 825.
[187] Caesar, *B.C*. 3.59.2. On the command structure of such units, cf. ch. 4, pp.110-111.
[188] Wightman (1977) 119; Drinkwater (1978) 872.
[189] Caesar, *B.G*. 1.18.10; cf. *Dumnorix*.

Vertiscus[190]. Caesar, therefore, employed established members from the highest level of the Gallic elite and also used his patronage to bring forward men who would then owe their new status to him. Such men also, as Wightman points out, provided useful hostages[191]. Importantly, however, such men were not Roman citizens[192]. As with the grandfather of Pompeius Trogus, Roman citizenship was a reward that could be won with service. This practice continued into the imperial period, where parallels can be found in the Cheruscans Flauus and Arminius, and the Batavian Chariovalda[193]. As with the Italian elite of the second century BC, a family's first step towards junior officer status came with the command of men from their own communities within the Roman military system.

The sons of Gallic commanders who had acquired citizenship through service in the Roman army were eligible to hold junior officer positions, as seen in the example of C. Iulius Victor[194], and the importance of service for Rome to the elites of the north-west frontier of Italy can also be seen in the 'courtesy titles' given to men such as Staius Esdragassi f. or M. Iulius Cottius Victor[195], the king of the *alpes Cottiae*[196]. Where the Gallic elites acquired junior officer status, it served a dual purpose. To the men themselves, it was a way of demonstrating status within their own communities and a means to gain wealth, valuable connections, and, perhaps, future promotion. And, of course, to the Romans the service of Gallic *nobiles* as junior officers served to tie them more closely into the Roman military and political system. A demonstration of this is provided by [290] Velleius Paterculus' description of Arminius as "assiduus militiae nostrae priores comes"[197]. A parallel can be found in the speech given by Sallust to Micipsa upon Jugurtha's return from Numidia: "nouissume rediens Numantia meque regnumque meum gloria honorauisti tuaque uirtute nobis Romanos ex amicis amicissumos fecisti; in Hispania nomen familiae renouatum est"[198]. For the elite of the north western regions of the empire, however, this integration took place at a time when old kingdoms and, as Drinkwater notes, old military systems, were being

[190] Caesar, *B.G*. 8.12.4-5; cf. *Vertiscus*.
[191] Wightman (1976) 79.
[192] Cf. Drinkwater (1976) 825ff.
[193] Cf. *(?C. ?Iulius) Flauus*; *(C. Iulius) Arminius*; *(?C. ?Iulius) Chariovalda*; Drinkwater (1983) 24.
[194] Cf. *C. Iulius Cognometodubni f. Acedomopatis n. Volt(inia) Victor*.
[195] Cf. *Staius Esdragassi f.*; *M. Iulius Cottius Regis Donni f. Victor*.
[196] Cf. PIR(2) 274; Pflaum (1950) 20, 215; Demougin (1992) 417 n.14.
[197] Velleius 2.18; cf. Saddington (2003) 20; *(C. Iulius) Arminius*.
[198] Sallust, *B.J*. 10.2.

integrated into the Roman system[199], with new concepts of community, as seen in the altar at Lugdunum or even in the creation of new *provinciae*, being paralleled by new military structures, such as the permanent Roman *cohortes* and *alae*, commanded at the tactical level by a Roman officer. For the Romans, a Gallic elite whose status and wealth was partly owed to service as a junior officer provided a useful means of encouraging the development of the new system.

It is perhaps significant that Gallic junior officers are generally found serving on the Rhine, close to their homes[200]. However, as this pattern can also be seen among junior officers from Roman colonies in the East during the pre-Antonine period[201], it probably reflects not a desire for the Roman elite to shelter the Gallic elite[202], but rather a preference among local elites to serve in areas with which they were familiar, which were close to their homes and families, and in units which would contain men from their own communities. Significantly, however, the Gallic elite often served as cavalry commanders, essentially performing the same command roles as they had for centuries, and as *praefecti fabrum*, which enabled a member of the Gallic elite to develop a close relationship with members of the Roman elite[203]. It is tempting to see parallels here with Cornelius Balbus, or with the two Spanish Cornelii Bocchi[204] who served for extended periods as *praefecti fabrum*. As with Bantius the Nolan, and throughout our period, close ties with powerful Roman patrons were crucial in the acquisition of future posts and status. Moreover, as with the Cornelii Bocchi, and other junior officers from the provinces, service as a junior officer appears to have been linked to provincial religious office, so too we find it in the case of Gallic officers such as the Santonan C. Iulius Rufus[205] at the cult centre in Lugdunum.

We do not, however, have examples of Gallic junior officers promoted to the Roman Senate in our period. The reason for this might, of course, be the result of the slow spread of the epigraphic habit to the West. However, it may well be that for the Gallic elite, as with the Italian elite in the first century BC, service as a junior officer was one step on a family's progression within Roman society. It generally took more than

[199] Cf. Drinkwater (1978) 829ff.
[200] Cf. Drinkwater (1978) 829ff.
[201] Birley (1953) 137; Devijver (1974) 149.
[202] Drinkwater (1978) 848ff.
[203] Drinkwater (1978) 848; cf. Pflaum (1950) 195ff.; Saller (1980) 56-57.
[204] Cf. *[?L.] C[orn]elius C.f. Bocchus (1)*.
[205] Drinkwater (1978) 848.

one generation for a family to move from being foreigners to being members of the highest levels of the Roman elite. However, for the Gallic elite, as for the newly enfranchised citizens of Italy, the status and connections, as well as the wealth, gained through service as a junior officer enabled their descendants to aim for higher office, and even for the highest office of all.

Conclusion

The central conclusion of this thesis is that, contrary to certain modern theories, the junior officer corps of the last years of the Republic was not fundamentally different from that of the second century BC. Instead, it was the period of civil war (49 – 31BC) that brought about dramatic change in the junior officer corps. The effects of this period can be seen most clearly in the composition of the junior officer corps: we do not find, for instance, young members of the senatorial elite serving as military tribunes, while promoted centurions (especially *primipilares*), begin to appear, as do increasing numbers of men from the provinces. In addition, the period of civil war appears to have been a period of rapid innovation in the system of military organisation: the development of the permanent legions, with discrete identities, is well known, but we should also recognise the importance of the early permanent *cohortes* and *alae*. As we have seen, the changes in Roman auxiliary recruitment and organisation, while not entirely unprecedented, were to have far-reaching implications for the future organisation of the Roman army, and for the junior officer corps: two of the three posts which formed part of the standard equestrian military cursus of the Flavian period involved the command of such units. We must therefore recognise that while the Augustan reforms of the Roman army were wide-reaching, he inherited a system which had already undergone dramatic change, and further significant change was to come: the junior officer posts of the Augustan period were often markedly different from those of the later Principate. Two posts help to illustrate this: the post of *praefectus castrorum*, still in its earliest years, and sometimes held following junior officer posts that were later part of the equestrian military cursus; and the post of *praefectus leuis armaturae*, an innovation that was soon abandoned.

While the junior officer corps of the period 49 – 31BC included individuals from a much wider geographical area than before, and while the status of the military tribunate, at least, appears to have declined, there is no suggestion that the junior officer positions ceased to be posts of equestrian status. We have also seen how the link between the holding of junior officer positions and membership of the equestrian ordo, deliberately reinforced by Augustus, enabled men from communities which had recently acquired Roman citizenship to demonstrate their new status as members of the Roman municipal elite – as well as the way in which the junior officer positions

themselves enabled men from such backgrounds to develop connections with important men. Contrary to some modern perceptions, the typical junior officer of the Augustan period was not a man who had completed his municipal cursus, or one who was holding a junior officer position (typically the military tribunate) principally to confirm his membership of the equestrian *ordo*; in fact, only a minority of junior officers held municipal office before holding a junior officer post, and more than half of the military tribunes of the Augustan period (and the same is true of junior officers in general), held more than one junior officer position. The junior officer positions were, throughout our period, an important means by which emergent men and families could attain greater recognition, and advance further within Roman society.

Bibliography

Aigner, H. (1974), *Die Soldaten als Machtfaktor in der Ausgehenden Römischen Republik*, Innsbruck.

Alföldy, G. (1962), 'Die Auxiliartruppen der Provinz Dalmatien', *Acta Archaeologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 14 (1962) 259-296.

Alföldy, G. (1968), *Die Hilfstruppen der römischen Provinz Germania inferior*, Epigraphische Studien 6, Düsseldorf.

Alföldy, G. (1969a), *Fasti Hispanienses: senatorische Reichsbeamte und Offiziere in den spanischen Provinzen des Römischen Reiches von Augustus bis Diokletian*, Wiesbaden.

Alföldy, G. (1969b), *Die Personennamen in der römischen Provinz Dalmatia*, Beiträge zur Namenforschung, Bhft. 4, Heidelberg.

Alföldy, G. (1973), *Flamines Provinciae Hispaniae Citerioris*, Anejos de Archivo Español de Arqueologia VI, Madrid.

Alföldy, G. (1975), *Die römischen Inschriften von Tarraco*, Berlin.

Alföldy, G. (1977), 'Les *equites romani* et l'histoire sociale des provinces germaniques de l'empire Romain', *Corsi di cultura sull'arte Ravennate e Bizantina* 7 (1977) 7-19.

Alföldy, G. (1982), 'Senatoren aus Norditalien Regiones IX, X und XI', in *Epigrafia e Ordine Senatorio* II, *Tituli* 5 (1982) 309-368.

Alföldy, G. (1984a), *Römische Statuen in Venetia et Histria. Epigraphische Quellen*, Heidelberg.

Alföldy, G. (1984b), 'Drei städtische eliten im römischen Hispanien', *Gerión* 2 (1984) 193-238.

Alföldy, G. (1985), 'Hispanien und das römischen Hispanien', *Gerión* 3 (1985) 379-410.

Alföldy, G. (1990), *Der Obelisk auf dem Petersplatz in Rom. Ein historisches Monument der Antike*, Heidelberg.

Alföldy, G. (2002), 'Zu kaiserlichen Bauinschriften aus Italien', *Epigraphica* 64 (2002) 113-146.

Amandry, M. (1988), *Le monnayage des duovirs Corinthiens*, BCH Suppl. XV, Paris.

Anderson, A.S. (1984), *Roman Military Tombstones*, Aylesbury.

Andrezejewski, S. (1954), *Military Organisation and Society*, London.

Antolini, S. (2000), 'Suasa', in *Supplementa Italica* N.S. 18, Rome, 317-394.

Arnaldi, A. (1986), 'Un primipilo sentinate in una iscrizione inedita da corchiano (VT)', *Picus. Studi e ricerche sulle Marche nell'antichità* 6 (1986) 129-135

Badian, E. (1954), 'Lex Acilia Repetundarum' in *American Journal of Philology* 75 (1954) 374-84.

Badian, E. (1959), 'The Early Career of A. Gabinius', in *Philologus* 103 (1959) 87-99.

Badian, E. (1964), *Studies in Greek and Roman History*, Oxford.

Badian, E. (1972), *Publicans and Sinners. Enterprise in the Service of the Roman Republic*, Oxford.

Badian, E. (1997), 'Notes on a recent list of Praefecti Fabrum under the Republic', *Chiron* 27 (1997) 3-19.

Baillet, J. (1926), *Inscriptions grecques et latines des tombeaux des rois ou syringes*, 3 Vols., Cairo.

Balland, A. (1981), *Fouilles de Xanthos, Tome VII: Inscriptions d'epoque impériale du Létôon,* Paris.

Baltry, J. and Baltry, J.C. (1977), 'Apamée de Syrie, archéologie et histoire. I. Des origines à la Tétrachie', *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II.8 (1977) 103-134.

Bandelli, G. (1983), 'Per una storia delle classe dirigente di Aquileia Repubblicana', in *Les "Bourgeoisies" Municipales Italiennes Aux IIe et Ier Siecles av. J-C.* (Cébeillac-Gervasoni, M. ed.), Paris.

Bandelli, G. (2000), 'I *praefecti iure dicundo* come supplenti degli imperatori e dei cesari nelle *regiones* XI, X, IX e VIII', in *Les élites municipales de l'Italie péninsulaire de la mort de César à la mort de Domitien entre continuité et rupture: classes sociales dirigeantes et pouvoir central* (Cébeillac-Gervasoni, M. ed.), Collection de l'École Française de Rome 271, Rome, 149-175.

Barbieri, G. (1941), 'Il "Praefectus orae maritimae"', *Rivista di filologia e distruzione classica* 19 (1941) 268-280.

Bassignano, M.S. (1997), 'Ateste', in *Supplementa Italica* N.S. 15, Rome.

La Baume, P. (1973), 'Oppidum Ubiorum und Zweilegionenlager in Köln', *Gymnasium* 80 (1973) 333-380.

Bean, G.E. (1965), *Side Kitabeleri (Inscriptions of Side)*, Ankara, *non uidi*.

Ben Zeev, M.P. (1998), *Jewish Rights in the Ancient World – The Greek and Roman Documents Quoted by Josephus Flavius*, Tübingen.

Bernand, A. and Bernand, E. (1969), *Les inscriptions grecques de Philae*, Vols I-II, Paris.

Bernand, A. (1977), *Pan du désert*, Leiden.

Bertman, S. (1976), *The Conflict of Generations in Ancient Greece and Rome*, Amsterdam.

Bertrandy, F. and Rémy, B. (2000), 'Legio XII Fulminata', *Les légions de Rome sous le haut-empire: actes du congrès de Lyon (17-19 septembre 1998)* (Le Bohec, Y. and Wolff, C. eds.), Lyons, 253-258.

Birley, A.R. (2003), 'The commissioning of equestrian officers', in *Documenting the Roman Army. Essays in Honour of Margaret Roxan* (Wilkes, J. ed.), London, 1-19.

Birley, E. (1953), 'The Equestrian Officers of the Roman Army', in *Roman Britain and the Roman Army: Collected Papers* (Birley, E. ed.), Kendal, 133-153.

Birley, E. (1957), 'Rev. Suolahti', in *English Historical Review* 72 (1957) 143-144.

Birley, E. (1969), 'Septimus Severus and the Roman Army', in *Epigraphische Studien* 8 (1969) 63-82.

Birley, E. (1978), '*Alae* named after their commanders', *Ancient Society* 9 (1978) 257-273.

Birley, E. (1981), 'Evocati Aug.: A Review', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 43 (1981) 25-29.

Birley, E. (1986), 'Before Diplomas and the Claudian Reform', in *Heer und Integrationspolitik: die römischen Militärdiplome als historische Quelle* (Eck, W. and Wolff, H. eds.), Köln, 249-257.

Bivona, L. (1981), 'Appunti di onomastica termitana (I *Cestii*, i *Granii* e i *Veciliii*)', in *Scritti sul mondo antico in memoria di Fulvio Grosso* (Gasperini, L. ed.), Rome, 39-53.

Bivona, L. (1985), 'Ancora sui *Cestii* d'Africa e di Sicilia', *L'africa romana* 3 (1985) 97-100.

Bivona, L. (1994), *Iscrizioni latine lapidarie del Museo Civico di Termini Imerese*, Rome.

De Blois, L. (1987), *The Roman Army and Politics in the First Century B.C.*, Amsterdam.

De Blois, L. (1992), 'Roman officers and politics. The manipulation of the military cadre in the period 44-36 BC', *Laverna* 3 (1992) 104-128.

De Blois, L. (2000), 'Army and Society in the Late Roman Republic: Professionalism and the Role of the Military Middle Cadre', in *Kaiser, Heer und Gesesllschaft in der Römischen Kaiserzeit – Gedenkschrift für Eric Birley* (Alföldy, G., Dobson, B. and Eck, W. eds.), Stuttgart, 11-31.

De Blois, L. (2005), 'Army and General in the Late Republic', in *A Companion to the Roman Army (Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World)* (Erdkamp, P. ed.), Oxford, 164-179.

Boak, A.E.R. (1957), 'Rev. Suohalti', *Latomus* 16 (1957) 514-515.

Bogaers, J.E. (1974), 'Troupes Auxiliaries Thraces dans la Partie Néerlandaise de la Germania Inferior', in *Actes du IXe Congrès International d'Études sur les Frontières Romaines* (Pippidi, D.M. ed.), Cologne, 445-463.

Le Bohec, Y. (1989), *La Troisième Légion Auguste*, Paris.

Le Bohec, Y. (1990), *La Sardaigne et l'armée romaine sous le Haut Empire*, Pubblicazioni del Dipartimento di Storia dell'Università degli Studi di Sassari 15, Sassari.

Le Bohec, Y. (1994), *The Roman Imperial Army*, London.

Le Bohec, Y. (1999), 'Les *milites Glanici*: possibilités et probabilités', *Revue Archeologique de Narbonnaise* 32 (1999) 293-300.

Bollini, M. (1975), '*C. Baebius, praefectus orae maritimae* di Ottaviano', *Studi Romagnoli* 26 (1975) 339-346.

Bowman, A.K. and Thomas, J.D. (1983), *Vindolanda: The Latin Writing Tablets*, Britannia

Monograph Series 4, London.

Braund, D. (1998), '*Cohors*: the governor and his entourage in the self-image of the Roman Republic', in *Cultural Identity in the Roman Empire* (Laurence, R. and Berry, J. eds.), London, 10-24.

Breeze, D.J. (1969), 'The Organization of the Legion: The First Cohort and the Equites Legionis', *Journal of Roman Studies* 59 (1969) 50-55.

Brizzi, G. (1995), 'La gerarchia militare in età repubblicana', in *La hiérarchie (rangordnung) de l'armée romaine sous le haut-empire* (Le Bohec, Y. ed.), Paris, 15-21.

Broadhead, W. (2005), 'Colonisation, Land Distribution, and Veteran Settlement', in *A Companion to the Roman Army (Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World)* (Erdkamp, P. ed.), Oxford, 148-163.

Broughton, T.R.S (1951-1986), *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic*, III Vols., New York.

Brunt, P.A. (1962), 'The army and the land in the Roman revolution', *Journal of Roman Studies* 52 (1962) 69-86.

Brunt, P.A. (1971), *Italian Manpower 225BC-AD14*, Oxford.

Brunt, P.A. (1974), 'C. Fabricius Tuscus and an Augustan Dilectus', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 13 (1974) 161-185.

Brunt, P.A. (1975), 'The Administrators of Roman Egypt', *Journal of Roman Studies* 65 (1975) 124-147.

Brunt, P.A. (1983), '*Princeps* and *Equites*', *Journal of Roman Studies* 73 (1983) 42-75.

Brunt, P.A. (1988), *The fall of the Roman Republic and related essays*, Oxford.

Brusin, G. (1991-1993), *Inscriptiones Aquileiae*, Udine.

Buckler, W.H. and Calder W.M. (1939), *Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua Vol. VI: Monuments and Documents from Phrygia and Caria*, Manchester.

Büjükolanci, M. and Engelmann, H. (1991), 'Inschriften aus Ephesos', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 86 (1991) 137-144.

Buonapane, A. and Eck, W. (1994), 'Praefect[us ... Caes]aris, nicht praefect[us aerarii milit]aris: zu CIL V 8845', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 102 (1994) 195-205.

Buonocore, M. (1987), 'Corfinium', in *Supplementa Italica*, NS 3 (1987) 93-222, Rome.

Buonocore, M. (1989), 'Superaequum', in *Supplementa Italica*, NS 5 (1989) 88-144, Rome.

Buonocore, M. (2001-2002), 'De titulis quibusdam Trebulae Mutuescae repertis adnotationes nonnullae', *Atti della Pontificia Romana di archeologia - Rendiconti* (RPAA) 74 (2001-2002) 281-304.

Busquets-Artigas, S. (2009), '*Auxilia* in the Roman Eastern Campaigns (89-62 B.C.)', in *Transforming Historical Landscapes in the Ancient Empires* (Antela-Bernárdez, B. and Ñaco del Hoyo, T. eds.), BAR International Series 1986, 63-76.

Cadiou, F. (2001), 'Les guerres en *Hispania* et l'émergence de la cohorte légionnaire dans l'armée romaine sous la rébublique: une révision critique', *Gladius* 21 (2001) 167-182.

Cadiou, F. (2002), 'À propos du service militaire dans l'armée romaine au IIe siècle avant J.-C.: le cas de Spurius Ligustinus (Tite-Live 42,34)', in *Homages à Carl Deroux, II: Prose et linguistique, Médicine* (Defosse, P. ed.), Collection Latomus 267, Brussels, 76-90.

Cadiou, F. (2009), 'Le *dilectus* de l'année 151 et les Guerres Celtibério-Lusitaniennes: Remarques sur la question de la réticence face au service militaire dans la Rome du IIe s. av. J.-C.', in *Transforming Historical Landscapes in the Ancient Empires* (Antela-Bernárdez, B. and Ñaco del Hoyo, T. eds.), BAR International Series 1986, 33-51.

Caginard, P.F. (1995), 'Strategy and Politics in Caesar's Spanish Campaign, 49BC: Variations on a Theme by Clausewitz', in *The Ancient World* 26 (1995) 29-44.

Caginard, P.F. (2005), 'The Late Republican Army', in *A Companion to the Roman Army (Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World)* (Erdkamp, P. ed.), Oxford, 80-95.

Calbi, A. '*Decurio a populo*: proposta per un'iscrizione piacentina', *Epigraphica* 43 (1981) 251-257

Camodeca, G. (1982), 'Italia: Regio I (Campania, escusa la zona di Capua e Cales), Regio II (Apulia et Calabria), Regio III (Lucania et Bruttii)', in *Epigrafia e Ordine Senatorio II*, Tituli 5 (1982) 101-163.

Camodeca, G. (2003), 'Due nuovi cavalieri ercolanesi di èta augustea: i mammii di *CIL* X 1449 e 1476', *Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire de l'École Française de Rome, Antiquité* 115 (2003) 640-644.

Campbell, J.B. (1975), 'Who Were the *'viri Militares'*?', *Journal of Roman Studies* 65 (1975) 11-31.

Campbell, J.B. (1984), *The Emperor and the Roman Army 31BC - AD235*, Oxford.

Campbell, J.B. (1987), 'Teach Yourself How to Be a General', *Journal of Roman Studies* 77, (1987) 13-29.

Campos, J. and González, J. (1987), 'Los foros de Hispalis Colonia Romula', *Archivo Español de Arquelogia* 60 (1987) 123-158.

Carter, J.M. (1982), *Suetonius. Divus Augustus*, Bristol.

Castelli, M. (1992), 'Dedica onoraria di età Tiberiana a due membri della famiglia degli Scipioni', *Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire de l'École Française de Rome, Antiquité* 104 (1992) 177-208.

Castillo, C. (1974), 'El progreso de la Epigrafía romana de Hispania', *Emerita* 41 (1974) 109-128.

Castillo Garcia, C. (1965), *Prosopographia Baetica,* Vol. I, Pamplona.

Castillo Garcia, C. (1975), 'Städte und Personen der Baetica', *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II.3, 601-654.

Castrén, P. (1974), 'About the *Legio X Equestris*', *Arctos* 8 (1974) 5-7.

Castrén, P. (1975), *Ordo Populusque Pompeianus. Policy and society in Roman Pompeii*, Acta Instituti Romani Finlandiae VIII, Rome.

Castrén, P. (1983), 'Cambiamenti nel Gruppo die Notabili Municipali', in *Les "Bourgeoisies" Municipales Italiennes Aux IIe et Ier Siècles av. J-C.* (Cébeillac Gervasioni, M. ed.), Paris.

De Callataÿ, F. (1997), *L'histoire des guerres Mithridatiques vue par les monnais*, Philadelphia.

Cavenaile, R. (1970), 'Prosopographie de l'armée romaine d'Égypte d'Auguste à Dioclétien', *Aegyptus* 50 (1970) 213-320.

Cébeillac Gervasoni, M. (1972), *Les "Quaestores principis et candidati" aux Ier et IIeme siecles de l'Empire*, Milan.

Cenerini, F. (1992), 'Forum Livi', in *Supplementa Italica* N.S. 10 (1992) 33-59.

Cerva, M. (2000), 'La *praefectura fabrum*. Un'introduzione', in *Les élites municipales de l'Italie péninsulaire de la mort de César à la morte de Domitien – entre continuité et rupture* (Cébeillac Gervasoni, M. ed.), Collection de l'École française de Rome 271, 177-196.

Ceylan, A. and Ritti, T. (1987), 'L. Antonius Zenon', *Epigraphica* 49 (1987) 77-98.

Chastagnol, A. (1973), 'La naissance de *l'ordo* senatorius', *Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire de l'École Française de Rome, Antiquité* 85 (1973) 583-607.

Chastagnol, A. (1980). 'La crise de recrutement sénatorial des années 16-11 av. J.-C.', in *Miscellanea di studi classici in onore di Eurenio Manni* II, Rome, 465-476.

Cheesman, G.L. (1913), 'The Family of the Caristanii at Anitioch in Pisidia', *Journal of Roman Studies* 3 (1913) 253-266.

Cheesman, G.L. (1914), *Auxilia of the Roman Imperial Army*, Oxford.

Christol, M. and Demougin, S. (1982), 'La carrière d'un notable Narbonnais, au début du Ier s. après J.-C. (CIL XII 4371 et 4372)', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 49 (1982) 141-153.

Christol, M., Drew-Bear, T. and Taslianan, M. (2001), 'L'empereur Claude, le chevalier C. Caristanius Fronto Caesianus Iullus et le culte impérial à Antioche de Pisidie', *Tyche* 16 (2001) 1-20.

Christol, M. and Drew-Bear, T. (2002), 'Un nouveau notable d'Antioche de Pisidie et les prefets de *duumviri* de la colonie', *Anatolia Antiqua* 10 (2002) 277-289.

Christol, M. (1999), 'L'épigraphie et les débuts du culte impérial dans les colonies de vétérans en Narbonnaise', *Revue Archeologique de Narbonnaise* 32 (1999) 11-20.

Christol, M. (2001), 'Nouvelles réflextions sure les *milites Glanici*', *Revue Archeologique de Narbonnaise* 34 (2001) 157-164.

Cichorius, C. (1922), 'Das Offizierkorps eines römischen Heeres aus dem Bundesgenossenkrieg', *Römische Studien*, Leipzig, 130-185.

Clinton, K. (2001), 'Initiates in the Samothracian Mysteries, September 4, 100BC', *Chiron* 31 (2001) 27-35.

Coarelli, F. (2004), 'Per una "topografia gamaliana" di Ostia', in *Ostia, Cicero, Gamala, Feasts & the Economy. Papers in Memory of John H. D'Arms* (Zevi, G.A. and Humphrey, J.H., eds), Journal of Roman Archaeology Supp. 57, Rhode Island, 89-98.

Cotton, H.M. (1981a), *Documentary letters of recommendation in Latin from the Roman empire*, Beiträge zur Klassischen Philologie 132, Königstein.

Cotton, H.M. (1981b), 'Military Tribunates and the Exercise of Patronage', *Chiron* 11 (1981) 229-238.

Cotton, H.M. (1985), '"*Mirificum genus commendationis*". Cicero and the Latin Letter of Recommendation', *American Journal of Philology* 106 (1985) 328-334.

Cotton, H.M. (1986), 'The Role of Cicero's Letters of Recommendation. *Iustitia versus Gratia*', *Hermes* 114 (1986) 443-460.

Corbier, M. (1974), *L'aerarium saturni et l'aerarium militare. Administration et prosopographie sénatoriale*, Rome.

Crawford, M.H (1975), *The Roman Republican Coinage*, Cambridge

Crawford, M.H. (1996), *Roman Statutes*, London.

Criniti, N. (1970), *L'epigrafe di Asculum di Gn. Pompeo Strabone*, Milan.

Cuff, P.J. (1957), 'Rev. Suolahti', *Classical Review* 7 (1957) 147-148.

Curchin, L.A. (1990), *The Local Magistrates of Roman Spain*, Toronto.

Cuvigny, H. (2002), 'Vibius Alexander, *praefectus* et épistratège de l'Heptanomie', *Chronique d'égypte* 77 (2002) 238-248.

D'Ambrosio, A. and De Caro, S. (1983), *Un Impegno per Pompei – fotopiano e documentazione della necropoli di porta nocera*, Milan.

Daris, S. (1988), 'Le truppe ausiliarie romane in Egitto', *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II.10.1, 743-766.

D'Arms, J.H. (1974), 'Puteoli in the Second Century of the Roman Empire: a Social and Economic Study', *Journal of Roman Studies* 64 (1974) 104-124.

Davies, R.W. (1969), 'Joining the Roman Army', in *Bonner Jahrbücher* 169 (1969) 208-232.

Davies, R.W. (1989), *Service in the Roman Army*, Edinburgh.

Dean, L.R. (1919), 'Latin Inscriptions from Corinth, II', *American Journal of Archaeology* 23 (1919) 163-174.

Degrassi, A. (1942-1943), 'La data della fondazione della colonia romana di Pola', *Atti dell'Istituto Veneto* 52 (1942-1943) 667-678 = (1962) *Scritti vari di antichità*, Vol. II, Trieste, 913-920.

Demougin, S. (1975), 'Les juges des cinq décuries originaires de l'Italie', *Ancient Society* 6 (1975) 143-202.

Demougin, S. (1978a), 'Un nouveau membre de la *gens arrecina*', *Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire de l'École Française de Rome, Antiquité* 90 (1970) 317-330.

Demougin, S. (1978b), 'M. Sufenas M.f. Proculus', *Latomus* 37 (1978) 620-624.

Demougin, S. (1981), 'A propos d'un préfet de Commagène', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 43 (1981) 97-107.

Demougin, S. (1982) '*Uterque ordo*. Les rapports entre l'ordre senatorial et l'ordre equestre sous les Julio-Claudiens', *Epigrafia e Ordine Senatorio* I, *Tituli* 4 (1982) 73-104.

Demougin, S. (1983), 'Notables Municipeaux et Ordre Équestre À L'Epoque des Dernières Guerres Civiles', in *Les "Bourgeoisies" Municipales Italiennes Aux IIe et Ier Siècles av. J-C.* (Cébeillac Gervasioni, M. ed.), Paris.

Demougin, S. (1988), *L'ordre équestre sous les Julio-Claudiens*, Collection de l'École française de Rome 108, Rome.

Demougin, S. (1991), 'Attilio Degrassi et les inscriptions Républicaines: à propos d'*ILLRP* 549', in *Epigrafia. Actes du Colloque international d'épigraphie latine en mémoire de Attilio Degrassi*, Collection de l'École Française de Rome 143, Rome, 225-239.

Demougin, S. (1992), *Prosopographie des Chevaliers Romains Julio-Claudiens (43 av. J.-C. – 70 ap. J.-C.)*, Rome.

Demougin, S. (1998), 'Un préfet des ouvriers d'Arles', in *Epigrafia romana in area adriatica - Actes sur la IXe recontre Franco-Italienne sur l'épigraphie du monde romain* (Paci, G. ed.), 333-342.

Dench, E. (1997), 'From Sacred Springs to the Social War. Myths of origins and questions of identity in the Central Appennines', in *Gender and Ethnicity in Ancient Italy* (Cornell, T. and Lomas, K. eds.), London, 43-51.

Deniaux, E (1993), *Clientèles et pouvoir à l'époque de Cicéron*, Collection de l'École française de Rome 182, Rome.

Deniaux, E. (2000), 'Tribunat militaire et promotion des elites – richesses municipales et pratiques de recommandation', in *Les élites municipales de l'Italie péninsulaire de la mort de César à la morte de Domitien – entre continuité et rupture* (Cébeillac Gervasoni, M. ed.), Collection de l'École française de Rome 271, 225-236.

Detchev, D. (1950), 'Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der linkspontischen Griechenstädte', *Bulletin de l'Institut Archéologique Bulgare* 17 (1950) 59-64.

Devijver, H. and Van 'T Dack, E. (1982-1983), 'Un nouveau témoignage concernant le nom *Aquitius* (CIL X 4876, Venafrum, Italia)', *Ancient Society* 13-14 (1982-1983) 167-177.

Devijver, H. and van Wonterghem, F. (1985), 'Nuovi contributi alla prosopografia di Superaequum', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 59 (1985) 200-204.

Devijver, H. and van Wonterghem, F. (1990), 'The Funerary Monuments of Equestrian Officers of the Late Republic and Early Empire in Italy 50BC-100AD', in *Ancient Society* 21 (1990) 59-98.

Devijver, H. (1970), 'Suétone, Claude 25, et les Milites Équestres', in *Ancient Society* 1 (1970) 69-81.

Devijver, H. (1972), 'The Career of M. Porcius Narbonensis, CIL II. 4239 – New evidence for the re-organisation of the *militiae equestres* by the emperor Claudius?', in *Ancient Society* 3 (1972) 165-191.

Devijver, H. (1973), 'Some observations on Greek Terminology for the *militiae equestres* in the Literary, Epigraphical and Papyrological Sources', in *Zetesis: Album Amicorum* (de Strycker, E. ed.), Antwerp, 549-565.

Devijver, H. (1974a), 'De Leetijd de Ridderofficiered Tijdens het Vroeg-Romeinse Keizerrijk (Augustus 27v.C. – Gallienus 268 n.C.)', in *Handelingen van de Koninklijke Zuidnederlandse Maatschapiipij voor Taal- en Letter-kunde en Geschiedenis* 28 (1974) 83-146.

Devijver, H. (1974b), 'The Roman Army in Egypt', *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II.1 (1974) 452-492.

Devijver, H. (1975), *De Aegypto et exercitu Romano: sive, Prosopographia militiarium equestrium, quae ab Augusto ad Gallienum seu statione seu origine ad Aegyptum pertinebant*, Studia Hellenistica 22, Leuven.

Devijver, H. (1976-2001), *Prosopographia militiarum equestrium quae fuerunt ab Augusto ad Gallienum*, Vols. I-VI, Leuven.

Devijver, H. (1982), '*Cohortes Cilicum* in the Service of Rome', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 47 (1982) 173-183.

Devijver, H. (1986), 'Equestrian Officers from the East', in *The Defence of the Roman and Byzantine East. Proceedings of a colloquium held at the University of Sheffield in April 1986* (Freeman, P., and Kennedy, D. eds.), BAR International Series 297, Vol. I, 109-225.

Devijver, H. (1989), 'The Geographical Origin of Equestrian Officers', in *Bulletin of the Institute of Archeology* 16 (1989) 107-126.

Devijver, H. (1991), 'The monument of the equestrian officer Cn. Petronius Asellio (CIL XIII 6816 - Mogontiacum)', *Ancient Society* 22 (1991) 245-254.

Devijver, H. (1992a), '*Eques Romanus, a militiis*', in *The Equestrian Officers of the Roman Imperial Army* (Devijver, H. ed.), Vol. II, Stuttgart, 148-53.

Devijver, H. (1992b), 'Equestrian Officers and their Monuments', in *The Equestrian Officers of the Roman Imperial Army,* Vol. II (Devijver, H. ed.), Stuttgart, 416-49.

Devijver, H. (1992c), 'The monument of the equestrian officer T. Iunius Montanus (AIJ 173 – Emona)', *Ancient Society* 23 (1992) 61-70.

Devijver, H. (1995), 'Les milices équestres et la hiérarchie militaire', in *La hiérarchie (rangordnung) de l'armée romaine sous le haut-empire* (Le Bohec, Y. ed.), Paris, 175-191.

Devijver, H. (1998), 'Commanders and officers of *Legio IIII Scythica*', in *The twin towns of Zeugma on the Euphrates: rescue work and historical studies* (Kennedy, D. ed.), Journal of Roman Archaeology Supp. 27, Portsmouth, Rhode Island, 205-232.

Diebner. S. (1979), *Aesernia-Venafrum. Untersuchungen zu den römischen Steindenkmälern zweier Landstädte Mittelitaliens*, Rome.

Dietz, K. (2000), 'Legio III Italica', *Les légions de Rome sous le haut-empire: actes du congrès de Lyon (17-19 septembre 1998)* (Le Bohec, Y. and Wolff, C. eds.), Lyons, 133-144.

Dobson, B. and Breeze, D.J. (1969), 'The Rome Cohorts and the Legionary Centurionate', in *Epigraphische Studien* 8 (1969) 100-124.

Dobson, B. (1964), 'The Significance of the Centurion and "Primipilaris" in the Roman Army and Administration', in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II.1, New York, 392-434.

Dobson, B. (1966), 'The Praefectus Fabrum in the Early Principate', in *Britain and Rome, Essays Presented to Eric Birley on his Sixtieth Birthday* (Jarret, M.G. and Dobson, B. eds.), Kendal, 61-84.

Dobson, B. (1970), 'The Centurionate and Social Mobility During the Principate', in *Recherches sur les structures sociales dans l'antiquité classiqe. Caen 25-26 Avril 1969*, Paris, 99-116.

Dobson, B. (1972), 'Legionary Centurion or Equestrian Officer? A comparison of pay and prospects', in *Ancient Society* 3 (1972) 193-207.

Dobson, B. (1974), 'The significance of the centurion and 'primipilaris'', *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II.1 (1974) 392-434.

Dobson, B. (1978), *Die Primipilares, Entwicklung und Bedeutung, Laufbahnen und Persönlichkeiten eines römischen Offiziersranges*, Cologne.

Dobson, B. (1982), 'Praefectus Castrorum Aegypti - a reconsideration', *Chronique d'Égypte* 57 (1982) 322-337.

Dobson, B. (1995), 'The Bibliography of Rangordnung', in *La hiérarchie (rangordnung) de l'armée romaine sous le haut-empire* (Le Bohec, Y. ed.), Paris, 41-46.

von Domaszewski, A. (1908), 'Die Rangordnung des römischen Heeres', *Jahrbücher des Vereins von Alterthumsfreunden im Rheinlande*, 117 (1908).

von Domaszewski, A. (1967), *Die Rangordnung des römischen Heeres*[2] (Dobson, B. ed.), Cologne.

Donati, A. (1982), 'Ascesa al senato e rapporti con i territori d'origine Italia: Regio VIII (Aemilia)', in *Epigrafia e Ordine Senatorio* II, Tituli 5 (1982) 301-308.

Donati, A. (1996). 'L'immagine del *bonus agricola*. Considerazioni sull'inscrizione forlivese di Castricio', in *Atti e Memorie. Deputazione di storia patria per le province di Romagna* N.S. 47 (1996) 197-204.

Dondin, M. (1979), 'Les «Atilii Glabriones» de Pérouse: ascension sociale et relations sénatoriales de magistrats municipaux', *Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire de l'École Française de Rome, Antiquité* 9 (1979) 651-670.

Drinkwater, J.F. (1978), 'The Rise and Fall of the Gallic Iulii: Aspects of the Development of the Aristocracy of the Three Gauls under the Early Empire', *Latomus* 37 (1978) 817-850.

Drinkwater, J.F. (1979), 'A Note on Local Careers in the Three Gauls under the Early Empire', *Britannia* 10 (1979) 89-100.

Drinkwater, J.F. (1983), *Roman Gaul – The Three Provinces, 58 BC-AD 260*, London.

Ducos, M. (1995), 'La hiérarchie militaire dans les sources littéraires', in *La hiérarchie (rangordnung) de l'armée romaine sous le haut-empire* (Le Bohec, Y. ed.), Paris, 47-51.

Duncan-Jones, R. (1965), 'An Epigraphic Survey of Costs in Roman Italy', *Papers of the British School at Rome* 33 (N.S. 20) (1965) 189-306.

Duncan-Jones, R. (1982), *The economy of the Roman Empire. Quantitative Studies*, 2nd Edition, Cambridge.

Dušanić, S. (1978), 'A Military Diploma of AD 65', *Germania* 56 (1978) 461-475.

Dušanić, S. (1982), 'The issue of military diplomata under Claudius', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 47 (1982) 149-171.

Duthoy, R. (1984-1986), 'Le profil social des patrons municipaux en Italie', *Ancient Society* (15-17) 121-154.

Earl, D.C. (1961), *The Political Thought of Sallust*, Cambridge.

Eck, W. (1979a), 'Inscrizioni nuove dall'Etruria meridionale (Supplemento a CIL, XI)', in *Epigraphica* 41 (1979) 89-118.

Eck, W. (1979b), 'Wahl von Stadtpatronen mit kaiserlicher Beteiligung?', *Chiron* 9 (1979) 489-494.

Eck, W. (1981), 'Miscellanea Prosopographica', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 42 (1981) 227-256.

Eck, W. (1982), 'Jahres- und Provinzialfasten der senatorischen Statthalter von 69/70 bis 138/39', *Chiron* 12 (1982) 281-362.

Eck, W. (1987), 'Senatorische Amtsträger und Rätien unter Augustus', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 70 (1987) 203-209.

Eck, W. (1997), 'Zu kleinasiatischen inschriften (Ephesos, Museum Bursa)', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 117 (1997) 107-115.

Edmonds, M. (1988), *Armed Services and Society*, Leicester.

Eilers, C. (2003), 'Josephus' Caesarian Acta: History of a Dossier', *SBL Josephus Seminar - Papers from the 2003 Session* <http://pace.mcmaster.ca/York/york/pdf/sbl/eilers2003.pdf>, accessed 24 February 2009.

D'Encarnação, J. (1984), *Inscrições romanas do conventus Pacensis: subsídios para o estudo da romanização*, Coimbra.

Erdkamp , P. (2005), 'War and State Formation in the Roman Republic', in *A Companion to the Roman Army (Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World)* (Erdkamp, P. ed.), Oxford, 96-113.

Espérandieu, E. (1929), *Inscriptions latines de Gaule (Narbonnaise)*, Paris.

Étienne, R. (1958), *Le culte impérial dans la péninsule ibérique d'Auguste à Dioclétien*, Paris.

Eyben, E. (1993), *Restless Youth in Ancient Rome*, London.

Fabbri, M. and Trotta, A. (1989), *Una scuola-collegio di età Augustea: L'Insula di Velia*, Archeologia Perusina 7, Rome.

Fabre, G., Mayer, M. and Rodà, I. (1984-2002) *Inscriptions romaines de Catalogne*, Vols I-V, Paris.

Fear, A.T. (1991), 'The Vernacular Legion of Hispania Ulterior', *Latomus* 50 (1991) 809-821.

Ferrero, E. (1901), *L'Arc d'Auguste a Suse*, Turin.

Fink, R.O. (1953), 'Centuria Rufi, Centuria Rufiana and the Ranking of Centuries', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 84 (1953) 210ff.

Finley, M.I. (1982), *Authority and Legitimacy in the Classical City-State*, Copenhagen.

Firpo, G. (1985), '*CIL*, XI, 6011 e la grande rivolta dalmatico-pannonica del 6-9 D.C.', *Epigraphica* 47 (1985) 21-33.

Fishwick, D. (1987), 'The Caesareum at Alexandria Again', *American Journal of Ancient History* 12 (1987) 62-72.

Fitz, J. (1987), 'Notes', *Alba Regia. Annales Musei Stephani Regis* 23 (1987) 255-256.

Fitz, J. (1990), 'Prosopographia Pannonica II', *Alba Regia. Annales Musei Stephani Regis* 24 (1990) 169-196.

Forni, G. (1982a) 'Umbri antichi iscritti in tribù romane', *Bollettino della deputazione di storia patria per l'Umbria* 79 (1982) 21-73.

Forni, G (1982b), 'Intorno al Consilius di L. Cornelio Lentulo', in *Romanitas-Christianitas: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Literatur der roumlautmischen Kaiserzeit* (Wirth, G. et al. eds.), Berlin-New York, 154-163

Forni, G. (1987), *Epigrafi lapidarie romane di Assisi*, Perugia.

Forni, G. (1988), 'Epigraphica III', *Epigraphica* 50 (1988) 105-143

Fraenkel, H. (1957), *Horace*, Oxford.

Franke, T. (2000), 'Legio XXII Primigenia', in *Les légions de Rome sous le haut-empire: actes du congrès de Lyon (17-19 septembre 1998)* (Le Bohec, Y. and Wolff, C. eds.), Vol. I, Lyon, 95-104.

Franklin, J.L., Jr. (2001), *Pompeis Difficile Est - Studies in the Political Life of Imperial Pompeii*, Ann Arbor.

Frézouls, E. (1995), 'Le commandement et ses problèmes', in *La hiérarchie (rangordnung) de l'armée romaine sous le haut-empire* (Le Bohec, Y. ed.), Paris, 157-166.

Gabba, E. (1951), 'Ricerche sull'esecito professionale romano da Maria ad Augusto', *Athenaeum* 29 (1951) 171-272.

Gabba, E. (1976), *Republican Rome, the Army and the Allies* (trans. Cuff, P.J.), Oxford.

Gaggiotti, G. and Sensi, L. (1982) 'Ascesas al senato e rapporti con i territori d'origine Italia: Regio VI (Umbria)', in *Epigrafia e Ordine Senatorio* II, Tituli 5 (1982) 245-274.

Gaggiotti, G. (1991), 'Nota sulla classe dirigente sepinate di età augustea', *Athenaeum* 69 (1991) 495-508.

Garcia Merino, C. (1977), 'Un olvidado nucleo de poblacion hispanorromano: el yacimento de San Esteban de Gormaz', in *Hispania Antiqua* 7 (1977) 165-229.

Garcia Merino, C. (1987), 'Desarrollo urbano y promocion politica de Uxama Argaela', *Boletin del seminario de estudios de arte y arqueologia (BSAA)* 53 (1987), 73-114.

Garcia y Bellido, A. (1961), 'El "exercitus hispanicus" desde Augusto a Vespasiano', *Archivo Español de Arquelogia* 34 (1961) 114-160.

Garlan, Y. (1975), *War in the Ancient World – A Social History* (trans. Lloyd, J.), London.

Gasperini, L. (1971), 'Le iscrizioni del Caesareo e della Basilica di Cirene', *Quaderni di Archeologia della Libia* 6 (1971) 3-22.

Gatti, C. (1972-1973), 'Note su alcune epigrafi di primipili romani nei primi due secoli D.C.', *Atti - Centro studi e documentazione sull'Italia romana* 4 (1972-1973) 83-96.

Gatti, G. (1906), 'Avanzi di un sepolero romano recentemente scoperti', *Notizie degli scavi di antichità* 1906 142.

Gelzer, M (1968), *Caesar, Politician and Statesman* (trans. Needham, P.), Oxford.

Ghiardini, G. (1905), 'Lapide romana scoperta nelle fondazioni del campanile di s. Marco', *Notizie degli scavi di antichità* (1905) 219-225.

Gilliver, C.M. (1996), 'Mons Graupius and the Role of Auxiliaries in Battle', *Greece & Rome* 43 (1996) 54-67.

Le Glay, M. (1972), 'Le commandement des *cohortes voluntariorum* de l'armée Romaine', *Ancient Society* 8 (1972) 209-221.

Goldsworthy, A.K. (1996), *The Roman Army at War 100BC-AD200*, Oxford.

González, J. (1989), *Estudios sobre Urso. Colonia Iulia Genetiva*, Seville.

González Fernández, J. (1992), *Corpus de inscripciones latinas de Andalucía*, Vol. II Tomo I, Seville.

González Herrero, M. (2002), 'Contribución al estudio prosopográfico de los equites lusitanoromanos: el cursus honorum del tribuno Lucius Cornelius Lucii filius Galeria Bocchus', *Aquila legionis* 2 (2002) 33-57, *non uidi*.

Gordon, G. (2003), 'Roman Inscriptions 1995-2000', *Journal of Roman Studies* 93 (2003) 212-294.

Gowing, A.M. (1992), *The Triumviral Narratives of Appian and Cassius Dio*, Ann Arbor.

Gracey, M. (1986), 'The Armies of the Judean Client Kings', in *The Defence of the Roman and Byzantine East. Proceedings of a colloquium held at the University of Sheffield in April 1986* (Freeman, P., and Kennedy, D. eds.), BAR International Series 297, Vol. I, 311-323.

Grant, M. (1946), *From imperium to auctoritas: a historical study of aes coinage in the Roman Empire 49 B.C.-A.D. 14*, Cambridge.

Greenhalgh, P.A.L. (1981), *Pompey, the Republican Prince*, London.

Gregori, G.L. (1989), *Epigrafia anfiteatrale dell'Occidente Romano*, Vol. II (Regiones VI-XI), Vetera 4, Roma.

Gregori, G.L. (1990), 'Gaio Silio Aviola, patrono di *Apsia Maius, Siagu, Themetra e Thimiliga*', *L'africa romana* 8 (1990) 229-238.

Grenier, A. (1960), 'Les tribuns militaires de la Narbonnaise', *Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres* (1960) 53-64.

Groag, E. (1939), *Die römischen Reichsbeamten von Achaia bis auf Diokletian*, Vienna.

Gruen, E.S. (1974), *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic*, London.

Gruen, E.S. (1984), *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome*, Vol. I, London.

Guarducci, M. (1930), 'Nuovi contributi alla prospografia romana di Gortina', *Rivista del R. Instituto d'Archeologia e storia dell'arte* 2 (1930) 76-87.

Habicht, C. (1969), *Die Inschriften des Asklepieions*, Altertümer von Pergamon Vol. VIII.3, Berlin.

Hamdoune, C. (1999), *Les* auxilia externa *africains des armées romaines – IIIe siècle av.J.-C. - IVe siècle ap.J.-C.*, Montpellier.

Halfmann, H. (1979), *Die Senatoren aus dem östlichen Teil des Imperium Romanum: bis zum Ende des 2. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.*, Göttingen.

Halfmann, H. (1982), 'Die Senatoren aus den Kleinasiatischen Provinzen des römischen Reiches vom 1. bis 3. Jahrhundert (Asia, Pontus-Bithynia, Lycia-Pamphilia, Galatia, Cappadocia, Cilicia)', *Tituli* 5 (1982) 603-650.

Halfmann, H. (1986), *Itinera principium. Geschichte und Typologie der Kaiserreisen im Römischen Reich*, Stuttgart.

Harmand, H. (1967), *L'Armeé et le Soldat a Rome de 107 à 50 avant notre ère*, Paris.

Harrington, D. (1978), 'Cassius Dio as a Military Historian', *Acta Classica* 21 (1978) 159-165.

Harris, W.V. (1979), *War and Imperialism in Republican Rome 327-70BC*, Oxford.

Harris, W.V. (1984a), 'Current Directions in the Study of Roman Imperialism', in *The Imperialism of Mid-Republican Rome, American Academy at Rome Papers and Monologues 29* (Harris, W.V. ed.), Rome, 13-35.

Harris, W.V. (1984b), 'The Italians and the Empire', in *The Imperialism of Mid-Republican Rome, American Academy at Rome Papers and Monologues 29* (Harris, W.V. ed.), Rome, 89-109.

Harris, W.V. (1989), 'Roman expansion in the west', in *Cambridge Ancient History, Volume VIII – Rome and the Mediterranean to 133 B.C*[2], Cambridge, 107-162.

Haynes, I.P. (2001), 'The Impact of Auxiliary Recruitment on Provincial Societies from Augustus to Caracallaa', in *Administration, prosopography and appointment policies in the Roman empire : proceedings of the first Workshop of the International Network*

Impact of Empire (Roman Empire, 27 B.C.-A.D. 406), Leiden, June 28 - July 1, 2000 (De Blois, L. ed.), 62-83.

von Hesberg, H. (1988), 'Das Mausoleum des Augustus', in *Kaiser Augustus und die Verlorene Republik*, Berlin, 245-250.

Heuberger, R. (1942), 'Wann wurde Rätien Provinz?', *Klio* 34 (1942) 290-292.

Hillard, T.W. (1987), 'Plutarch's Late-Republican Lives: Between the Lines', *Antiochon* 21 (1987) 19-48.

Hiller von Gaertringen, F.F. (1906), *Inschriften von Priene*, Berlin.

Holder, P.A. (1980), *Studies in the Auxilia of the Roman Army from Augustus to Trajan*, BAR International Series 70, Oxford.

Holleaux, M. (1919), 'Dècret de Chéronée relatif a la premiére guerre de Mithridates', *Revue des Études Greques* 32 (1919) 320-327.

Hölscher, T. (2003), 'Images of War in Greece and Rome: Between Military Practice, Public Memory, and Cultural Symbolism', *Journal of Roman Studies* 93 (2003) 1-17.

Holtheide, B. (1983), *Römische Bürgerrechtspolitik und römische Neubürger in der Provinz Asia,* Hochschulsammlung Philosophie 5, Freiburg.

Içten, Ç. and Engelmann, H. (1992), 'Inschriften aus Ephesos und Umgebung', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 91 (1992) 283-295.

Ilari, V. (1974), *Gli italici nelle strutture militari romane*, Milan.

Isaac, B. (1995), 'Hierarchy and Command-Structure in the Roman Army', in *La hiérarchie (rangordnung) de l'armée romaine sous le haut-empire* (Le Bohec, Y. ed.), Paris, 23-31.

Jarrett, M.G. (1972), 'An Album of the Equestrians from North Africa in the Emperor's Service', *Epigraphische Studien* 9, Bonn, 146-232.

Joliffe, R.O. (1919), *Phases of Corruption in Roman Administration in the Last Half-Century of the Roman Republic*, Menasha.

Jones, A.H.M. (1938), *The Herods of Judea*, Oxford.

Jones, C.P. (1971), *Plutarch and Rome*, Oxford.

Juster, J. (1914), *Les Juifs dans l'Empire romain, I*, Paris.

Keaveney, A. (1987), *Rome and the Unification of Italy*, London.

Keaveney, A. (2003), 'Cassius' Parthian Allies', *Hommages à Carl Deroux* (Defosse, P. ed.), Collection Latomus 270, Bruxelles, 232-234.

Kent, J.H. (1966), *The Inscriptions – 1926-1950*, Corinth 8 Part III, Princeton.

Keppie, L. (1973), 'Vexilla veteranorum', *Papers of the British School at Rome* 42 (1973) 8-17.

Keppie, L. (1983), *Colonisation and Veteran Settlement in Italy, 47-14 B.C.*, London.

Keppie, L. (1984), *The Making of the Roman Army, From Republic to Empire*, London.

Keppie, L. (1990), 'The history and the disappearance of Legio XXII Deiotariana', in *Greece and Rome in Eretz Israel: Collected Essays* (Kasher, A., Rappaport, U. and Fuks, G. eds.), Jerusalem, 54-61.

Keppie, L. (1995), 'Soldiers and Veterans at the Colony of *Forum Julii* (Fréjus)', in *La hiérarchie (Rangordnung) de l'armée romaine sous le haut-empire* (Le Bohec, Y. ed.), Paris, 367-372

Keppie, L. (1996a), 'The Praetorian Guard before Sejanus', *Athenaeum* 84 (1996) 101-124.

Keppie, L. (1996b), 'The Army and the Navy [43BC - AD69]', in *Cambridge Ancient History,* Vol. X (Bowman, A.K., Champlin, E. and Lintott, A. eds.), Cambridge, 371-396.

Keppie, L. (1997), 'Military service in the Late Republic: the evidence of inscriptions and sculpture', *Journal of Roman Military Equipment Studies* 8 (1997) [2000] 3-11 = *L'equipment militaire et l'armement de la république (IVe-Ier s. avant J.-C.). Proceedings of the Tenth International Roman Military Equipment Conference, Montpellier* (Feugère, M. ed.), Oxford, 3-11.

Keppie, L. (2000a), '*Legiones II Augusta, VI Victrix, IX Hispania, XX Valeria Victrix*', in *Les légions de Rome sous le haut-empire: actes du congrès de Lyon (17-19 septembre 1998)* (Le Bohec, Y. and Wolff, C. eds.), Vol. I, Lyon, 25-37.

Keppie, L. (2000b), Colonisation and veteran settlement in Italy, 47-14BC: new evidence and futher thoughts', in *Legions and Veterans – Roman Army Papers 1971-2000* (Keppie, L. ed.), Stuttgart, 249-262.

Keppie, L. (2003), 'Having been a soldier', in *Documenting the Roman Army. Essays in Honour of Margaret Roxan* (Wilkes, J. ed.), London, 31-54.

Kim, C.-H. (1972), *The Form and Structure of the Greek Letter of Recommendation*, Los Angeles.

Kleijwegt, M. (1991), *Ancient Youth: The ambiguity of youth and the absence of adolescence in Greco-Roman society*, Amsterdam.

Knapp, R.C. (1981), 'L. Axius Naso and *pro legato*', *Phoenix* 35 (1981) 134-141.

Knibbe, D., Engelmann, H. and Iplikcioglu, B. (1993), 'Neue Inschriften aus Ephesos', *Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Instituts* 62(2) (1993) 113-150.

Kockel, V. (1993), *Porträtreliefs Stadtrömischer Grabbauten*, Mainz am Rhein.

Konrad, C. (1994), *Plutarch's Sertorius: A Historical Commentary*. Chapel Hill.

De Laet, S.J. (1941), *De Samenstelling van den Romeinschen Senat – Gedurende de Eerste Eeuw van het Principaat (28 Vóór Chr. – 68 NA Chr.)*, Antwerp.

Laffi, U. (1977), 'La procuratela quadriennale di Q. Octavius Sagitta in vindalicis et Raetis et in valle Poenina', *Athenaeum* 55 (1977) 369-379.

Laffi, U. (1978), 'Zur Geschichte Vindeliciens unmittelbar nach der römischen Eroberung', *Bayerishce Vorgeschichtsblätter* 41 (1978) 19-24.

Laronde, A. (1988), 'La Cyrénaïque Romaine (96 av. J.-C. - 235 ap. J.-C.)', *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* X.1, 1006-1064.

Lassère, J.-M. (1994), 'La cohorte des Gétules', in *L'Afrique, la Gaule, la religion à l'époque romaine. Mélanges à la mémoire de M. Le Glay* (Le Bohec, Y. ed.), Collection Latomus 226, Brussels, 244-253.

Lesquier, J. (1918), *L'armée romaine d'Égypte d'Auguste á Dioclétien*, Mémoires publiés par les membres de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale du Caire 41, Cairo.

Letta, C. (1978), 'Le Imagines Caesarum di un praefectus castrorum aegypti e l'XI choorte pretoria', *Athenaeum* 56 (1978) 3-19.

Letta, C. (1979), 'Magistrature italiche e magistrature municipali: continuità o frattura?', in *Studi sulle magistrature indigene e municipali in area italica* (Campanile, E. and Letta, C. eds.), Pisa.

Leveau, P. (1973), ‘L’aile II des Thraces, la tribu des Mazices et les *praefecti gentis* en Afrique du Nord’, *Antiquités Africaines* 7 (1973) 153-192.

Levick, B. (1965), *Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor*, Oxford.

Levick, B. (1976), *Tiberius the Politician*, London.

Levick, B. (1982), ‘Sulla's March on Rome in 88 B.C.’, *Historia* 31 (1982) 503-508.

Licordati, A. (1982), ‘Italia: Regio I (Latium)’, in *Epigrafia e Ordine Senatorio II*. Tituli 5 (1982) 9-57.

Linderski, J. (1984), ‘Si Vis Pacem, Para Bellum: Concepts of Defensive Imperialism’, in *The Imperialism of Mid-Republican Rome, American Academy at Rome Papers and Monologues 29* (Harris, W.V. ed.), Rome, 133-164.

Lintott, A.W. (1967), ‘P. Clodius Pulcher - Felix Catilina?’, in *Greece and Rome* 14 (1967) 157-169.

Lintott, A.W. (1993), *Imperium Romanum: politics and administration*, London.

Lintott, A.W. (1999), *The constitution of the Roman Republic*, Oxford.

Lomas, K. (1996), *Roman Italy, 338BC-AD200: a sourcebook*, London.

Loreto, L. (2000), *Il comando militare nelle province procuratorie 30 a.C. - 280 d.C. Dimensione militare e dimensione costituzionale*, Napoli.

Luni, M. (1991), ‘Strutture monumentali e documenti epigrafici nel Foro di Cirene’, *L’Africa romana* 9 (1991) 123-146.

Magalhaes, M.M. (2003), *Storia, istituzioni e prosopografia di Surrentum romana: la collezione epigrafica del Museo Correale di Terranova*, Naples.

Malay, H. (1987), ‘An Inscription from Apollonia Salbake in Caria’, *Epigraphica Anatolica* 9 (1987) 73-75.

Manganaro, G. (1989), ‘Iscrizioni latine nuove e vecchie della Sicilia’, *Epigraphica* 51 (1989) 161-209.

Mankin, D. (1995), *Horace, Epodes*, Cambridge.

Manzella, I.D.S. (1981), ‘Falerii Novi’, in *Supplementa Italica* N.S. 1, 101-176.

Marengo, S.M. (1990), ‘Camerium’, in *Supplementa Italica* N.S. 6, 57-79.

Marengo, S.M. (2003), 'T. Satanus Sabinus, duovir et duovir C.A.P.', *Picus* 23 (2003) 219-226, *non uidi*.

Marsden, E.W. (1973), 'Polybius as a military historian', in *Polybe. Neuf exposés suivis de discussions. Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique* 20 (Gabba, E. ed), Geneva, 267-302.

Marwick, A., Golby, J. and Waites, B. (1990), 'The Processes of Change', in *War and Change in 20th Century Europe* (Marwick, A., Waites, B., Emsley, C. and Golby, J. eds.), London, 61-95.

Mastino, A. (1984), 'Popolazione e classi sociali a Turris Libisonis: i legami con Ostia', in *Turris Libisonis colonia Iulia* (Boninu, A., Le Glay, M. and Mastino, A. eds.), Pubblicazioni del Departimento di Storia dell'Università di Sassari 3, Sassari.

Mattingly, H.B. (1975), 'The *consilium* of Pompeius Strabo in 89BC', *Athenaeum* 53 (1975) 262-266

Maurin, L. (1994), *Inscriptions Latines d'Aquitaine (I.L.A.): Santons*, Bordeaux.

Maxfield, V.A. (1981), *The Military Decorations of the Roman Army*, London.

McAlindon, D. (1957), 'Entry to the Senate in the Early Empire', in *Journal of Roman Studies* 47 (1957) 191-195.

McCabe, D., Ehrman, B.D. and Elliot, N.R. (1987), *Priene inscriptions. Texts and list*, Princeton [on CDROM PHI 6, Packard Humanities Institute, Los Altos, California].

McCabe, D. (1996), *Apollonia Salbake*, Princeton [on CDROM PHI 7, Packard Humanities Institute, Los Altos, California].

McCall, J.B. (2002), *The cavalry of the Roman Republic: cavalry combat and elite reputations in the middle and late Republic*, London.

Meier, C. (1996), *Caesar* (trans. McLintock, D.), London.

Meiggs, R. (1973), *Roman Ostia*^{2}, Oxford.

Mello, M. and Voza, G. (1968), *Le iscrizione latine di Paestum*, Naples.

Meloni, P. (1958), *L'Amministrazione della Sardegna da Augusto all'Invasione Vandalica*, Rome.

Menella, G. (1983) 'Un A. Octavius Ligus in un'iscrizione del Museo di La Spezia (Italia: Regio VII)', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 51 (1983) 215-218.

Menella, G. (1991), 'Inscriptiones Latinae Liberae Rei Publicae - No. 149', in *Epigrafia: Actes du Colloque international d'épigraphie latine en mémoire de Attilio Degrassi pour le centenaire de sa naissance*, Rome, 420-421.

Merlin, A. (1944), *Inscriptions latines de la Tunisie*, Paris.

Millar, F. (1963), 'Rev. Pflaum', *Journal of Roman Studies* 53 (1953) 194-200.

Millar, F. (1964), *A Study of Cassius Dio*, Oxford.

Millar, F. (1995), 'The Last Century of the Roman Republic. Whose History?', *Journal of Roman Studies* 85 (1995) 236-243.

Moehring, H.R. (1975), 'The *Acta pro Judaeis* in the Antiquities of Flavius Jospephus: A study in Hellenistic and Modern Apologetic Historiography', in *Christianity, Judaism and other Greco-Roman Cults – Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty*, *3. Judiasm before 70* (Neusner, J. ed.), Leiden, 124-158.

Mollo, S. (1980-1981), 'I seviri equitum Romanorum di estrazione equestre', in *Atti. Centro Ricerche e Documentazione sull'Antichita Classica* 11 (N.S. 1) (1980-1981) 403-423.

Mommsen, T. (1884), 'Observationes Epigraphicae', in *EE* 5 (1884) 142ff.

Mommsen, T. (1887-1888), *Römisches Staatsrecht*, III Vols., Leipzig.

Morillo Cerdan, A. and Garcia Marcos, V. (2000), 'Nuevos testimonios acerca de las legiones VI Victrix y X Gemina en la region septentrional de la península Ibérica', *Les légions de Rome sous le haut-empire: actes du congrès de Lyon (17-19 septembre 1998)* (Le Bohec, Y. and Wolff, C. eds.), Vol. II, Lyon, 589-607.

Mouritsen, H. (1988), *Elections, Magistrates and Municipal Élite – Studies in Pompeian Epigraphy*, Rome.

Mouritsen, H. (1998), *Italian Unification – A Study in Ancient and Modern Historiography*, BICS Supp. 40, London.

Mulroy, D. (1988), 'The Early Career of P. Clodius Pulcher: A Re-examination of the Charges of Mutiny and Sacrilege', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 118 (1988) 155-178.

Ñaco del Hoyo, T. (2006), 'Rearguard Strategies of Roman Republican Warfare in the "Far West"', in *War and Territory in the Roman World – Guerra y territorio en el mundo*

romano (Ñaco, T. and Arrayás, I. eds), BAR International Series 1530, Oxford, 149-168.

Ñaco del Hoyo, T. (2009), 'Le *praefectus praesidii* sous la République. Quelques cas d'étude', *Revue des Études Anciennes* 111 (2009) 179-195.

Nicolet, C. (1966), 'Procurateurs et préfets à l'époque républicaine', *Mélanges d'archéologie, d'épigraphie et d'histoire offerts à Jerôme Carcopino*, Vol. III, París, 691-709.

Nicolet, C. (1967), 'Tribuni Militum A Populo', *Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire de l'école Française de Rome, Antiquité* 79 (1967) 29-76.

Nicolet, C. (1969), Armée et société à Rome sous la République à propos de l'ordre équestre', in *Problèmes de la guerre à Rome* (Brisson, J. ed.), Paris, 117-156.

Nicolet, C. (1974), *L'ordre Èquestre A L'époque Républicaine (312-43 av. J-C)*, Vol. II, Paris.

Nicolet, C. (1979), *Rome et la Conquête du Monde Méditerrannéen, 264-27 Avant J.-C.*, Vol. I, Paris.

Nicolet, C. (1980), *The World of the Citizen in Republican Rome*[2] (trans. Falla, P.S.), London.

North, J. (1981), 'The Development of Roman Imperialism', *Journal of Roman Studies* 71 (1981) 1-9.

Orth, W. (1978), 'Zur Fabricius-Tuscus-Inschrift aus Alexandria Troas', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 28 (1978) 57-60.

Paci, G. (1978), 'Senatori e Cavalieri Romani nelle iscrizioni di «Forum Clodii»', in *Scritti storico-epigrafici in memoria di Marcello Zambelli* (Gasperini, L. ed.), Pubblicazioni della Facoltà di lettere e filosofia, Università di Macerata 5, Rome, 261-314.

Parker, H.M.D. (1928), *The Roman Legions*, Oxford.

Parkin, T.G. (1992), *Demography and Roman Society*, London.

Parma, A. (1990), 'Note di epigrafia Alifana', in *Il territorio Alifano, archeologia, arte, storia - Convegno di Studi S. Angelo d'Alife, 26 Aprile 1987* (Di Cosmo, L. and Villuci, A.M. eds.), Minturnes, 103-121.

Patterson, J. (1993), 'Military organisation and social change in the late Republic', in *War and Society in the Ancient World* (Rich, J. and Shipley, G. eds.), London, 93-113.

Pelletier, A. (1997), 'Quelques inscriptions inédites de la cité de Vienne (Isère, France)', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 119 (1997) 209-212.

Pellegrini, S. and Pulini, I. (2002), *Il lapidario romano dei Musei civici di Moderna*, Moderna.

Pelling, C.B.R. (1988), *Plutarch, Life of Antony*, Cambridge

Pesando, F. (2000), 'Edifici pubblici «antichi» nella Pompei augustea: il caso della Palestra Sannitica', *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts (Römische Abteilung)* 107 (2000) 155-175.

Peskett, A.G. (1974), *Caesar. The Civil Wars*, London.

von Petrikovitis, H. and Müller, G. (1961), 'Die Ausgrabungen in Neuß (Stand der Ausgrabungen Ende 1961)', *Bonner Jahrbücher* 161 (1961) 449-485.

Pflaum, H.-G. (1950), *Les Procurateurs Équestres sous le Haut-Empire Romain*, Paris.

Pflaum, H.-G. (1955-1956), 'Une Inscription de Castellum Arsacalitanum' in *Recueil des notices et memoires de la Societe archeologique de la province de Constantine*, 69 (1955-1956) 145-172.

Pflaum, H.-G. (1960-1961), *Les Carrières Procuratoriennes Équestres sous le Haut-Empire Romain*, Paris.

Pflaum, H.-G. (1963), 'Du nouveau sur les *agri decumantes* à la lumière d'un fragment de Capoue, CIL X 3872', *Bonner Jahrbücher* 163 (1963) 224-237.

Pflaum, H.-G. (1968), 'Procuratèles financiéres du haut-empire', *Revue Historique de Droit Français et Étranger*, 46 (1968) 367-388.

Pflaum, H.-G. (1978), *Les Fastes de la Province de Narbonnaise*, XXX^{e} Supplément à «Gallia» Ed. du C.N.R.S., Paris.

Pflaum, H.-G. (1982), *Les Carrières Procuratoriennes Équestres sous le Haut-Empire Romain*. *Supplement*, Paris.

Phang, S.E. (2008), *Roman Military Service. Ideologies of Discipline in the Late Republic and Early Principate*, Cambridge.

Picard, G-.C. (1963), ‘Glanum et les origines de l'art romano-provençal. Première partie: architecture’, *Gallia* 21 (1963) 111-124.

Pina Polo, F. (2001), ‘Die Freunde des Scipio Aemilianus im numantinischen Krieg: Über die sogenannte cohors amicorum’, in *Aspects of Friendship in the Greek and Roman World* (Peachin, M. ed.), Portsmouth, 89-98.

Pina Polo, F. (2003) ‘¿Por qué fue reclutada la « turma salluitana » en Salduie?’, *Gerión* 21 (2003) 197-204.

Prag, J.R. (2007), ‘*Auxilia* and *Gymnasia*: A Sicilian Model of Roman Imperialism’, *Journal of Roman Studies* 97 (2007) 68-100.

Rawson, B. (1974), ‘Rev. Criniti (1970)’, *Classical Philology* 69 (1974) 63-65.

Rawson, E. (1991), *Roman culture and society: collected papers*, Oxford.

Rebecchi, F. (1975), ‘Un nuovo magistrato di *Mutina*’, *Epigraphica* 37 (1975) 216-219.

Rebecchi, F. (1999), ‘Per l’iconografia della *transvectio equitum*. Altre considerazioni e nuovi documenti’, in *L’ordre équestre – histoire d’une aristocratie (IIe siècle av. J.-C. – IIIe siècle ap. J.-C.)* (Demougin, S., Devijver, H. and Raepsaet-Charlier, M.-T. eds.), Rome, 191-214.

Reddé, M. (1986), *Mare Nostrum*, Rome-Paris.

Rémy, B. and Ferber, E. (1991), ‘Une inscription de la cité de Vienne retrouvée’, *Revue Archéologique de Narbonnaise* 24 (1991) 267-270.

Rémy, B. (1997), *Inscriptions latine de Narbonnaise (ILN) V.1 Vienne*, Paris.

Rémy, B., Pernon, J. and Segard, M. (2002), ‘Arbin (Savoie), le site de Mérande (*villa* ou *vicus*?)’, *Revue Archéologique de Narbonnaise* 35 (2002) 273-280.

Rendic-Miocevic, D. (1964), ‘P. Cornelius Dolabella’, *Akte des IV. internationalen Kongresses für griechische und lateinische Epigraphik (Wien, 17. bis 22. September 1962)*, Vienna, 338-347.

Reusser, C. (1985), ‘Zur aufstellung römischer grabältare in Aquileia’, *Aquileia Nostra* 56 (1985) 118-144.

Reynolds, J.M. (1979), 'Military inscriptions of Roman Cyrenaica', in *Actes du VIIe Congrès International d'Épigraphie Grecque et Latine* (Pippidi, D.M. ed.), Paris, 458-460.

Rich, J.W. (1983), 'The Supposed Roman Manpower Shortage of the Later Second Century B.C.', *Historia* 32 (1983) 287-331.

Rich, J.W. (1993), 'Fear, Greed and Glory: the causes of Roman war-making in the Middle Republic', in *War and Society in the Ancient World* (Rich, J. and Shipley, G. eds.), London, 38-68.

Rickman, G. (1980), *The Corn Supply of Ancient Rome*, Oxford.

Ricl, M. (1997), *The Inscriptions of Alexandria Troas*, Inschriften Griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien 53, Bonn.

Rizakis, A.D., Zoumbaki, S. and Kantirea, M. (2001), *Roman Peloponnese I: Roman Personal Names in Their Social Context (Achaia, Arcadia, Argolis, Corintha and Eleia)*, Athens.

Robert, L. and Robert, J. (1954), *La Carie - histoire et géographie historique. Tome II: Le plateau de tabai et ses environs*, Paris.

Robinson, D.M. (1926), 'Inscriptions from Asia Minor', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 57 (1926) 195-237.

Roldán Hervás, J.M. (1974a), *Hispania y el ejercito romano: contribucion a la historia social de la España antigua*, Salamanca.

Roldán Hervás, J.M. (1974b), 'Legio Vernacular ¿Iusta Legio?', *Zephyrus* 23 (1974) 457ff.

Rolland, H. (1953), 'Fouilles de Glanum (1951-1952)', *Gallia* XI (1953) 3-19.

Rollinger, R. (2001), '*Raetiam autem et Vindelicos ac Noricos Pannoniamque et Scordiscos novas imperio nostro subiunxit provincias*. Oder: Wann wurde Raetien (einschließlich Noricums und Pannoniens) als römische Provinz eingerichtet?', in *Althistorische Studien im Spannungsfeld Zwischen Universalund Wissenschaftsgeschichte* (Haider, W.H. and Rollinger, R. eds.), Stuttgart, 267-315.

La Rosa, F. (1994), 'I «tribuni militum» tra le istituzioni dell'alta repubblica', *Iura* 45 (1994) 15-33.

Rosenstein, N. (1990), 'War, Failure and Aristocratic Competition', *Classical Philology* 85 (1990) 225-265.

Rosenstein, N. (2004), *Rome at War – Farms, Families, and Death in the Middle Republic*, London.

Rosenstein, N. (2005), 'Military Command, Political Power and the Republican Elite', in *A Companion to the Roman Army (Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World)* (Erdkamp, P. ed.), Oxford, 132-147.

Ross-Taylor, L. (1924), '*Seviri Equitum Romanorum* and municipal *Seviri*: A study in pre-military training among the Romans', *Journal of Roman Studies* 14 (1924) 158-171.

de Rossi, G.M. (1967), *Tellenum, Forma Italiae I.4*, Rome.

Le Roux, P. (1981), 'Inscriptions militaires et déplacements de troupes dans l'Empire Romain', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 43 (1981) 195-206.

Le Roux, P. (1982), *L'armée romaine et l'organisation des provinces ibériques d'Auguste à l'invasion de 409*, Paris.

Le Roux, P. (1986), 'Th. Mommsen et C. Iulius Macer (CIL XIII, 1041)', in *Mélanges offert à Monsieur Michel Labrousse* (Pailler, J-.M. ed.), Toulouse, 119-135.

Rowland, R.J. (1978), 'Two Sardinian Notes', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 30 (1978) 166-172.

Sabbatini, A. (1983), *L'iscrizione di C. Castricio Calvo: Aspetti di storia economica e sociale*, Bologna.

Sabbatini Tumolesi, P. (1980), *Gladiatorum Paria. Annunci di spettacoli gladiatorii a Pompei*, Tituli I (1980), Rome.

Sablayrolles, R. (1984), 'Le praefecti fabrum de Narbonnaise, *Revue Archeologique de Narbonnaise* 17 (1984) 239-247.

Sablayrolles, R. (1996), *Les Cohortes de Vigiles*, Rome.

Saddington, D.B. (1980), 'Prefects and Lesser Officers in the Roman Auxilia of the Early Imperial Period', in *Proceedings of the African Classical Association* 15 (1980) 20-58.

Saddington, D.B. (1982), *The Development of the Roman Auxiliary Forces from Caesar to Vespasian (49 B.C. – A.D. 79)*, Harare.

Saddington, D.B. (1983), 'The auxiliary Prefect Glabrio and the introduction of the duovirate at Perusia', *Athenaeum* 61 (1983) 264-266.

Saddington, D.B. (1985), 'Praefecti Fabrum of the Julio-Claudian Period', in *Römische Geschichte, Altertumskunde und Epigraphik. Festschrift für Artur Betz zur Vollendung Seines 80 Lebensjahres* (Weber, E.N., Dobesch, G. eds.), Vienna, 529-546.

Saddington, D.B. (1987), 'Military Praefecti with Administrative Functions', in *Acta Centri Hisoriae – Terra Antique Balcanica II* (Fol, A., Zhivkov, V., and Nedjalkov, N. eds.), Trinovi, 268-274.

Saddington, D.B. (1988a), 'Praefecti classis, orae maritimae and ripae of the Second Triumvirate and the Early Empire', *Jahrbuch des Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseums Mainz* 35 (1988) 299-313.

Saddington, D.B. (1988b), 'Two unpublished inscriptions of auxiliaries in Aquileia and the presence of the military there in the early Imperial period', *Aquileia Nostra* 59 (1988) 67-76.

Saddington, D.B. (1990), 'Praefecti classis and praefecti castrorum in the Julio-Claudian period', in *Aken des 14. Int. Limeskongresses 1986 in Carnuntum*, Vienna, 67-70.

Saddington, D.B. (1991a), 'Tacitus and the Roman Army', *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II 35.5, 3484-3555.

Saddington, D.B. (1991b), 'The origin and character of the provincial fleets of the early Roman Empire', *Roman Frontier Studies 1989 – Proceedings of the XVth International Congress of Roman Frontier Studies* (Maxfield, V.A. and Dobson, M.J. eds.), Exeter, 397-399.

Saddington, D.B. (1992), 'The armed forces and the equestrian administrators of early imperial Sardinia and Corsica', in *Sardinia antiqua: studi in onore di Piero Meloni in occasione del suo settantesimo compleanno*, Calgiari, 265-270.

Saddington, D.B. (1994), 'A Context for a Dedication by Five Cavalry Regiments to a Cornelius Scipio in Rome?', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 104 (1994) 73-77.

Saddington, D.B. (1995), 'Problems in military ranks and military personnel in Josephus', in *La hiérarchie (rangordnung) de l'armée romaine sous le haut-empire* (Le Bohec, Y. ed.), Paris, 53-55.

Saddington, D.B. (1996a), 'The relationship between holding office in a *municipium* or *colonia* and the *militia equestris* in the early Principate', *Athenaeum* 84 (1996) 158-181.

Saddington, D.B. (1996b), 'Early Imperial *Praefecti Castrorum*', *Historia* 45 (1996) 244-252.

Saddington, D.B. (1997), 'The "politics" of the auxilia and the forging of auxilliary regimental identity', in *Roman Frontier Studies 1995 – Proceedings of the XVIth International Congress of Roman Frontier Studies* (Graenman-Van Waateringe, W. et al. eds), Oxford, 493-496.

Saddington, D.B. (1999), 'Military Tribunes in the Roman Military and Administrative System in the Pre-Flavian Period', in *XI Congresso Internazionale di Epigraphia Greca e Latina. Roma, 18-24 settembre 1997. Atti*, Roma, 297-314.

Saddington D.B. (2003), 'An Augustan Officer on the Roman Army: *Militaria* in Velleius Paterculus and Some Inscriptions', in *Documenting the Roman Army. Essays in Honour of Margaret Roxan* (Wilkes, J. ed.), London, 19-29.

Saddington, D.B. (2005a), 'The Roman government and the Roman auxilia', in *Limes XIX, Proceedings of the XIXth International Congress of Roman Frontier Studies held in Pécs*, *Hungary, September 2003* (Visy, Z. ed.), Pécs, 63-69.

Saddington, D.B. (2005b), '*Classes*: The Evolution of the Roman Imperial Fleet', in *A Companion to the Roman Army (Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World)* (Erdkamp, P. ed.), Oxford, 201-217.

Saller, R.P. (1980) 'Promotion and Patronage in Equestrian Careers', *Journal of Roman Studies* 70 (1980) 44-63.

Salmon, E.T. (1969), *Samnium and the Samnites*, Cambridge.

Salomies, O. (1992), *Adoptive and Polyonymous Nomenclature in the Roman Empire*, Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum. Societas Scientiarum Fennica 97, Helsinki.

Sasel, A. and Sasel, J. (1978), *Inscriptiones Latinae: quae in Iugoslavia inter annos MCMLX et MCMLXX repertae et editae sunt*, Situla 19, Ljubljana.

Sasel, J. (1974), 'Pro legato', *Chiron* 4 (1974) 467-477.

Schaub, A. (2001), 'Die förmliche Provinz-konstitution Raetiens unter Tiberius nach dem Zeugnis des Velleius Paterculus', *Germania* 79 (2001) 391-400.

Schmitthenner, W.C.G. (1958), *The armies of the triumviral period: a study of the origins of the Roman Imperial Legions*, DPhil Thesis, University of Oxford, 1958.

Scullard, H.H. (1957), 'Rev. Suolahti', *History* 42 (1957) 138-39.

Seager, R. (1972), *Tiberius*, Oxford.

Segenni, S. (1992), '*Amiternum - Ager Amiterninus*', in *Supplementa Italica* N.S. 9, Rome.

Sensi, L. and Sensi, M. (1986), 'Frammenti postumi dell'arciprete Bernardino Bartolini Bocci', *Bollettino storico della citta di Foligno* 10 (1986) 51-128.

Shackleton Bailey, D.R. (1976), *Two Studies in Roman Nomenclature*, American Classical Studies 3.

Shackleton-Bailey, D.R. (1977), *Cicero: Epistulae ad Familiares*, Cambridge.

Shatzman, I. (1975), *Senatorial Wealth and Roman Politics*, Collection Latomus 142, Brussels.

Shatzman, I. (1991), *The armies of the Hasmonaeans and Herod: from Hellenistic to Roman frameworks*, Tübingen.

Sheldon, R.M. (2005), *Intelligence Activities in Ancient Rome,* London.

Sherk, R.K. (1951), *The legates of Galatia from Augustus to Diocletian*, Baltimore.

Sherk, R.K. (1969), *Roman Documents from the Greek East* – Senatus Consulta *and* Epistulae *to the Age of Augustus,* Baltimore.

Sherwin-White, A.N. (1973), *The Roman Citizenship*^{2}, Oxford.

Sherwin-White, A.N. (1980), 'Rome the Aggressor?', *Journal of Roman Studies* 70 (1980) 177-181.

Simon, E. (1962), 'Zur Bedeutung des Greifen in der Kunst der Kaiserzeit', *Latomus* 21 (1962) 749-780.

Smallwood, E.M. (1981), *The Jews Under Roman Rule – From Pompey to Diocletian*, Leiden.

Smith, R.E. (1958), *Service in the Post-Marian Roman Army*, Manchester.

Solin, H. (1991a), 'Inscriptiones Latinae Liberae Rei Publicae - No. 147', in *Epigrafia: Actes du Colloque international d'épigraphie latine en mémoire de Attilio Degrassi pour le centenaire de sa naissance*, Rome, 415.

Solin, H. (1991b), 'Analecta epigraphica CXL-CXLIV', *Arctos* 25 (1991) 139-156.

Spaul, J. (1994), *ALA^2: the auxiliary cavalry units of the pre-Diocletianic Imperial Roman army*, Andover.

Spaul, J. (2000), *COHORS^2: the evidence for and a short history of the auxiliary infantry units of the Imperial Roman Army*, BAR International Series 841, Oxford.

Spaul, J. (2002), *Classes Imperii Romani: An epigraphic examination of the men of the Roman Imperial Navy*, Andover.

Speidel, M.A. (1982), 'Augustus' Deployment of the Legions in Egypt', *Chronique d'Égypte* 57 (1982) 120-124.

Speidel, M.A. (1988), '*Legio IIII Scythica*, its movements and men', in *The twin towns of Zeugma on the Euphrates: rescue work and historical studies* (Kennedy, D. ed.), Journal of Roman Archaeology Supp. 27, Portsmouth, Rhode Island, 163-204.

Speidel, M.A. (2000), 'Legio IV Scythica', *Les légions de Rome sous le haut-empire: actes du congrès de Lyon (17-19 septembre 1998)* (Le Bohec, Y. and Wolff, C. eds), Lyons, 327-337.

Speidel, M.A. (2001), 'Specialisation and Promotion in the Roman Imperial Army', in *Administration, prosopography and appointment policies in the Roman empire : proceedings of the first Workshop of the International Network Impact of Empire (Roman Empire, 27 B.C.-A.D. 406), Leiden, June 28 - July 1, 2000* (De Blois, L. ed.), 50-61.

Speidel, M.P. (1975), 'Germanicus' Gardereiter: Ein neues Zeugnis zur Geschichte der niederrheinischen Ala praetoria und zeur Entstehung der Singulares', *Germania* 53 (1975) 165-166.

Speidel, M.P. (1976), 'Citizen Cohorts in the Roman Imperial Army, New Data on the Cohorts Apula, Campana, and III Campestris', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 106 (1976) 339-348.

Speidel, M.P. (1977), 'The Eastern Desert Garrisons under Augustus and Tiberius', *Studien zu den Militärgrenzen Roms, II : Vorträge des 10. Internationalen Limeskongresses in der Germania Inferior*, Cologne, 511-515.

Speidel, M.P. (1980), 'A Spanish Cavalry Decurion in the Time of Caesar and Augustus', *Archivo Español de Arqueologia* 53 (1980) 211-213.

Standing, G. (2003), 'The Claudian Invasion of Britain and the Cult of *Victoria Britannica*', *Britannia* 34 (2003) 281-287.

Starr, C.G. (1957), 'rev. Suolathi (1955)', in *Classical Philology* 52 (1957) 281-282.

Stockton, D. (1965), 'Primus and Murena', *Historia* 14 (1965) 18-40.

Suic, M. (1991-1992), 'Liburnija i Liburni u vrijeme velikog ustanka u Iliriku od 6. do 9. god. poslije krista (uz CIL V.3346)', *Vjesnik Arheoloskog Muzeja u Zagrebu* 24-25 (1991-1992) 55-66.

Sumner, G.V. (1970), 'The Truth about Velleius Paterculus: Prolegomena', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 74 (1970) 257-299.

Sumner, G.V. (1971), 'The lex annalis under Caesar', *Phoenix* 25 (1971) 246-271.

Suolahti, J. (1955), *The Junior Officers of the Roman Army in the Republican Period: a study in social structure*, Helsinki.

Suolahti, J. (1958), 'The Council of L. Cornelius P.f. Crus in the year 49BC', *Arctos* 2 (1958) 152-163.

Susini, G. (1972), 'I Purtisii Atinates', *Studi di Antichità, Estratto dal vol. XX degli «Studi Romagnoli»*, Faenza, 351-358.

Susini, G. (1983) 'Stel Atinas: una lettura «a colpo d'occhio»', *Epigraphica* 45 (1983) 151-154.

Swarney, P.R. (1970), *The Ptolemaic and Roman idios logos*, American Studies in Papyrology 8, Toronto.

Syme, R. (1932), ‘Die Zahl der praefecti castrorum im Heere des Varus’, *Germania* 16 (1932) 109-111.

Syme, R. (1933), ‘Some Notes on the Legions under Augustus’, *Journal of Roman Studies* 23 (1933) 14-33.

Syme, R. (1939), *The Roman Revolution*, Oxford.

Syme, R. (1956a), ‘Some Friends of the Caesars’, *American Journal of Philology* 77 (1956) 264-273.

Syme, R. (1956b), ‘Missing Persons I (PW VIII A)’, *Historia* 5 (1956) 204-212.

Syme, R. (1959), ‘Missing Persons II’, *Historia* 8 (1959) 207-212.

Syme, R. (1963), ‘Ten Tribunes’, *Journal of Roman Studies* 53 (1963) 50-60.

Syme, R. (1964a), ‘Senators, Tribes and Towns’, *Historia* 13 (1964) 105-125.

Syme, R. (1964b), ‘The Stemma of the Sentii Saturnini’, *Historia* 13 (1964) 156-166.

Syme, R. (1969), ‘Pliny the Procurator’, *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 73 (1969) 201-236.

Syme, R. (1974), ‘The Crisis of 2 B.C.’, *Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-Historiche Klasse. Sitzungsberichte* 7 (1974) 3-34.

Syme, R. (1979), ‘The Allegiance of Labienus’, in *Roman Papers I*, Oxford, 113-25.

Syme, R. (1986), *The Augustan Aristocracy*, Oxford.

Syme, R. (1995), *Anatolica: studies in Strabo* (Birley, A. ed.), Oxford.

Szramkiewicz, R. (1975-1976), *Les gouverneurs de province à l'époque augustéenne: contribution à l'histoire administrative et sociale du principat*, Vol. II, Paris.

Talbert, R.J.A. (1984), *The Senate of Imperial Rome*, Princeton.

Taylor, L.R. (1960), *The Voting Districts of the Roman Republic*, Rome.

Thackeray, H. St.-J. (1926), *Josephus*, Loeb Classical Library, Vol. II, Cambridge, MA.

Thomas, J.D. (1982), *The Epistrategos in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt. Part 2: The Roman Epistrategos*, Papyrologica Coloniensia 6, Opladen.

Thomasson, B.E. (1972), ‘Zur Verwaltungsgeschichte der Provinz Sardinia’, *Eranos* 70 (1972) 72-81.

Thomasson, B.E. (1982), 'Sullo stato dei *legati censitores*', in *Epigrafia e Ordine Senatorio* I, Tituli 4 (1982) 305-318.

Thomasson, B.E. (1984), *Laterculi praesidium*, Vol. I, Gothenburg.

Thurn, J. (2000), *Ioannis Malalae, Chronographia – Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae Vol. 35*, Berlin.

Tibiletti, G. (1953), 'Governatori romani in città provincali', *Rendiconti. Instituto Lombardo di scienze e lettere* 86 (1953) 64-100.

Timpe, D. (1970), *Arminius-Studien*, Bibliothek der klassischen Altertumswissenschaften N.F. 2. Reihe 34, Heidelburg.

Torelli, M. (1962), 'Laberia Crispina e un praefectus castrorum in due epigrafi inedite di Trebula Mutuesca', *Epigraphica* 24 (1962) 55-77.

Torelli, M. (1969), 'Senatori etruschi della tarda repubblica e dell'impero', *Dialoghi di Archeologia* 3 (1969) 285-363.

Torelli, M. (1975), *Elogia tarquiniensia*, Florence.

Torelli, M. (1982), 'Ascesa al senato e rapporti con i territori d'origine Italia: Regio IV (Samnium)', *Epigrafia e Ordine Senatorio* II, Tituli 5 (1982) 165-199.

Torelli, M, (1996), 'Donne, *domi nobiles* ed evergeti a Paestum tra la fine della repubblica e l'inizio dell'impero', in *Les élites municipales de l'Italie péninsulaire des Gracques à Néron: actes de la table ronde de Clermont-Ferrand, 28-30 novembre 1991* (Cébeillac Gervasoni, M. ed.), Rome, 153-178.

Toynbee, A.J. (1965), *Hannibal's legacy: the Hannibalic War's effects on Roman life*, Vol. II, London.

Traversari, G. (1979), *L'Arco dei Sergi*, Padova.

Verzár-Bass, M. (2000), 'Il *praefectus fabrum* e il problema dell'edilizia pubblica', in *Les élites municipales de l'Italie péninsulaire de la mort de César à la morte de Domitien – entre continuité et rupture* (Cébeillac Gervasoni, M. ed.), Collection de l'École française de Rome 271, 197-224.

Veyne, P. (1960), 'Iconographie de la «transvectio equitum» et des lupercales', *Revue des Études Anciennes* 62 (1960) 100-112.

Vives, J. (1971-1972), *Inscripciones latinas de la España romana: antología de 6800 textos*, Barcelona.

Wagner, G. (1971), 'Inscriptions grecques du temple de Karnak, I', *Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale* 70 (1971) 1-38.

Walbank, F. (1957-79), *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, III Vols., Oxford.

Watson, G.R. (1957), 'rev. Suolathi (1955)', *Journal of Roman Studies* 47 (1957) 244-245.

Webster, G. (1996), *The Roman Imperial Army of the first and second centuries A.D.*[2], London.

Welch, K. (1995), 'The office of Praefectus Fabrum in the late Republic', *Chiron* 25 (1995) 131-145.

Welch, K. (1996), 'T. Pomponius Atticus', *Historia* 45 (1996) 450-471.

Welch, K. (1998), 'Caesar and his Officers in the Gallic War Commentaries', in *Julius Caesar as Artful Reporter: The War Commentaries as Political Instruments* (Welch, K., and Powell, A. eds.), Swansea, 85-110.

Wells, C.M. (1972), *The German Policy of Augustus,* Oxford.

West, A.B. (1931), *Latin inscriptions, 1896-1926*, Corinth Vol. 8 Part II, Cambridge, MA.

Wierschowski, L. (1986), 'AE 1980, 615 und das erste Auftreten der Formel "omnibus honoribus in colonia sua functus" in den westlichen Provinzen', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 64 (1986) 287-294.

Wilcken, U. (1899), *Griechische Ostraca aus Aegypten und Nubien: ein Beitrag zur antiken Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, Vol. II, Berlin.

Will, E. (1957), 'rev. Suolahti (1955)', *Acta Classica* 26 (1957) 236-239.

Wilkes, J.J. (1969), *Dalmatia*, London.

Wilson, R.J.A. (1990), *Sicily under the Roman empire: the archaeology of a Roman province, 36 BC-AD 535*, Warminster.

Wightman, E.M. (1976), 'Soldier and civilian in early Roman Gaul', *Akten des XI internationalen Limeskongresses* (Fitz, J. ed), Budapest, 75-86.

Wightman, E.M. (1977), 'Military arrangements, native settlements, and related developments in early Roman Gaul', *Helinium* 17 (1977) 105-126.

Wiseman, T.P. (1964), ‘Some Republican Senators and their Tribes’, *Classical Quarterly* N.S. 14 (1964) 122-135.

Wiseman, T.P. (1971), *New men in the Roman senate, 139 B.C.-A.D. 14*, London.

Wiseman, T.P. (1985), ‘Who Was Crassicius Pansa?’, *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 115 (1985) 187-196.

Wiseman, T.P. (1995), ‘The God of the Lupercal’, *Journal of Roman Studies* 85 (1995) 1-22.

van Wonterghem, F. (1982), ‘Momumento funerario di un *tribunus militum* a Corfinio’, *Acta Archaeologica Lovaniensia* 21 (1982) 99-125.

Woodman, A.J. (1975). ‘Questions of Date, Genre and Style in Velleius: Some Literary Answers’, *Classical Quarterly* N.S. 25 (1975) 272-301.

Wrobel, T. (2009), ‘Military *Praefecti* and Provincial Government in the Early Principate: the Case of Raetia’, in *Transforming Historical Landscapes in the Ancient Empires* (Antela-Bernárdez, B. and Ñaco del Hoyo, T. eds.), BAR International Series 1986, 77-82.

Yoshimura, T. (1961) ‘Die Auxiliartruppen und die Provinzialklientel in der römischen Republik’, *Historia* 10 (1961) 473-495.

Zanier, W. (1999), ‘Der Alpenfeldzug 15 v. Chr. und die Eroberung Vindelikiens’, *Bayerische Vorgeschichtsblätter* 64 (1999) 99-132.

Zanier, W. (2000), ‘Der Alpenfeldzug 15 v. Chr. und die augusteische Okkupation in Süddeutschland’, in *Die Römer zw. Alpen und Nordmeer* (=Wamser, L. ed.), Rosenheim, 11-17.

Zucca, R. (1988), ‘Le *Civitates Barbariae* e l’occupazione militare della Sardegna: aspetti e confronti con L’Africa’, *L’Africa romana* 5 (1988) 349-373.

Introduction to the Appendices

A searchable version of these appendicies can be found at http://www.en-clair.net/officers.

Appendix A comprises all individuals of the period 91BC – AD14 who are either identified as junior officers in this thesis, or who are named as possible junior officers of the period in Broughton (1951-1986); Suolahti (1955), (1958); Demougin (1992); Devijver (1975), (1976-2001), (1986); Dobson (1966), (1978); Holder (1980); Nicolet (1967); Pflaum (1960-1961); Saddington (1980), (1985), (1987), (1988a), (1988b), (1990), (1991a), (1996a), (1996b), (1999); and Sasel (1974). In addition, some individuals are included who appear in none of these works (for example, where evidence has recently come to light). In Appendix A (by contrast with the main body of the thesis), the relevant volumes of Devijver (1976-2001) are referred to by year as 'Devijver (1976-1977)' for the first two volumes, which contain the alphabetical list of officers, 'Devijver (1987)' for the first supplement, and 'Devijver (1993)' for the second supplement.

The individuals are listed in the following order: cases where no part of the nomen or cognomen survives are placed at the start of the list and ordered alphabetically by source (e.g. AE, CIL, Ovid); cases where only part of the nomen or cognomen survives (and where it cannot be reconstructed with any certainty) are placed after those above, and ordered alphabetically by the surviving part of the nomen or cognomen; cases where the whole of the nomen and/or cognomen survives are placed next and ordered alphabetically by nomen, then cognomen, then praenomen, then filiation.

Where I have judged there to be sufficient evidence to identify an individual as certainly or probably a junior officer of the period 91BC – AD14, his name is given in bold type. The number that appears before his name is an identification number used elsewhere in this thesis, including the lists which comprise Appendices B and C. Where I have judged that an individual was not a junior officer in this period, or that there is insufficient evidence to identify an individual as certainly or probably a junior officer in this period, his name appears in italics and there is no identification number before the name; in each case a reason for exclusion from the numbered list of officers is given.

The following sections appear in the entry for each individual in Appendix A:

Catalogues: for each individual, the first line of the entry below the name consists of references to the standard catalogues (SUO – Suolahti (1955); DEV – Devijver (1976-2001); BRO – Broughton (1951-1986); and DEM – Demougin (1992)), along with references to RE and PIR.

Post(s): the posts held by an individual, not all of which are necessarily junior officer posts. See below for a list of the abbreviations used.

Date of post(s): the date, or dates, an individual held these posts. If an individual is not considered in this thesis to have held a post, then the date shown is the date to which a post has been assigned by other authors, and is placed within square brackets.

Primary evidence: references to evidence relating directly to this individual's junior officer career, or to the relevant evidence if he is judged not to have held a junior officer position.

The following sections appear where relevant in the entries in Appendix A:

Other reference works: references to the works listed in the first paragraph of this introduction, other than the four main catalogues.

Further bibliography: references to additional discussions of the individual or his post.

Future career: the highest known equestrian or senatorial post in an individual's future career (or in a few cases – denoted by square brackets – in his past career).

Relevant text: the text of the primary evidence, where it is judged necessary to cite it.

Note: for an individual who is considered in this thesis as a junior officer of the period 91BC – AD14, but whose junior officer career or dating might be controversial, a short note discussing these issues.

Reason for exclusion: for an individual who is not considered in this thesis as a junior officer in this period, the reason for his exclusion.

Appendices B and C have been created on the basis of those identified as certainly or probably junior officers of this period in Appendix A and given an officer number.

Appendix B is a chronologically ordered list of postholding by the numbered junior officers (alphabetical by officer's name within each year), each individual identification number appearing in italics after the name of the officer.

Appendix C is a list of postholding by the numbered junior officers ordered alphabetically by type of post (for each type of post, the list is ordered first chronologically, then alphabetically by officer's name within each year). Each individual identification number appears in italics after the name of the officer. Where there is doubt about an officer's holding of a post, an asterisk appears before his name.

Appendix D is a list of officers (ordered chronologically, with each post appearing on a separate line) who have been excluded from the list of those who were certainly or probably junior officers of the period 91BC – AD14 on the grounds that there is insufficient evidence to date them more precisely than (e.g.) to the period 'before AD38', 'before AD42', etc. It is likely that some of these officers will have served in the Augustan period, but it is not possible to say which did so.

Abbreviations used in the Appendices

The following abbreviations are used to identify the posts held by an individual: a question-mark indicates doubt about the holding of a particular post; where one or more alternatives exist, a "|" is placed between the options (one or more of which may sometimes not be a junior officer post), which are listed in descending order of likelihood from left to right.

Junior officer posts:

EP: a prefect in charge of cavalry who is not necessarily to be identified as a *praefectus alae*, *praefectus* of a *cohors equitata*, *praefectus equitum*, or *praefectus equitum alae*.

EP(PA), EP(PCE), EP(PE), EP(PEA): a prefect in charge of cavalry who is explicitly identified as a *praefectus alae*, *praefectus* of a *cohors equitata*, *praefectus equitum*, or *praefectus equitum alae*.

IP: a military prefect in charge of infantry, who is not necessarily to be identified as a *praefectus castrorum*, *praefectus cohortis*, *praefectus cohortium*, *praefectus leuis armaturae*, or *praefectus ueteranorum*.

IP(PCAST), IP(PCOH), IP(PCOHORTIUM), IP(PLA), IP(PV): a military prefect in charge of infantry who is explicitly identified as a *praefectus castrorum*, *praefectus cohortis*, *praefectus cohortium*, *praefectus leuis armaturae*, or *praefectus ueteranorum*.

MP: a military prefect whose role was *ad hoc* or cannot be clearly identified.

MP(GC): a military prefect who was either a garrison commander or in command of a town or region.

MT: a military tribune (no distinction is made here between those who were elected and those who were appointed) who is not to be identified as a *tribunus militum a populo*, *tribunus militum cohortis* (or *tribunus cohortis*), *tribunus militum pro legato* or *tribunus sesmenstris*.

MT(AP), MT(COHA), MT(COHP/U), MT(PL), MT(SM): a military tribune explicitly identified as a *tribunus militum a populo*, *tribunus militum cohortis* (or *tribunus cohortis*) in charge of an auxiliary cohort of Roman citizens (MT(COHA)) or in charge of a praetorian or urban cohort (MT(COHP/U)), *tribunus militum pro legato*, or *tribunus sesmenstris*.

NP: a naval prefect who is not necessarily to be identified as a *praefectus classis* or *praefectus nauium*.

NP(PC), NP(PN): a naval prefect explicitly identified as a *praefectus classis* or *praefectus nauium*.

PF: a *praefectus fabrum*.

Posts other than junior officer posts:

CENT: a centurion who was not a *primipilus*.

CENT(PP): a centurion who was a *primipilus*.

CP: the holder of an equestrian-ranked civilian post that was not a junior officer post (e.g. *epistrategos, praefectus ad agros diuidundos*).

LEG: a legate

SEN: the holder of a senior equestrian-ranked post that should not be considered a junior officer post (e.g. Sex. Pompeius as *praefectus classis et orae maritimae*, or holders of the posts of *praefectus Aegypti* and *praefectus praetorii*).

Appendix A

[- - -] (AE 1926, 82)
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** Inc. 65: (1976-1977) 921-922, (1987) 1800, (1993) 2301; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 310; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Holder (1980) 246 no. E41; Saddington (1980) 35 no. 48 bis, (1987) 270 no. 14
Further bibliography: Keppie (1973) 13ff.; Demougin (1981) 98; Christol and Drew-Bear (2002) 286
Post(s): EP(PA)|EP(PEA), IP(PV), ?MP(GC)
Date of post(s): EP(PA)|EP(PEA) before AD38, IP(PV) before AD38, ?MP(GC) before AD38
Future career: Pro legato
Primary evidence: AE 1926, 82 = AE 1982, 885 = AE 2002, 1453 = EDH HD001203 (Antiocha Pisidia, Asia)
Relevant text: [- - -] / [praef(ecto) equi]t(um) *uel* [praefec]t(o) alae Anti/[anae pr]aef(ecto) ueteran(orum) / [leg(ionis) - - -] XII praefect(o) / [pro leg(ato) C]ommagene[s] / [praef(ecto) Ti.] Caesaris Aug(usti) / [col(onus)] Caes(areus)
Reason for exclusion: Given the status of Commagene during the period, as well as his municipal prefecture (cf. Demougin (1992) 264), it is likely that the junior officer posts of this individual belong to the Tiberian era.

1 [- - -] (AE 1933, 199)
Catalogues: SUO: A281; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Guarducci (1930) 86-87; Schmitthenner (1958) 198 n.2
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before 36BC
Primary evidence: AE 1933, 199 (Priansos, Creta et Cyrenaica)

2 [- - -] (AE 1964, 107)
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 109; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Dobson (1978) 168-169 no. 7; Saddington (1996b) 246 no. 2
Further bibliography: Torelli (1962) 73
Post(s): IP(PCAST)
Date of post(s): IP(PCAST) before AD7
Primary evidence: AE 1964, 107 (Trebula Mutuesca, Regio 4, Italia)

[- - -] (AE 1982, 694)
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** Inc. 228: (1976-1977) 980-981, (1987) 1821, (1993) 2318; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 410; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Dobson (1978) 186-187 no. 49
Further bibliography: Pflaum (1978) 197; Christol and Demougin (1982) 143-144
Post(s): NP(PN)|PF|EP(PE), CENT(PP), MT
Date of post(s): NP(PN)|PF|EP(PE) before AD38, CENT(PP) before AD38, MT before AD38
Primary evidence: AE 1982, 694 = CIL 12.4371-2 (Narbo, Gallia Narbonensis)
Relevant text: [- - -] / [duom]uir quinquenna[li]s duomuir / [iteru]m praefectus pro duouiro augur / [tribunu]s militum primipilus(!) praefectus [?naui *uel* ?fabr *uel* ?equit]um / [ex c]onlegio Honoris et Virtutis arbitratu / Zenonis lib(erti)
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Gaian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

[- - -] (AE 2000, 539)
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Antolini (2000) 361
Post(s): MT, EP(PE)|PF
Date of post(s): MT before AD42, EP(PE)|PF before AD42
Primary evidence: AE 2000, 539 = Antolini (2000) 361 no. 6 (Supp.It. 18.S.6) (Suassa, Regio 6, Italia)
Relevant text: [- - -] / L(ucius?) E[- - -] / tri[b(unus) mil(itum) - - -] / pr[aef(ectus)

[?equit(um) *uel* ?fab(rum) - - -]
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Claudian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

[- - -] (AE 2000, 540)
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Antolini (2000) 362
Post(s): EP(PE)
Date of post(s): EP(PE) before AD42
Primary evidence: AE 2000, 540 = Antolini (2000) 361-362 no. 7 (Supp.It. 18.S.7) (Suassa, Regio 6, Italia)
Relevant text: [- - -] / [- - - praefectus e]quitum / [- - -]
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Claudian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

[- - -] (CIL 2.1625)
Catalogues: SUO: A292; **DEV:** - : (1976-1977) 894, (1987) - , (1993) - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): -
Date of post(s): [before 1BC]
Primary evidence: CIL 2.1625a-b, 1626 (Igabrum, Baetica)
Relevant text: CIL 2.1625a: [- - -]liu[s - - -] / [- - -]acer [- - -] / [- - -]enius [- - -] / [- - - R]ufus [- - -] / [- - -] ab po[- - -] / [- - -]m ad [- - -] / [- - -] d(e) s(ua) p(ecunia) f(aciendum) c(urauit) CIL 2.1625b: [- - -]PR[- - -] / PI[- - -] / [- - -] C VI[- - -] / ob [honorem] / [- - -]uirat[us - - -] CIL 2.1626: [- - -] Caes[ar? - - -] / [- - -] trib(unicia) p[ot(estate) - - -] / [- - -]C[- - -]F[- - -]
Reason for exclusion: No evidence that this individual held a junior officer position

3 [- - -] (CIL 5.3346)
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Saddington (1987) 270 no. 6a
Further bibliography: Suic (1991-1992) 65
Post(s): MP(GC)
Date of post(s): MP(GC) before AD15
Primary evidence: CIL 5.3346 = ILS 2673 = AE 1993, 774 (Arusnates, Regio 10, Italia)

[- - -] (CIL 5.4379)
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** Inc. 80: (1976-1977) 930, (1987) 1805, (1993) - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD42
Primary evidence: CIL 5.4379 = Inscr.It. 10.05.172 (Brixia, Regio 10, Italia)
Relevant text: [- - -] / trib(unus?) mil(itum) [- - -]
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Claudian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

4 [- - -]f. Pap(iria) (CIL 6.32935)
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** Inc. 101: (1976-1977) 938, (1987) 1806, (1993) 2304; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 34; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Saddington (1985) 530 no. 6
Further bibliography: Pflaum (1960-1961) 10
Post(s): ?CENT(PP), ?MT, PF
Date of post(s): ?CENT(PP) before AD15, ?MT before AD15, PF before AD15
Primary evidence: CIL 6.32935 (Roma)

[- - -]f. Pap(iria) (CIL 6.32936)
Catalogues: SUO: A280; **DEV:** Inc. 102: (1976-1977) 938, (1987) - , (1993) 2304; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 194; **RE/PIR:** RE 12.1595
Other reference works: Nicolet (1967) 52 n.1
Post(s): ?MT(AP), ?PF
Date of post(s): ?MT(AP) before AD15, ?PF before AD15
Primary evidence: CIL 6.32936 (Roma)
Relevant text: [- - -] f. Pap(iria) / [- - -]ae / [?trib(unus) ?mil(itum) ?a p]opulo / [?praef(ectus) ?fab]r(um)

Reason for exclusion: While Demougin ((1992) 173; cf. Devijver (1976-1977) 938) accepts the reconstruction of this inscription, the doubts expressed by Nicolet ((1967) 52 n.1) cannot be ignored: the inscription is simply too fragmentary. As the inscription is dated to the Augustan period principally on the basis of the reconstruction of the post of *tribunus militum a populo*, this date is also uncertain.

5 [- - -] (CIL 6.37045)
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Cichorius (1922) 146 no. 9; Criniti (1970) 105-106
Post(s): ?MT
Date of post(s): ?MT in 89BC
Primary evidence: Criniti (1970) 16-26 = CIL 6.37045 = CIL 1.709 = CIL 16, p.145 = ILLRP 515 = ILS 8888 = AE 1909, 30 = AE 1910, +126 = AE 1910, +153 = AE 1910, +162 = AE 1910, 207 = AE 1910, 218 = AE 1911, 126 = AE 1912, +10 = AE 1912, +117 = AE 1912, +287 = AE 1920, +130 = AE 1923, +103 = AE 2003, +831 = EDH HD019742 (Roma)
Note: See the discussion of *consilia* in ch. 1.

6 L. [- - -] (CIL 6.37045)
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Cichorius (1922) 150 no. 15; Criniti (1970) 114
Post(s): ?MT
Date of post(s): ?MT in 89BC
Primary evidence: Criniti (1970) 16-26 = CIL 6.37045 = CIL 1.709 = CIL 16, p.145 = ILLRP 515 = ILS 8888 = AE 1909, 30 = AE 1910, +126 = AE 1910, +153 = AE 1910, +162 = AE 1910, 207 = AE 1910, 218 = AE 1911, 126 = AE 1912, +10 = AE 1912, +117 = AE 1912, +287 = AE 1920, +130 = AE 1923, +103 = AE 2003, +831 = EDH HD019742 (Roma)
Note: See the discussion of *consilia* in ch. 1.

7 [- - -]f. Suc(cusana) (CIL 6.37045)
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Cichorius (1922) 150 no. 16; Criniti (1970) 114
Post(s): ?MT
Date of post(s): ?MT in 89BC
Primary evidence: Criniti (1970) 16-26 = CIL 6.37045 = CIL 1.709 = CIL 16, p.145 = ILLRP 515 = ILS 8888 = AE 1909, 30 = AE 1910, +126 = AE 1910, +153 = AE 1910, +162 = AE 1910, 207 = AE 1910, 218 = AE 1911, 126 = AE 1912, +10 = AE 1912, +117 = AE 1912, +287 = AE 1920, +130 = AE 1923, +103 = AE 2003, +831 = EDH HD019742 (Roma)
Note: See the discussion of *consilia* in ch. 1.

8 [- - -] (CIL 6.41050) (1)
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: AE 1992, 186 adnot.; Castelli (1992) 193-194; Saddington (1994) 73, 75
Post(s): EP(PE)
Date of post(s): EP(PE) before AD15
Primary evidence: CIL 6.41050 = AE 1992, 186 = AE 1994, 144 (Roma)
Relevant text: [P. Corneli]o Orestino / [comiti T]i. Caesaris / [Xuir(o) stl(itibus)] iudicand(is) / [tr(ibuno) leg(ionis) se]cundae // P. Cornelio P. f. Scipion[i - - -] / pr(aetori) proco(n)s(uli) leg(ato) diui Au[g(usti) et Ti. Caes(aris) Aug(usti)] / tr(ibuno) pl(ebis) q(uaestori) pro pr(aetore) Xuiro stl[itibus iudicandis] / alae Astyrum [praef(ecto) - - -] / Agrippiana praef(ecto) N[- - -] / Hispanorum ueterana p[raef(ecto) - - -] / praetoria praef(ecto) [- - -] / Hispanorum tironum [praef(ecto) - - -]
Note: This inscription from Rome is in two parts, from two sides of a monument. The first part is a dedication to P. Cornelius Orestinus, the second to a P. Cornelius Scipio, almost certainly the father of Orestinus and Cornelia Orestina (wife of Caligula). P. Cornelius Scipio was quaestor in AD2/3, legate in Germany in AD13/14, and is the subject of the second (and main) dedication, made by five *alae* (cf. AE 1992, 186 adnot.; Castelli (1992) 193-194; Saddington (1994) 73, 75). The *praefecti* of these*alae*, whose names do not survive, were commanders of cavalry units which appear to have served under P. Cornelius Scipio in Germany, and it is possible that Scipio was placed in some form of general cavalry command there (Castelli (1992) 194; Saddington (1994) 75; L. Stertinus may have succeeded him in this role (Tacitus, *Ann*. 2.8.4, 2.11, 2.17.1; cf.

Saddington (1980) 184 no. 36, (1991a) 3536 no. A2 75, (1994) 75)). If the suggested reconstruction is correct, Orestinus served as a military tribune in Legio II (Augusta), which was also in service on the Rhine at the time. The inscription appears to have been found on land owned by the Cornelii Scipiones in the *ager Vaticanus* and may well have featured a dedication to P. Cornelius Scipio's wife on the opposite side to that of Orestinus (AE 1992, 186 adnot; Castelli (1992) 194).

9 N[- - -] (CIL 6.41050) (2)
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: AE 1992, 186 adnot.; Castelli (1992) 193-194; Saddington (1994) 73, 75
Post(s): EP(PE)
Date of post(s): EP(PE) before AD15
Primary evidence: CIL 6.41050 = AE 1992, 186 = AE 1994, 144 (Roma)
Note: Cf. [- - -] (CIL 6.41050) (1)

10 [- - -] (CIL 6.41050) (3)
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: AE 1992, 186 adnot.; Castelli (1992) 193-194; Saddington (1994) 73, 75
Post(s): EP(PE)
Date of post(s): EP(PE) before AD15
Primary evidence: CIL 6.41050 = AE 1992, 186 = AE 1994, 144 (Roma)
Note: Cf. [- - -] (CIL 6.41050) (1)

11 [- - -] (CIL 6.41050) (4)
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: AE 1992, 186 adnot.; Castelli (1992) 193-194; Saddington (1994) 73, 75
Post(s): EP(PE)
Date of post(s): EP(PE) before AD15
Primary evidence: CIL 6.41050 = AE 1992, 186 = AE 1994, 144 (Roma)
Note: Cf. [- - -] (CIL 6.41050) (1)

12 [- - -] (CIL 6.41050) (5)
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: AE 1992, 186 adnot.; Castelli (1992) 193-194; Saddington (1994) 73, 75
Post(s): EP(PE)
Date of post(s): EP(PE) before AD15
Primary evidence: CIL 6.41050 = AE 1992, 186 = AE 1994, 144 (Roma)
Note: Cf. [- - -] (CIL 6.41050) (1)

13 [- - -] (CIL 9.3159)
Catalogues: SUO: A393; **DEV:** Inc. 163: (1976-1977) 959-960, (1987) 1812, (1993) 2310-2311; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 196; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Nicolet (1967) 37 no. 5
Further bibliography: van Wonterghem (1982) 118; Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 87-88
Post(s): MT(AP)
Date of post(s): MT(AP) before AD15
Primary evidence: CIL 9.3159 (Corfinium, Regio 4, Italia)

[- - -] (CIL 9.3664)
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - : (1976-1977) 960, (1987) - , (1993) - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): -
Date of post(s): [before AD18]
Primary evidence: CIL 9.3664 (Marruuium, Regio 4, Italia)
Relevant text: Diuos(!) Aug(ustus) E[- - -] / Ti. Caesar de inquisitio[ne - - -] / ordini scripsit cuius [- - -] / principes in quos imperi[um - - -] / per successiones tra[dunt - - -] / praefecto sagittar[iorum - - -] / Germanico Caesare II [L. Seio Tuberone co(n)s(ulibus)] / Ascalonitanae IIIIuir[- - -]
Reason for exclusion: This anonymous individual claims to have served as a commander of archers (*praefectus sagittar[iorum]*), a term otherwise unattested. Given the lack of information on

this post, if such a post indeed existed, it is impossible to tell whether or not he was a junior officer.

[- - -] (CIL 9.5369)
Catalogues: SUO: C375; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): -
Date of post(s): [before AD15]
Primary evidence: CIL 9.5369 = CIL 1.1921 = ILLRP 594 (Firmum Picenum, Regio 5, Italia)
Relevant text: Q. Attius C. f. / [- - - Se]ptumius C. f. / aid(iles) / [- - - Ca]esonius P. f. / q(uaestor) aquam / d(ecurionum) d(ecreto) / curauerunt
Reason for exclusion: No evidence that this individual held a junior officer position

14 [- - -] M.f. Fal(erna) [- - -] (CIL 10.3888)
Catalogues: SUO: A342; **DEV:** Inc. 178: (1976-1977) 964, (1987) - , (1993) 2313; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 197; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Nicolet (1967) 45 no. 23
Further bibliography: Duncan-Jones (1982) 166-171
Post(s): MT(AP)
Date of post(s): MT(AP) before AD15
Primary evidence: CIL 10.3888 (Capua, Regio 1, Italia)

[- - -] (CIL 11.712)
Catalogues: SUO: C376; **DEV:** Inc. 191: (1976-1977) 969, (1987) 1817, (1993) 2315; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 406; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Dobson (1978) 186 no. 48; Holder (1980) 247 nos. E59, E60
Post(s): CENT(PP), MT, EP(PE)lIP(PCAST), PF
Date of post(s): CENT(PP) before AD42, MT before AD42, EP(PE)lIP(PCAST) before AD42, PF before AD42
Primary evidence: CIL 11.712 (Bononia, Regio 8, Italia)
Relevant text: [- - ?D]enticol(a?) Q. f. C B / [- - -] prim(us)pil(us) praef(ectus) eq(uitum) / [II]uir i(ure) d(icundo) / [prim(us)]pil(us) [?II] trib(unus) mil(itum) praef(ectus) / [?eq(uitum) pr]aef(ectus) fabrum / [IIuir q]uinq(uennali) potest(ate) / [- - - port]icus de p(ecunia) s(ua) d(ederunt)
Reason for exclusion: On this anonymous individual, see [- - -]enticol. Q.f. (CIL 11.712).

[- - -] (CIL 11.4191)
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 66; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD42
Primary evidence: CIL 11.4191 (Interamna Nahars, Regio 6, Italia)
Relevant text: [- - - IIII]uir tr(ibunus) m[il(itum) - - -] / [- - -] Rubrius [- - -]
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Claudian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date, cf. [- - -] Aufidi[us - - -] (CIL 11.4183a).

[- - -] (CIL 11.4193)
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** Inc. 197: (1976-1977) 970, (1987) - , (1993) 2316; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 67; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD42
Primary evidence: CIL 11.4193 (Interamna Nahars, Regio 6, Italia)
Relevant text: [- - -]illus IIIIuir i(ure) d(icundo) [- - -] / [- - - praet(or)] sacr(orum) quaestor [- - -] / [huic decreto decuri]onum funus publica [- - -] / [impensa duci statuamq]ue in foro poni placuit [- - -] / [- - - IIII]uir [i(ure)] d(icundo) trib(unus) [mil(itum) - - -]
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Claudian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date, cf. [- - -] Aufidi[us - - -] (CIL 11.4183a).

[- - -] (CIL 11.4194)
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** Inc. 198: (1976-1977) 971, (1987) - , (1993) 2316-2317; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 68; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): MT

Date of post(s): MT before AD42
Primary evidence: CIL 11.4194 (Interamna Nahars, Regio 6, Italia)
Relevant text: [- - -] / [trib(uno) mil(itum)] legionis XIII / [mag(istri?) ordinis] (h)aruspicum LX bis / [IIIIuir(o) iure] dicundo / [- - -]mateuria T. f. Sc[- - -]
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Claudian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date, cf. [- - -] Aufidi[us - - -] (CIL 11.4183a).

15 [- - -] (CIL 11.4791)
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** Inc. 207: (1976-1977) 974, (1987) - , (1993) 2317; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 198; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Nicolet (1967) 46 no. 27
Post(s): MT(AP)
Date of post(s): MT(AP) before AD15
Primary evidence: CIL 11.4791 (Spoletium, Regio 6, Italia)

16 [- - -] (Cicero, *Murena* 73)
Catalogues: SUO: C73; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.484, 3.123; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Welch (1995) 134 no. iv; Badian (1997) 4-5 no. v
Post(s): PF
Date of post(s): PF in 64BC
Primary evidence: Cicero, *Murena* 73

17 [- - -] (Ovid, *Fasti* 4)
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Saddington (1999) 305 no. 2
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT in 46BC
Primary evidence: Ovid, *Fasti* 4.378-384

18 [- - -] (Velleius 2.112.6)
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Saddington (1996b) 246 no. 4
Post(s): IP(PCAST)
Date of post(s): IP(PCAST) in AD7
Primary evidence: Velleius 2.112.6

[- - -]enticol. Q.f.
Catalogues: SUO: A323, C294; **DEV:** Inc. 191: (1976-1977) 969, (1987) 1817, (1993) 2315; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 405; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Dobson (1978) 186 no. 47; Holder (1980) 247 nos. E59, E60
Post(s): CENT(PP), EP(PE)
Date of post(s): CENT(PP) before AD42, EP(PE) before AD42
Primary evidence: CIL 11.712 (Bononia, Regio 8, Italia)
Relevant text: [- - ?D]enticol(a?) Q. f. CB / [- - -] prim(us)pil(us) praef(ectus) eq(uitum) / [II]uir i(ure) d(icundo) / [prim(us)]pil(us) [?II] trib(unus) mil(itum) praef(ectus) / [?eq(uitum) pr]aef(ectus) fabrum / [IIuir q]uinq(uennali) potest(ate) / [- - - port]icus de p(ecunia) s(ua) d(ederunt)
Reason for exclusion: CIL 11.712 is a highly problematic inscription. Gatti ((1972-1973) 92) argues that it refers to only one individual. Dobson and Demougin, however, argue that the dual mention of the post of *primipilus* (on lines 2 and 4) must belong to separate individuals (Dobson (1978) 186; Demougin (1992) 332). None of the other men known to have held the post more than once in the pre-Claudian era are found with the post mentioned more than once and in different positions in the descriptions of their cursus (Demougin (1992) 332); this is also the case for junior officer posts. However, while it is difficult to calculate the length of text missing from the left side of the inscription, there are no lines missing, and it is hard to see where another name would fit into the text. The answer may lie in the first line, and in a comparison with the inscriptions recording L. Volumnius Verus and L. Volumnius Seuerus (CIL 14.2495: L(uci) Volumni / Verus et Seuerus; CIL 14.2495a: Volumni duo / Verus et Seuerus). Given that it is unlikely that only one cursus is listed on this inscription, and given that there does not appear to be space for a further name in lines 2-7, it is likely that two close relatives, perhaps brothers, are jointly recorded on line

1 (cf. [- - -] CIL 11.712); note the two unassigned letters at the end of the line. The prefecture belonging to lines 4-5 (praef(ectus) / [- - -]) is possibly that of a *praefectus castrorum*, as this cursus is known from the Augustan period (CIL 10.1262: L. Curiatius L.f.; cf. Dobson (1978) 186), although the post of *praefectus equitum* is perhaps more likely (Dobson (1966) 73 n.48, (1978) 186; cf. Cn. Petronius Asellio (CIL 13.6816)). As for the name of the *gens* in the first line, a M. Cassius Denticulus is known from Verona, and was a military tribune in the Flavian era (AE 1893, 118 = ILS 7729; Devijver (1976-177) 230).

19 [- - -]ius Sex.f. [- - -]
Catalogues: SUO: A344, C321, C322, C323; **DEV:** S106: (1976-1977) 772, (1987) 1734, (1993) 2247; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 46; **RE/PIR:** RE 12.1709
Other reference works: Pflaum (1960-1961) 7-10 no. A(8); Holder (1980) 246 no. E38; Saddington (1980) 28 no. 1, (1985) 530 no. 7, (1987) 270 no. 5
Further bibliography: Ritterling, RE 12.1709; Saddington (1982) 57; Wilson (1990) 38; Bivona (1994) 130
Post(s): PF, MT(PL), NP(PC), ?EP(PCE)
Date of post(s): PF before 21BC, MT(PL) before 21BC, NP(PC) before 21BC, ?EP(PCE) before 21BC
Primary evidence: Bivona (1994) 130-131 no. 16 = CIL 10.7351 (Thermae Himeraeae, Sicilia)
Relevant text: [- - -]io Sex [f. - - -] / [equo public]o praef(ecto) fabr(um) [trib(uno) milit(um)] / [le]g(ionis) XII [Ful]minatae pro [legato ?Aug(usti)] / Caesari[s] Cypri praef(ecto) cl[ass(is) - - -] / equitatae et Iulia[e - - -] / M. Liuius Macedonic[us - - -] / l(ocus) [d(atus) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum)]
Note: It is probable that the post at the end of line 4 is that of *praefectus classis*, as, given its relatively high status, this is more likely to follow the position of *tribunus militum pro legato* in a cursus, and the letters "ch" for "cohortis" would be an unusual abbreviation for such an early inscription. All that is visible from the photograph in Bivona (Bivona (1994) plate 10) is a "C" followed by a vertical stroke, and, for the reasons given, "CL" for "classis" is a more natural reading of this than "CH" for "cohortis". He may have been the *praefectus* of a *cohors equitata*, although this would be an unusually early attestation of the post and, as Saddington points out, the preceding lacuna is too big to allow for certainty (Saddington (1982) 57; cf. Saddington (1980) 28, (1985) 530, (1987) 270).

20 [- - -]lius Ti.f. Pup(inia) Clemens
Catalogues: SUO: A286; **DEV:** C278: (1976-1977) 315, (1987) 1537, (1993) 2086; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 51; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Nicolet (1967) 45-46 no. 25; Saddington (1999) 307 no. 13
Further bibliography: Gregori (1989) 31-32
Post(s): MT(AP)
Date of post(s): MT(AP) circa 20BC
Primary evidence: Gregori (1989) (EAOR II) 31-32 no. 12 = CIL 11.4575 = ILS 1901 (Carsulae, Regio 6, Italia)

[- - -]nius L.f. Le[m(onia)]
Catalogues: SUO: A348, A349, A350, A351, C325, C326; **DEV:** Inc. 190: (1976-1977) 968, (1987) 1871, (1993) 2315; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 352; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Pflaum (1960-1961) 1041; Dobson (1978) 168 no. 6; Holder (1980) 247 no. E58; Saddington (1980) 32 no. 25, (1988) 309 no. 34, (1996a) 247 no. 8
Post(s): MT, ?EP(PE), IP(PCAST), NP(PC)
Date of post(s): MT before AD42, ?EP(PE) before AD42, IP(PCAST) before AD42, NP(PC) before AD42
Primary evidence: CIL 11.711 (Bononia, Regio 8, Italia)
Relevant text: [- - -]nius L. f. Le[m(onia) - - - trib(unus)] mil(itum) IIII / [?pr(aefectus) ?eq(uitum)] III praef(ectus) c[astr(orum) -- Caes]aris Augu[sti] / [praef(ectus) c]lassis IIu[ir quinquenn]alis pont[ifex] / [- - -]am cryptam [- - - a sol]o peq(unia)! sua d(onum) [d(edit)]
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Claudian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

[- - -] Pup(inia) Pro[- - -]
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** P132 bis: (1976-1977) 693, (1987) 1702, (1993) 2217; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Saddington (1980) 31 no. 21, (1987) 273 no. 42

Post(s): MT, IP(PCOH)
Date of post(s): MT after AD37, IP(PCOH) after AD37
Primary evidence: CIL 5.536 = Inscr.It. 10.4.41 = AE 1991, 758 (Tergeste, Regio 10, Italia)
Relevant text: [- - -] Pup(inia) Pro[- - -] / [leg(ionis) XXI]I Primig[eniae - - -] / [- - - pr]aef(ectus) Gaesa[torum] / [- - -]um Heluet[iorum - - -] / [- - - leg(ionis)] V Maced[onicae - - -]
Reason for exclusion: Given his service in Legio XXII Primigenia, this individual is highly unlikely to have served as a junior officer in the Augustan period (cf. Saddington (1980) 31 no. 21).

21 [- - -u]rius C.f. Aem(ilia) Gallu[s]
Catalogues: SUO: C299; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 19.1973
Other reference works: Dobson (1978) 185 no. 45; Saddington (1980) 33 no. 28, (1987) 273 no. 46
Post(s): IP(PLA)
Date of post(s): IP(PLA) before AD15
Primary evidence: AE 1995, 276 = CIL 10.6098 (Formiae, Regio 1, Italia)

22 [- - -]rnius L.f. Hor(atia) Asiati[cus - - -]
Catalogues: SUO: A305; **DEV:** C51: (1976-1977) 209, (1987) 1483, (1993) 2045; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 136; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Nicolet (1967) 46 no. 26
Further bibliography: Manzella (1981) 125
Post(s): MT(AP)
Date of post(s): MT(AP) before AD15
Primary evidence: CIL 11.7494 = AE 1907, 115 (Falerii Noui, Regio 7, Italia)

[- - -]rtius Q.f.
Catalogues: SUO: A369; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 12.1709
Post(s): ?MT
Date of post(s): ?MT before AD100
Primary evidence: CIL 12.1861 (Vienne, Gallia Narbonensis)
Relevant text: [- - -]rtio Q. [f. - - -] / [Xuiro st]litibus [iudicandis] / [trib(uno) mi]lit(um) leg(ionis) [- - -] / [leg(ionis) XII F]ulm[inatae] / [- - -]u[- - -]
Reason for exclusion: Ritterling (RE 12.1709) suggests that this individual was a *tribunus laticlauus* in Legio XII Fulminata, partly on the basis that the last line can be expanded to [quaest(ori) trib]u[n(o) pleb(is)]. However, too little survives of the inscription to permit a precise estimate of his date.

[- - -]scus
Catalogues: SUO: A324; **DEV:** Inc. 195 bis: (1976-1977) - , (1987) - , (1993) 2316; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 314; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD38
Primary evidence: Torelli (1975) 116, 123 no. 11 = CIL 11.3370 = ILS 2924 = AE 1899, 62a = AE 1953, +229 = AE 1954, 126 (Tarquinii, Regio 7, Italia)
Relevant text: Torelli (1975) no. 11: [- - - Romae] uitio m[onuit rogasse] / [- - -]m comiti[a inauspicato?] / [et placanda n]umina Arusan[ia(?) iussit] / [signumque I]ouis et Iustitiae et[iam] / [eo loco conse]crandum discipul[inam] / [haruspicii su]i carminibus edidit [*uac*] / [Romae trigin]ta annis ampliu[s artem] / [suam docuit] (*uac*.) / [- - -]scus trib(unus) m[il(itum)] / [apsens creatus per] priscum [ritum? - - -]
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Gaian, but insufficient evidence for a maore precise date. On [- - -]scus, see P. Coelius P.f. Etruscus.

[- - -]tius P.f. Ani(ensi) Varus
Catalogues: SUO: A380, C355, C356, C357; **DEV:** V137: (1976-1977) 887-888, (1987) 1781, (1993) 2288; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 509; **RE/PIR:** RE 12.1570
Other reference works: Saddington (1980) 38 no. 70
Further bibliography: Dobson (1966) 71; Saddington (1982) 63; Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 88
Post(s): PF, IP(PCOH), EP(PE), MT

Date of post(s): PF before AD49, IP(PCOH) before AD49, EP(PE) before AD49, MT before AD49
Primary evidence: CIL 14.2960 = CIL 10, p.590 = ILS 2681 (Praeneste, Latium, Italia)
Relevant text: [- - -]tio P. f. Ani(ensi) Varo / [- - - pra]ef(ecto) fabr(um) praef(ecto) cohort(is) German(orum) / [- - - pra]efecto equit(um) trib(uno) mil(itum) legionis V / [- - -] P. f. Ani(ensi) Varo q(uaestori) pr(aetori) pontif(ici) pr(aetori) quinq(uennali) / [- - -] Capituli(!) Hernico / [- - -]FIL[- - -] et sibi fecit
Reason for exclusion: Varus should almost certainly be dated to the Claudian era, given the order of his posts, which are given in chronological order (on the Claudian changes to the nascent equestrian cursus, see ch. 5; on Varus' date, cf. Ritterling, RE 12.1570; Dobson (1966) 71; Saddington (1980) 38, (1982) 63). From the shape of the surviving inscription, it is likely that it belongs to a round Augustan-style mausoleum (Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 88). Although it seems that Varus did not have a municipal career, his son enjoyed a successful municipal career in Capitulum Hernicorum (cf. Demougin (1992) 420-421).

23 [- - -]us
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** Inc. 178 bis, Inc. 202: (1976-1977) 972, (1987) 1815, (1993) - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD15
Primary evidence: CIL 10.4749 = AE 2002, 362 (Suessa Aurunca, Regio 1, Italia)
Note: On [- - -]us, cf. [- - - Qu]adratus Maesianus Celsus (CIL 10.4749 = AE 2002, 362)

24 [- - -]us T.f. Teret(ina)
Catalogues: SUO: A329, A330, C302, C303, C304, C305; **DEV:** I13: (1976-1977) 433-434, (1987) 1591, (1993) 2130; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 70; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Dobson (1978) 172 no. 11; Holder (1980) 247 no. E61; Saddington (1988) 311 no. 55, (1996b) 251 no. 38
Further bibliography: Grenier (1960) 60; Pflaum (1978) 196; Christol and Demougin (1982) 149-151; Sablayrolles (1984) 240; Christol (1999) 12-15
Post(s): CENT(PP), MT, EP(PE), IP(PCAST), PF, NP(PN)
Date of post(s): CENT(PP) before 10BC, MT before 10BC, EP(PE) before 10BC, IP(PCAST) before 10BC, PF before 10BC, NP(PN) before 10BC
Primary evidence: AE 1952, 169 = AE 1954, +39 = AE 1954, 104 = AE 1996, 1008 = AE 1999, 1020 (Arelate, Gallia Narbonensis)

[- - -]us T.f. Nepos
Catalogues: SUO: A346; **DEV:** N28: (1976-1977) 606, (1987) - , (1993) 2184; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 267; **RE/PIR:** RE 12.1612
Further bibliography: Étienne (1958) 206; Alföldy (1975) 96; Le Roux (1982) 84
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD38
Primary evidence: CIL 2.6097 = Alföldy (1975) no.173 (Tarraco, Hispania Tarraconensis)
Relevant text: [- - -]o T. f. / [- - -] Nepoti / [- - -]no trib(uno) / [mil(itum) leg(ionis)] VI flam(ini) / [Romae] et August(i) / [- - -] ex d(ecreto) d(ecurionum)
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Gaian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

[- - -]us T.f. Ter(etina) Rufus
Catalogues: SUO: A370, C347; **DEV:** R26: (1976-1977) 715, (1987) - , (1993) 2226; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 752; **RE/PIR:** PIR I142
Other reference works: Pflaum (1960-1961) 1042
Post(s): MT, NP(PC)
Date of post(s): MT before AD69, NP(PC) before AD69
Primary evidence: CIL 10.4867 (Venafrum, Regio 1, Italia)
Relevant text: [- - -]o T. f. Ter(etina) Rufo / [... trib(uno)] mil(itum) praef(ecto) clas(sis) / [... II]uiro q(uaestor *uel* uinquennalis)
Reason for exclusion: Julio-Claudian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

L. Acilius
Catalogues: SUO: C59; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.28; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 8

Post(s): LEG|MP(GC)
Date of post(s): LEG|MP(GC) in 90BC
Primary evidence: Appian, *B.C.* 1.41
Reason for exclusion: Since he was in command of Aesernia along with Cornelius Scipio, it is likely that Acilius was a legate (cf. Broughton (1951-1986) 2.28). Cf. L. Cornelius Scipio.

M. Acilius M'.f. Gal(eria) Silo
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** A11: (1976-1977) 50-51, (1987) 1410, (1993) 1980; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 714; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Curchin (1990) 139
Post(s): IP(PCOH)
Date of post(s): IP(PCOH) before AD42
Primary evidence: CIL 2.1314 (Asido, Baetica)
Relevant text: M. Acilius M. f. / Gal(eria) Silo IIuir / praef(ectus) cohor(tis) / h(ic) s(itus) e(st)
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Claudian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

25 D. Aebuti(us) D.f. Cor(nelia)
Catalogues: SUO: A165; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.35, 3.3; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 3
Other reference works: Cichorius (1922) 152-153 no. 19; Criniti (1970) 117-119
Further bibliography: Badian (1963) 131
Post(s): ?MT
Date of post(s): ?MT in 89BC
Primary evidence: Criniti (1970) 16-26 = CIL 6.37045 = CIL 1.709 = CIL 16, p.145 = ILLRP 515 = ILS 8888 = AE 1909, 30 = AE 1910, +126 = AE 1910, +153 = AE 1910, +162 = AE 1910, 207 = AE 1910, 218 = AE 1911, 126 = AE 1912, +10 = AE 1912, +117 = AE 1912, +287 = AE 1920, +130 = AE 1923, +103 = AE 2003, +831 = EDH HD019742 (Roma)
Note: See the discussion of *consilia* in ch. 1.

(L.?) Aelius Gallus
Catalogues: SUO: C214; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 57; **RE/PIR:** RE 59; PIR(2) 179
Further bibliography: Brunt (1975) 142; Thomasson (1984) 341 no. 2; Salomies (1992) 23 n.5
Post(s): SEN
Date of post(s): SEN in 26BC
Future career: Praefectus Aegypti
Primary evidence: Dio 53.29.3; Pliny, *N.H.* 6.160; cf. Strabo 16.4.22, 17.1.53-54
Reason for exclusion: This individual held a senior officer position.

L. Aelius Seianus
Catalogues: SUO: C251; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 272; **RE/PIR:** PIR(2) 255
Further bibliography: Demougin (1992) 234-237; Salomies (1992) 23
Post(s): SEN
Date of post(s): SEN in AD14
Future career: Consul AD30
Primary evidence: Tacitus, *Ann.* 1.24.2, 4.1.7; Dio 57.19.5-6; Velleius, 2.127.3; cf. Tacitus, *Ann.* 4.39.5, 58.1.
Reason for exclusion: This individual held a senior officer position.

26 [M. Aem]ili(us) Q.f. Pal(atina) (?Lepidus)
Catalogues: SUO: A166; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.35; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 72
Further bibliography: Cichorius (1922) 147 no. 10; Criniti (1970) 106-107
Post(s): ?MT
Date of post(s): ?MT in 89BC
Primary evidence: Criniti (1970) 16-26 = CIL 6.37045 = CIL 1.709 = CIL 16, p.145 = ILLRP 515 = ILS 8888 = AE 1909, 30 = AE 1910, +126 = AE 1910, +153 = AE 1910, +162 = AE 1910, 207 = AE 1910, 218 = AE 1911, 126 = AE 1912, +10 = AE 1912, +117 = AE 1912, +287 = AE 1920, +130 = AE 1923, +103 = AE 2003, +831 = EDH HD019742 (Roma)
Note: See the discussion of *consilia* in ch. 1.

Aemilius Rectus
Catalogues: SUO: C253; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 205; **RE/PIR:** RE 124; PIR(2) 394

Further bibliography: Brunt (1975) 143 no. 11; Thomasson (1984) 343 no. 12
Post(s): SEN
Date of post(s): SEN in AD14
Future career: Praefectus Aegypti
Primary evidence: Dio 57.10.5
Reason for exclusion: This individual held a senior officer position.

27 Q. Aemilius Q.f. Pal(atina) Secundus
Catalogues: SUO: C254, C255; **DEV:** A90: (1976-1977) 86-87, (1987) 1427, (1993) 1993; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 107; **RE/PIR:** RE 4.373; PIR(2) 406
Other reference works: Pflaum (1960-1961) 1081; Holder (1980) 242 no. E3; Saddington (1980) 30 no. 10, (1985) 530 no. 11; Devijver (1986) 179 no. 5
Further bibliography: Balty and Balty (1977) 117-120; Saddington (1982) 57, (1985) 537
Post(s): IP(PCOH), PF
Date of post(s): IP(PCOH) circa AD6, PF circa AD6
Primary evidence: CIL 3.6687 = CIL 5.*136 = Pais 475 = ILS 2683 (Berytus, Syria)

[- - - A]eschinus
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** A268: (1976-1977) 166, (1987) - , (1993) - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): ?MT
Date of post(s): ?MT before AD68
Primary evidence: CIL 6.3502 (Roma)
Relevant text: [- - - A]eschinus pater tr(ibunus?) [mil(itum?)] / [- - -] occisus est in Lusita[nia- - -]
Reason for exclusion: This inscription is too fragmentary to allow certainty that Aeschinus was a military tribune, let alone that he should be dated to the Augustan period.

Sex. Afranius Sex.f. Volt(inia) Burrus
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** A96: (1976-1977) 89-90, (1987) 1428, (1993) 1994; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 552; **RE/PIR:** RE 8; PIR(2) 441
Post(s): MT, SEN
Date of post(s): MT before AD29, SEN before AD29
Future career: Praefectus praetorii
Primary evidence: CIL 12, 1360 = CIL 12.5842 = ILS 1321 = ILGN +191 = ICalvet 69 (Vasio, Gallia Narbonensis); cf. Tacitus, *Ann*. 12.42; 13.2; 14.51
Relevant text: Vasiens(es) Voc(ontiorum) / patrono / Sex. Afranio Sex. f. / Volt(inia) Burro / trib(uno) mil(itum) proc(uratori) Augus/tae proc(uratori) Ti. Caesar(is) / proc(uratori) diui Claudi / praef(ecto) pra[e]tori(o) orna/me[nt]is consular(ibus)
Reason for exclusion: Given that he was *procurator Augustae*, Burrus' service as a military tribune presumably took place in the period before Livia's death in AD29. However, given the length of his later career, Burrus was probably not a military tribune before AD15 (cf. Demougin (1992) 461).

Albinouanus Pedo
Catalogues: SUO: C245, C256; **DEV:** A97: (1976-1977) 90, (1987) 1428, (1993) 1994-1995; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 210; **RE/PIR:** PIR(2) A479, P158
Other reference works: Saddington (1980) 34 no. 35, (1991a) 3536 no. 1
Post(s): SEN|EP
Date of post(s): SEN|EP in AD15
Primary evidence: Tacitus, *Ann*. 1.60; Seneca, *Suas*. 1.15, *Cont*. 2.2.12; Seneca, *Ep*. 122.15; cf. Ovid, *ex Ponto* 4.10.3-4.
Reason for exclusion: This individual held a senior officer position.

28 Albius Tibullus
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** A100: (1976-1977) 91, (1987) 1429, (1993) 1995; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 55; **RE/PIR:** RE 12: PIR(2) 484
Post(s): ?MT
Date of post(s): ?MT in 28BC
Primary evidence: Suetonius, *de poetis*, *uita Albi Tibulli* 1-5
Relevant text: Albius Tibullus, eques Romanus insignis forma cultuque corporis obseruabilis,

ante alios Coruinum Messalam origine dilexit cuius et contubernalis Aquitanico bello militaribus donis donatus est
Note: If the poet Albius Tibullus was awarded *dona*, it is likely that, given his social status, he served as a junior officer, in which case he was probably a military tribune or prefect (Devijver (1976-1977) 91; Demougin (1993) 68).

Alexandros
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Saddington (1996b) 248 no. 14
Post(s): IP(PCAST)
Date of post(s): IP(PCAST) after AD500
Primary evidence: Baillet (1926) 441-443 no. 1733 = AE 2002, 1603 (Tomb of Ramses V (KV9), Egypt)
Relevant text: Ἀλέξανδρος, ἔπαρχος κάστρων Θηβῶν, ἶδον καὶ ἐθαύμασα·/ καὶ ὧδε ὁ τούτου νοτάριος Ἰσὰκ Ἀλεξανδρεὺς ὑπερ/εθαύμασα θιότατον {θειότατον} ἔργον.
Reason for exclusion: Cuvigny's convincing argument (Cuvigny (2002) 239-240) that this inscription belongs to the Byzantine period means that Speidel's suggestion that Alexandros was the commander of the Roman legionary camp at Thebes in the Augustan period (Speidel (1982) 120; Dobson (1982) 331; Saddington (1996b) 244) is no longer valid.

[. Alleni]dius M.f. [Vel(ina)]
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Forni (1988) 114ff.; AE 2000, 469 adnot.
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD42
Primary evidence: CIL 9.5185 = CIL 1.3298 = Forni (1988) 114-120 (Epigr 3) 7 = AE 2000, 469 (Asculum, Regio 5, Italia)
Relevant text: [. Alleni]dius M. f. / [Vel(ina)] tr(ibunus) mil(itum) // M. Allen[idius] / Vel(ina) cen[turio] / [domo] Castro Truen[tino] / [- - -] T. f. fileis uiua fe[cit et sibi]
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Claudian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

[. Al]lenius C.f. Strabo
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** A105: (1976-1977) 93, (1987) - , (1993) 1996; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 338; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): MT(SM)
Date of post(s): MT(SM) before AD68
Primary evidence: AE 1953, 33 = EDH HD018359 (Patauium, Regio 10, Italia)
Relevant text: [. Al]lenius C. f. Strabo / [p]raef(ectus) i(ure) d(icundo) tr(ibunus) mil(itum) p(er?) s(esmenstrem?) / [c]ur(ator) aerari(i) pluteum / dedit
Reason for exclusion: This inscription may refer to a *tribunus militum populi suffragio* (Devijver (1976-1993) 93), which would be equivalent to a *tribunus militum a populo* and date Allenius to the Augustan period. However, as Demougin suggests, the term *tribunus militum populi suffragio* would be unique, and it is, perhaps, better to assume that Allenius served as a *tribunus sesmenstris*, and that he should be dated to the early imperial period (Demougin (1988) 329, (1992) 286). It is likely that he was originally from Patauium, as other members of his family can be found there (cf. Demougin (1992) 287).

29 M. Allius M.f. Men(enia) Ru[fus]
Catalogues: SUO: A299; **DEV:** A109: (1976-1977) 94-95, (1987) - , (1993) 1996; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 134; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Nicolet (1967) 42-44 no. 21; Saddington (1985) 531 no. 23
Further bibliography: Dobson (1966) 69 n.43; Saddington (1996a) 161
Post(s): PF, MT(AP)
Date of post(s): PF before AD15, MT(AP) before AD15
Primary evidence: CIL 10.1132 = ILS 6447 (Abellinum, Regio 1, Italia)

30 Q. Allius Q.f. Vel(ina) Rufus
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** A110: (1976-1977) 95, (1987) - , (1993) 1997; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 135; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Dobson (1966) 71

Post(s): MT, PF, NP(PC)|IP(PCOH)
Date of post(s): MT after 26BC, PF after 26BC, NP(PC)|IP(PCOH) after 26BC
Primary evidence: CIL 9.5441 (Falerio, Regio 5, Italia)

T. Ampius T.(l.) Menander
Catalogues: SUO: C111a; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 2
Other reference works: Cichorius (1922) 135; Suolahti (1958) 153 no. 10
Further bibliography: Ben Zeev (1998) 189
Post(s): -
Date of post(s): [49BC]
Primary evidence: Josephus, *A.J.* 14.236-240; Cicero, *ad Fam.* 13.70
Reason for exclusion: See the discussion of *consilia* in ch. 1.

L. Ancharius C.f. Rom(ilia)
Catalogues: SUO: A300, A301, C257; **DEV:** A114: (1976-1977) 96-97, (1987) - , (1993) 1997; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 340; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Ghiardini (1905) 222; Dobson (1966) 69 n.43; Bassignano (1997) 160-161
Post(s): MT, PF
Date of post(s): MT before AD42, PF before AD42
Primary evidence: Bassignano (1997) 160 no. 16 (Supp.It 15.16) = AE 1906, 76 = AE 1997, +584 (Ateste, Regio 10, Italia)
Relevant text: Publice / L. Anchario C. f. Ro[m(ilia)] / trib(uno) mil(itum) bis praef(ecto) fab[r(um)] / IIuir(o) auguri / honoris caussa(!) loc[us] / sepulturae datu[s] / ipsi posterisque ei[us] / sepult(uram) / Vicellia T. f.[- - -]
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Claudian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

L. Annelius L.f. Aem(ilia) Rufus
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: AE 1996, 462 adnot.
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD42
Primary evidence: AE 1996, 462 (Copia, Regio 3, Italia)
Relevant text: L. Annelio L. f. Aem(ilia) Rufo p(atri) / [tr(ibuno) mil(itum) pont(ifici) IIIIuir(o) iur(e) d(icundo) iter(um)] / L. Annelio L. f. Aem(ilia) Rufo f(ilio) IIIIuir(o) [iur(e) d(icundo) Caesiae P. f. Rufae uxori] / L. Annelio L. f. Aem(ilia) Cordo // fratri // III[Iuir(o) i(ure) d(icundo) iter(um) Safiniae L. f. socrui] / ex testamento Ca[esia P. f. Rufa uxor fecit HS XXV(milibus)].
Reason for exclusion: This inscription, known previously in fragmentary form only, has recently been expanded thanks to Zumbo's report of the previously unpublished work of Gradilione, who was able to see a further part of the inscription (AE 1996, 462 adnot.; cf. Zumbo, A. (1996), " in *Vir bonus, docendi peritus, Ommagio dell'Universitá dell'Aquila a Giovanni Garuti* (Dell'Era, A. and Russi, A. eds), San Severo, 139-157, which I have been unable to obtain). L. Annelius was, therefore, a military tribune in an unidentified legion. The style of the inscription is similar to that of a number of late Republican/early Imperial era inscriptions (cf. AE 1996, 462 adnot.; L. Flaminius L.f. Hister (CIL 5.913)), and that is surely the period to which this inscription also belongs.

31 P. Annius
Catalogues: SUO: A179; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.49; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 17
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT in 87BC
Primary evidence: Appian, *B.C.* 1.72; Plutarch, *Mar.* 44.1; Valerius Maximus 8.9.2, cf. 9.2.2; cf. Cicero, *Brut.* 307, *de Or.* 3.10, *Tusc. Disp.* 5.55, *Phil.* 1.134; Livy *Per.* 80; Velleius 2.22.3; Lucan 2.122, Plutarch, *Ant.* 1; Florus 2.9.14; Dio 45.47.1; Schol. Cron. 286 Stangl.

32 T. Anni(us) T.f. Ouf(entina)
Catalogues: SUO: A167; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.35; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Cichorius (1922) 148 no. 12; Criniti (1970) 110-111
Post(s): ?MT
Date of post(s): ?MT in 89BC
Primary evidence: Criniti (1970) 16-26 = CIL 6.37045 = CIL 1.709 = CIL 16, p.145 = ILLRP

515 = ILS 8888 = AE 1909, 30 = AE 1910, +126 = AE 1910, +153 = AE 1910, +162 = AE 1910, 207 = AE 1910, 218 = AE 1911, 126 = AE 1912, +10 = AE 1912, +117 = AE 1912, +287 = AE 1920, +130 = AE 1923, +103 = AE 2003, +831 = EDH HD019742 (Roma)
Note: See the discussion of *consilia* in ch. 1.

Annius Rufus
Catalogues: SUO: C258; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 181; **RE/PIR:** PIR(2) 686
Other reference works: Pflaum (1960-1961) 1082
Post(s): CP
Date of post(s): CP in AD12
Future career: Procurator
Primary evidence: Josephus, *A.J.* 18.32
Reason for exclusion: This individual held a civilian position.

33 D. Antonius
Catalogues: SUO: C101; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.246; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 3
Further bibliography: Shackleton-Bailey (1977) no. 69; Brunt (1971) 227 n.4
Post(s): MP
Date of post(s): MP in 51BC
Primary evidence: Cicero, *ad Fam.* 3.6.5
Relevant text: uirum fortem mihique in primis probatum, D. Antonium, praefectum euocatorum, misi ad te, cui si tibi uideretur, cohortis traderes
Note: There are no other known *praefecti euocatorum*, and while there is a possible parallel with the post of *praefectus ueteranorum*, the context of Cicero's letter, that Antonius had been sent to locate and oversee the movement of three cohorts of veterans to the front, suggests that this was a temporary command, and that no permanent post of *praefectus euocatorum* existed: he was simply a prefect in charge of a unit of *euocati*.

34 M. Antonius
Catalogues: SUO: C86, C87, C89; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.205, 3.19-20; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 30
Further bibliography: Jones (1938) 14-26; Pelling (1988) 121
Post(s): EP
Date of post(s): EP in 57BC, EP in 56BC, EP in 55BC
Future career: Consul 44BC
Primary evidence: Plutarch, *Ant.* 3.1; cf. 3.2-4; Josephus, *A.J.* 14.84, cf. 86, 92

35 C. Antonius [Hybrida]
Catalogues: SUO: C68; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.61-62; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 19
Post(s): EP
Date of post(s): EP before 84BC
Future career: Consul 63BC
Primary evidence: Asconius 84.13-14C, cf. 88; cf. Cicero, *Com. Pet.* 8.9; Plutarch, *Luc.* 4.1

L. Antonius T.f. Gal(eria) Silo
Catalogues: SUO: C259; **DEV:** A145: (1976-1977) 113, (1987) 1439, (1993) - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): PF, IP(PCOH), MP(GC)
Date of post(s): PF after AD68, IP(PCOH) after AD68, MP(GC) after AD68
Primary evidence: CIL 2.4138 = Alföldy (1975) (RIT) 90 no. 162 = ILS 2715 (Tarraco, Hispania Citerior)
Relevant text: L. Antonio / T. f. Gal(eria) Siloni / praef(ecto) fabr(um) praef(ecto) / c(o)hor(tis) IIII Thrac(um) / praef(ecto) c(o)hor(tis) no/uae tironum praef(ecto) / orae maritumae / conuentus Tar/raconensis
Reason for exclusion: As Alföldy argues, L. Antonius Silo was a junior officer in the Flavian period, or possibly later (Alföldy (1968) 72, (1975) 90; cf. Dobson (1966) 74-75; Devijver (1976-1977) 113).

L. Antonius M. Antonii Polemonis filius Cor[nel]ia Zeno
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** A147: (1976-1977) 114, (1987) 1439, (1993) 2004-2005; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -

Other reference works: Devijver (1986) 118 no. 9; Saddington (1999) 308 no. 22
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD69
Future career: Achiereus Asiae
Primary evidence: Buckler and Calder (1939) 40 no. 104 (MAMA 6.104) = Robert and Robert (1954) 168 no. 54 = SEG 43.1232 (Herakleia, Asia); AE 1987, 929 = SEG 37.855 = McCabe (1996) no. 12 (Apollonia Salbake, Asia).
Relevant text: MAMA 6.104: [ὁ δῆμ]ος ἐ[τείμησεν] / [Λο]ύκιον Ἀντώ[νιον Πο]/[λέ]μωνος υἱὸν Κορ[νη]/[λί]α Ζήνωνα χειλί[αρχον]/[κα]ὶ ἀρχιερέα τῆς Ἀ[σί]ας; AE 1987, 929: Λούκιον Ἀντώνιον Μάρκου Ἀντω[νί]/ου Πολέμωνος υἱὸν Ζήνωνα μ[έ]/γαν ἀρίστη χιλιαρχήσαντα λεγ[ιῶ]/νος ιβ Κεραυνοφόρου τετειμ[η]/μένον ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεῶν ἐνφαν[εσ]/τάτου Σεβαστοῦ Βασιλικῇ διὰ τῆς / οἰκουμένης πορφυραφορία καὶ / ἀρχιερατεύσαντα Αὐτοκράτο/ρος Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ / τὴν ἀνάστασιν ποιησαμέν[ων] / Ἀττάλου καὶ Τάτας τῶν Ἑρμ[ο]/γένους τέκνων ἐκ διαθή/κης Ἑρμογένους Ἀττάλου / πατρὸς ἰδίου διὰ τὰς αὐ/τοῦ εἰς ἑαυτοὺς εὐεργεσία[ς]
Reason for exclusion: A chief priest of the imperial cult, as well as a military tribune in Legio XII Fulminata, Antonius Zeno was granted the right to wear purple by the emperor (Buckler and Calder (1939) 40; Robert and Robert (1954) 169; Ceylan and SEG 37.855 adnot.; Ritti (1987) 79-81; Malay (1987) 74). Antonius Zeno is generally identified with the Antonius Polemonis f. Zeno of the Claudian and Neronian eras (Buckler and Calder (1939) 40; Robert and Robert (1954) 169; SEG 37.855 adnot.; Malay (1987) 74; Devijver (1993) 2004; cf. BMC Phrygia 303 no 159, 324 no. 263), a member of a powerful family in Asia descended from the man granted the throne of Pontus by M. Antonius (cf. Buckler and Calder (1939) 40; Devijver (1976-1977) 114, (1987) 1439; Ceylan and Ritti (1987) 86ff.; Malay (1987) 74-75). However, Ceylan and Ritti have argued that he should be dated to the Augustan period on the basis of his imperial cult title (cf. Ceylan and Ritti (1987) 81-83; cf. Saddington (1999) 299). This analysis, however, is refuted by SEG (SEG 37.855 adnot.; cf. Malay (1987) 74; Devijver (1993) 2004), where it is maintained that he belongs to the Claudian and Neronian eras. If he did belong to the Augustan period, then parallels might be drawn with Iulius Posidonius (IGR 4.1626) and Fuluius Lesso (CIL 2.3852), who claim to have been directly appointed by Augustus - neither, however, can be conclusively dated to the Augustan period. In the light of such uncertainty, a more precise date cannot be given.

36 L. Aponius [- - -]
Catalogues: SUO: A302, C260, C261; **DEV:** A150: (1976-1977) 115, (1987) 1440, (1993) 2005; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 202; **RE/PIR:** 12.1625, 1793; PIR(2) 934
Other reference works: Devijver (1975) 28-29 no.8; Dobson (1978) 169-170 no. 8; Holder (1980) 246 no. E43; Saddington (1980) 30 no. 9, (1996b) 246 no. 3, (1999) 307 no. 16
Further bibliography: Halfmann (1986) 246; Fitz (1990) 179; Christol (1999) 15-16
Post(s): EP(PE), MT, IP(PCAST)
Date of post(s): EP(PE) before AD4, MT before AD4, IP(PCAST) before AD4
Primary evidence: CIL 12.4230 = Espérandieu (1929) no. 558 = AE 1999; cf. CIL 12.4235, 4241 (Baeterrae, Gallia Narbonensis); Tacitus, *Ann.* 1.29

Q. Aponius
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 3.20; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 6
Post(s): SEN
Date of post(s): SEN before 46BC
Primary evidence: Dio 43.29.3
Relevant text: χρονίζοντος οὖν αὐτοῦ, πυθόμενοι οἱ στρατιῶται οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰβηρίᾳ τόν τε Σκιπίωνα ἀπολωλότα καὶ τὸν Δίδιον ἐπιπλέοντά σφισι, καὶ φοβηθέντες μὴ διαφθαρῶσι πρὶν τὸν Πομπήιον ἐλθεῖν, οὐκ ἔμειναν αὐτόν, ἀλλὰ Τίτον τε Κυίντιον Σκαπούλαν καὶ Κύιντον Ἀπώνιον ἄνδρας ἱππέας προστησάμενοι τόν τε Τρεβώνιον ἐξέβαλον καὶ τὸ ἔθνος τὸ Βαιτικὸν πᾶν συναπέστησαν
Reason for exclusion: One of the two men whom the soldiers placed in command against Trebonius (cf. T. Quin(c)tius Scapula). Despite the suggestion of Broughton ((1951-1986) 3.20, 180), there is no evidence that either had held a junior officer position.

37 L. Appuleius L.f.
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** A154: (1976-1977) 117, (1987) 1441, (1993) 2006; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 22; **RE/PIR:** -

Further bibliography: Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 61; Kockel (1993) 108-9 (D1); Keppie (1997) 5
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD15
Primary evidence: CIL 14.3948 (Nomentum, Regio 1, Italia)

P. Apulanus P.f. Sabinus
Catalogues: SUO: A303; **DEV:** A158: (1976-1977) 119, (1987) - , (1993) 2006; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 341; **RE/PIR:** 12.1363
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD42
Primary evidence: CIL 3.2711 (Tilurnum, Dalmatia)
Relevant text: P. Apulanus P. f. / Pol(lia) Sabinus / domo E<p=T>or<e=F>d(ia) / tri(bunus) mil(itum) leg(ionis) XI / NIM
Reason for exclusion: Sabinus is dated to the pre-Claudian period by Demougin, and to the Claudian era by Devijver (Devijver (1976-1977) 119; Demougin (1992) 288). Suolahti's suggestion (Suolahti (1955) 345) that he belongs to the Augustan period is unlikely to be correct, as Legio XI was not stationed in Dalmatia until AD9, although it remains a possibility.

38 Q. Aquila
Catalogues: SUO: C146; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.303; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 8
Post(s): NP
Date of post(s): NP in 46BC
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.Afr*. 62, 67.1
Relevant text: *B.Afr*. 62: Caesar L. Cispium cum classe XXVII nauium ad Thapsum...mittit itemque Q. Aquilam cum XIII nauibus longis...praemittit; *B.Afr*. 67.1: Cispio Aquilaeque classe tradita
Note: Along with L. Cispius (cf. L. Cispius [?Laeuus]), Q. Aquila was placed in charge of 13 ships during the blockade of Thapsus. Their role was to blockade other parts of the African coast.

39 L. Aquillius Florus Turcianus Gallus
Catalogues: SUO: A283; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 22, 12.1664, 1669; PIR(2) 993
Further bibliography: De Laet (1941) 27; Cébeillac-Gervasoni (1972) 14; Amandry (1988) 106-107; Rizakis (2001) 267-277 no. COR *83
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD15
Future career: Proconsul
Primary evidence: CIL 3.551 = ILS 928 = Inscr.Att. 4 = IG 3.578 = IG II/III(2) 4126 (Athenae, Achaia); AE 1919, 1 = West (1931) (Corinth Vol. 8 Part 2) 8.2.54 (Corinthus, Achaia)

40 C. Aqutius (?Aclutius) L.f. Teret(ina) Gallus
Catalogues: SUO: A267; **DEV:** A12, A159(a): (1976-1977) 51, (1987) 1410, 1441, (1993) 1980, 2007; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 19; **RE/PIR:** RE 12.1380, 1387
Further bibliography: Devijver and Van 'T Dack (1982-1983) 168-169; Keppie (1983) 26-28, 107, (2000b) 253
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before 29BC
Primary evidence: CIL 10.4876 = ILS 2227 = AE 1984, 369 (Venafrum, Regio 1, Italia)

41 M. Aristius
Catalogues: SUO: A228; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.232; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 1
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT in 52BC
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.G*. 7.42.5, cf. 7.43.1

M. Arrecinus M.f. [- - -] Clemens
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** A159 bis: (1976-1977) 1001-1002, (1987) 1442, (1993) - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 289; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Saddington (1985) 532 no. 41

Further bibliography: Demougin (1978a) 317ff.
Post(s): MT, PF
Date of post(s): MT before AD38, PF before AD38
Primary evidence: ERimini 22 = AE 1976, 200 = AE 1978, 333 = AE 1988, +565 = EDH HD003689 (Ariminium, Regio 8, Italia)
Relevant text: M. Arrecinus M. f. [- - -] / Clemens trib(unus) mil(itum) leg(ionis) III Cyren(aicae) / et leg(ionis) XXII praef(ectus) fabr(um) IIuir IIIuir aug(ur) / B(accho) et S(iluano) u(otum) s(oluit) l(ibens) m(erito)
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Gaian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

42 M. Arrius M.f. Maximus
Catalogues: SUO: C262; **DEV:** A162: (1976-1977) 120, (1987) 1444, (1993) 2007; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** PIR(2) 1099
Other reference works: Holder (1980) 242 no. E1; Saddington (1980) 31 no. 20
Further bibliography: Wiseman (1971) 213 no. 38; Demougin (1982) 101 no. 3; Licordari (1982) 16
Post(s): EP(PE)
Date of post(s): EP(PE) before AD15
Future career: Curule aedile
Primary evidence: CIL 10.5911 = ILS 912 (Anagnia, Regio 1, Italia)

[?L.] Arrius Salanus
Catalogues: SUO: A304, C263; **DEV:** A163: (1976-1977) 121, (1987) 1444, (1993) 2008; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 268; **RE/PIR:** RE 12.1502, 1687
Other reference works: Pflaum (1960-1961) 53-54; Dobson (1978) 174-175 no. 16; Holder (1980) 242 no. E4; Saddington (1980) 31 no. 20, (1985) 533 no. 38, (1996b) 248 no. 15, (1999) 310 no. 31
Further bibliography: Saddington (1996a) 164-165
Post(s): MT, EP(PE), IP(PCAST), PF
Date of post(s): MT before AD29, EP(PE) before AD29, IP(PCAST) before AD29, PF before AD29
Primary evidence: CIL 10.6101 = ILS 6285 (Formiae, Regio 1, Italia)
Relevant text: [?L.] Arrio Salano / praef(ecto) quinq(uennali) Ti. Caesaris / praef(ecto) quinq(uennali) Neronis et Drus[i] / Caesarum designato tub(icini) sac(rorum) p(opuli) R(omani) / aed(ili) III auguri interregi / trib(uno) milit(um) legion(is) III August(ae) / leg(ionis) X Geminae praef(ecto) equit(um) / praef(ecto) castror(um) praef(ecto) fabr(um) / Oppia uxor
Reason for exclusion: Arrius Salanus' cursus appears not to follow the normal ordering of posts. His military career probably, but by no means certainly, followed most of his municipal career (Demougin (1992) 229; cf. Q. Decius Saturninus (CIL 10.5393); contra Le Bohec (1989) 135), but probably preceded his quinquennial prefectures. The inscription can be dated by the reference to Drusus and Germanicus Caesar, since Arrius presumably died before he could hold the quinquennial prefecture on their behalf, as they were only honoured from AD20 to 29 (Dobson (1978) 174-175; Le Bohec (1989) 135; Demougin (1992) 230). It makes sense to assume that his military career, which was a long one, did not all take place in the years AD20-29, suggesting that his military and later municipal cursus were intertwined. As Saddington points out, it is likely that the apparent division of Arrius Salanus' municipal cursus is, in fact, a division between municipal honours, such as the holding of quinquennial prefectures for members of the imperial house, and municipal posts such as that of aedile (Saddington (1996a) 165; cf. Demougin (1992) 229). His military career is probably given in chronological order (Saddington (1980) 31 no. 20, (1985) 533 no. 38, (1996) 248 no. 15; Demougin (1992) 299; contra Le Roux ((1982) 305 no. 3)). If this is the case, then he held the post of *praefectus fabrum* following those of military tribune (in Africa, then in Spain), *praefectus equitum* and*praefectus castrorum*, which was a career similar to that of other military officers with long careers from this period, such as Sex. Aulienus Sex.f. Ani(ensi) (for other pre-Claudian officers who held the position of *praefectus fabrum* at the end of their careers, see Dobson (1966) 73; cf. ch. 5). There is no reason to assume, as Dobson argues ((1978) 174 no.16; cf. Saddington (1985) 533), that as Arrius was a *praefectus castrorum* he must have held the position of *primipilus*, as there seems to be no reason why the position would be omitted, especially in such a comprehensive inscription (cf. Le Bohec (1989) 135; Demougin (1992) 231). On the basis of his municipal career, Arrius Salanus' military career almost certainly belongs to the Tiberian period, although it is possible that his early military tribunate might have been held under

Augustus (Ritterling, RE 12.1502, 1687; Devijver (1976-1977) 121; Le Bohec (1989) 135; cf. Roldán Hervás (1974a) 322 no. 792).

L. Arruntius
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.420; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** PIR(2) 1129
Other reference works: Saddington (1988a) 308 no. 24
Post(s): SEN|LEG|NP
Date of post(s): SEN|LEG|NP in 31BC
Primary evidence: Velleius 2.85
Relevant text: Dextrum nauium Iulianarum cornu M. Lurio commissum, laeuum Arruntio, Agrippae omne classici certaminis arbitrium; Caesar ei parti destinatus, in quam a fortuna uocaretur, ubique aderat. Classis Antonii regimen Publicolae Sosioque commissum. At in terra locatum exercitum Taurus Caesaris, Antonii regebat Canidius.
Reason for exclusion: Like L. Gellius Publicola, C. Sosius, M. Octauius, and other naval commanders at Actium, Arruntius should not be considered as a military tribune. He was, as Broughton notes, probably a legate (Broughton (1951-1986) 2.420, 422).

C. Atilius A.f. Glabrio
Catalogues: SUO: C264; **DEV:** A176: (1976-1977) 128, (1987) 1449, (1993) 2012; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 69; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Holder (1980) 242 no. E6
Further bibliography: Dobson (1966) 65; Nicolet (1974) 789 no. 37; Dondin (1979) 653-654; Solin (1991b) 415, (1991b) 145; Badian (1997) 2; Spaul (2000) 454 n.2
Post(s): PF, IP(PCOH)
Date of post(s): PF before AD42, IP(PCOH) before AD42
Primary evidence: CIL 11.1934 = CIL 1.3364 = ILLRP 638 = ILS 2685 = AE 1979, 245 = AE 1983, 393 = AE 1991, +663 (Perusia, Regio 7, Italia)
Relevant text: C. Atilius A. f. Glabrio / IIIIuir quinq(uennalis) praefectus fabr(um) / [delat(us?)] a co(n)s(ule) praef(ectus) cohor[tis] / [- - -]c(*aut* g)orum sagittar(iorum) / E (*aut* F) [- - -]m A. f. minore natus
Reason for exclusion: This inscription, from Perusia, gives the career, almost certainly in chronological order, of a local notable, C. Atilius Glabrio. The inscription has been dated to the period before the re-building of Perusia following the Perusine wars (Dobson (1966) 65; Nicolet (1974) 789; Devijver (1976-1977) 128; Dondin (1979) 655), as Perusia's magistrates from the imperial period are duovirs, not quattuorvirs. However, a more recent article by Saddington has shown this dating to be insecure. As Saddington points out, the post of *praefectus cohortis* is unattested in the Republican period, and is not found epigraphically until the mid- to late-Augustan era. Moreover, the use of "saggitar(iorum)" to describe the unit's function is unparalleled until the Flavian era; even the more common "cohors equitata" is rarely found before the late first century. The use of a cohort name based on the ethnic background of its members is also rare for this period (Saddington (1983) 264-265; Solin (1991b) 154). While we find individuals described as *praefectus leuis armaturae* (e.g. Sex. Pedius Lusianus Hirrutus (CIL 9.3044)) and *praefectus sagittar[iorum]* (cf. [- - -] (CIL 9.3664)), these descriptions qualify the type of troops commanded, not the unit's title. In addition, as Saddington and Solin demonstrate, there is no reason to assume that Perusia was refounded with duovirs following the Perusine wars, or that the town was further punished by Augustus after 40BC (Saddington (1983); cf. Solin (1991b) 415, (1991b) 145; Demougin (1992) 78). Given this argument, an Augustan, or even Caligulan, date has been advanced for Atilius Glabrio (Saddington (1983) 265-266; Solin (1991b) 415, (1991b) 145; Spaul (2000) 454 n.2), the latter date supported by a palaeographic analysis of the inscription (Solin (1991b) 415). As a result of Dondin's analysis of the inscription (Dondin (1979) 655-657), the unit which Atilius Glabrio commanded cannot be precisely identified. The presence of a 'C' or 'G' before 'orum' rules out the *cohors Tyriorum* (as was earlier suggested, cf. Devijver (1976-1977) 128; Spaul (2000) 454), but, as Saddington points out, Dondin's suggestions of *Dacorum* or *Sacorum* are anachronistic, and the unit is best left unidentified (Saddington (1983) 264). The description of Glabrio's role as *praefectus fabrum* is equally difficult. The formula "praefectus fabrum delatus a consule" is paralleled by an Augustan era inscription, that of Q. Aemilius Secundus (CIL 5.136; cf. Demougin (1992) 79), and although the text is unclear (Dondin (1979) 653-654, 654 fig. 2), this reading should probably be retained, albeit with caution: in the case of Aemilius Secundus, it probably refers to a mention in an official report. Glabrio was almost certainly a native of Perusia, as another member of the family is recorded there in another

inscription (CIL 11.1923), although, as Demougin points out, the relationship between the two Atilii Glabriones cannot be established with any certainty (Demougin (1992) 79; cf. Dondin (1979) 666ff.).

Sex. Atilius Sex.f. Aemilia Serranus
Catalogues: SUO: A232a; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Suolahti (1958) 153 no. 8
Further bibliography: Ben Zeev (1998) 188
Post(s): -
Date of post(s): [49BC]
Primary evidence: Josephus, *A.J.* 14.236-240
Reason for exclusion: See the discussion of *consilia* in ch. 1.

43 Q. Atius Varus
Catalogues: SUO: C102, C128; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.246, 283, 3.29, 205-206; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE Attius 33, Varus 5
Further bibliography: Welch (1998) 88-89
Post(s): EP(PE)
Date of post(s): EP(PE) in 51BC, EP(PE) in 48BC
Primary evidence: 51BC: Caesar, *B.G.* 8.28.2; 48BC: Caesar, *B.C.* 3.37.5

44 Q. Atrius
Catalogues: SUO: C90; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.227; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 4
Post(s): NP
Date of post(s): NP in 54BC
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.G.* 5.9.1, cf. 10.2

45 P. Attius P.f. Ouf(entina)
Catalogues: SUO: A168; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.35; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** cf. RE 11
Further bibliography: Cichorius (1922) 146 no. 7; Criniti (1970) 105-106
Post(s): ?MT
Date of post(s): ?MT in 89BC
Primary evidence: Criniti (1970) 16-26 = CIL 6.37045 = CIL 1.709 = CIL 16, p.145 = ILLRP 515 = ILS 8888 = AE 1909, 30 = AE 1910, +126 = AE 1910, +153 = AE 1910, +162 = AE 1910, 207 = AE 1910, 218 = AE 1911, 126 = AE 1912, +10 = AE 1912, +117 = AE 1912, +287 = AE 1920, +130 = AE 1923, +103 = AE 2003, +831 = EDH HD019742 (Roma)
Note: See the discussion of *consilia* in ch. 1.

Q. Attius Fronto
Catalogues: SUO: C248; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 125; **RE/PIR:** PIR(2) 1356
Other reference works: Pflaum (1960-1961) 1089
Post(s): CP
Date of post(s): CP in AD13
Future career: Idiologos
Primary evidence: P.Oxy. 1188 (February 2, AD13); cf. P.Oxy. 2277 (February 16, AD13)
Reason for exclusion: This individual held a civilian position.

46 C. Attius Paelignus
Catalogues: SUO: C112; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.270; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 4
Post(s): MP(GC)
Date of post(s): MP(GC) in 49BC
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.C.* 1.18; cf. Cicero, *ad Att.* 8.4.3; Orosius 6.15.4

Auectius
Catalogues: SUO: A297; **DEV:** I31: (1976-1977) 440-441, (1987) 1593, (1993) - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** PIR(2) 1377
Other reference works: Saddington (1980) 29 no. 3
Post(s): -
Date of post(s): [11BC]

Primary evidence: Livy, *Per*. 141
Reason for exclusion: On Auectius, cf. ?Chumstinctus.

47 Aufidienus Rufus
Catalogues: SUO: C265; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 201; **RE/PIR:** PIR(2) 1378
Other reference works: Dobson (1978) 172 no. 12; Saddington (1991a) 3515 no. 2, (1996b) 247 no. 12
Post(s): IP(PCAST)
Date of post(s): IP(PCAST) in AD14
Primary evidence: Tacitus, *Ann*. 1.20

C. Aufidienus C.f. Villus
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** A193: (1976-1977) 136, (1987) - , (1993) 2016; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 717; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Segenni (1992) 47
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD42
Primary evidence: CIL 9.4396 (Foruli, Regio 4, Italia)
Relevant text: C. Aufidienus C. f. / Villus tr(ibunus) mil(itum)
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Claudian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

[- - -] Aufidi[us - - -]
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** A194: (1976-1977) 136, (1987) - , (1993) 2016; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 59; **RE/PIR:** RE 6
Post(s): IP(PCOH), MT
Date of post(s): IP(PCOH) before AD42, MT before AD42
Primary evidence: CIL 11.4183a (Interamna Nahars, Regio 6, Italia)
Relevant text: [- - -] Aufidi[o - - -] / [- - - I]IIIuir(o) i(ure) d(icundo) [- - -] / [- - - praef(ecto?) c]ohortis [- - -] / [- - -] trib(uno) mil(itum) leg(ionis) [- - -] / [- - - e]t legioni[s - - -]
Reason for exclusion: Aufidius, who was probably a *praefectus cohortis* as well as a military tribune (Devijver (1976-1977) 136; Demougin (1992) 71) is of indeterminate date. Demougin, following CIL, dates him to the early Julio-Claudian period, probably to the Augustan period (CIL 11.4183a; Demougin (1992) 71) on stylistic grounds, and on the grounds of his holding of the quattuorvirate (cf. L. Autronius T.f. Clu(stumina) Causus (CIL 11.4184); C. Licin[ius .f. ?Clu(stumina)] (CIL 11.4187); Sex. Pomponius C.f. Clu(stumina) Balbus (CIL 11.4190); L. Valerius C.f. Vibrio (CIL 11.4192); [- - -] (CIL 11.4191); [- - -] (CIL 11.4193); [- - -] (CIL 11.4194)). It is better, perhaps, to be more cautious in ascribing a date (cf. Devijver (1976-1976) 136). As his *nomen* is found frequently at Interamna Nahars, he may well have originated from the town (e.g. CIL 11.4215 = ILS 6591; cf. Demougin (1992) 72 n.3).

P. Aufidius L.f.
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** A195: (1976-1977) 136, (1987) - , (1993) 2016; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 58; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Dobson (1966) 69
Further bibliography: Duncan-Jones (1965) 243 no. 592; Devijver (1992b) 421; Demougin (1988) 823
Post(s): MT, PF
Date of post(s): MT before AD42, PF before AD42
Primary evidence: CIL 11.1217 = CIL 11.*175 (Placentia, Regio 8, Italia)
Relevant text: P. Aufidius L. f. IIIIuir IIuir / tr(ibunus) milit(um) praef(ectus) fab(rum) sibi et / L. Aufidio Cn. f. patri et / Fadienae P. f. matri et / L. Aufidio L. f. fratri IIIIuir(o) et / Saluiae Cliae fratris uxori et / Liburniae L. f. consobrinae / factum ex testamento HS X(milia) arbitratu / C. Annisidi C. f. Rufi
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Claudian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

48 T. Aufidius T.f. Ani(ensi) Balbus
Catalogues: SUO: A306; **DEV:** A196: (1976-1977) 136-137, (1987) 1452, (1993) 2017; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 130; **RE/PIR:** RE 12.1793, 1796
Other reference works: Devijver (1975) 31-32 no. 12, (1986) 118 no. 10; Saddington (1999) 311 no. 37

Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD15
Primary evidence: CIL 3.399 (Pergamum, Asia)

49 T. Aufidius T.f. Ani(ensi) Spinter
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** A199: (1976-1977) 138, (1987) 1452, (1993) 2017; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 57; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Saddington (1999) 308 no. 24
Further bibliography: Pflaum (1955-1956) 162 nos. 5-6; Devijver (1975) 31, (1986) 118; Birley (1969) 79; Le Roux (1982) 395 no. 5
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD15
Primary evidence: CIL 3.399 (Pergamum, Asia)

50 C. Auienus
Catalogues: SUO: A247; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.299; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 1
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT in 46BC
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.Afr*. 54.1-4

A. Auilius Flaccus
Catalogues: SUO: C270; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 327; **RE/PIR:** PIR(2) 1414
Post(s): SEN
Date of post(s): SEN in AD32
Future career: Praefectus Aegypti
Primary evidence: Philo, *In Flaccum* 158, cf. 1-6; Wilcken (1899) 366 no. 1372, 4-5 (August 9, AD33); CIG 4716 (Tentyra, Aegyptus); cf. CIG 4957 add. p. 1236 (Oasis Thebarum, Aegyptus)
Reason for exclusion: This individual held a senior officer position.

C. Auilius L.f. Pol(lia) Gauianus
Catalogues: SUO: A308; **DEV:** A264: (1976-1977) 163-164, (1987) - , (1993) 2026; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 12.1530
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD42
Primary evidence: CIL 5.7478; cf. AE 1994, 638 (Industria, Regio 9, Italia)
Relevant text: C. Auilio L. f. / Pol(lia) Gauiano / flamin(i) diui / Caesar(is) perpetuo / patrono municipi(i) / trib(uno) milit(um) leg(ionis) III / Gallicae / d(ecreto) d(ecurionum) / quo honore contentus / impensam remissit(!)
Reason for exclusion: As Duthoy argues, the title *flamen diui Caesaris perpetuo* cannot be used to date this inscription (Duthoy (1984-1986) 139); Julius Caesar is generally referred to as *diuus Iulius*, not *diuus Caesar* (RE 6.2492; cf. CIL 5.1812). The formula "honore contentus, impensam remissit", and the presence and prominence of the legion's cognomen, might suggest a later, even a second-century AD, date, as Devijver argues (Devijver (1976-1977) 163); if so, then Auilius served in Syria. On the basis of his voting tribe, Auilius was probably a native of Industria (cf. CIL 5(2) pp.845-848), and, as a *patronus*, was clearly a prominent local figure - another copy of this inscription is also known (AE 1994, 638); an earlier C. Auilius is known from the town (CIL 5.7479: C. Auilius Optatus, IIIIuir).

51 Sex. Aulienus Sex.f. Ani(ensi)
Catalogues: SUO: A307, C266, C267, C268, C269; **DEV:** A201: (1976-1977) 139, (1987) 1452-1453, (1993) 2018; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 311; **RE/PIR:** PIR(2) 1422
Other reference works: Dobson (1966) 73, 81, (1978) 165 no.5; Saddington (1980) 32 no. 27, (1985) 530 no. 15, (1987) 273 no. 45, (1988a) 309 no. 35, (1996b) 247 no. 9, (1999) 307 no. 17
Further bibliography: Saddington (1996a) 167
Post(s): CENT(PP), MT, IP(PLA), IP(PCAST), NP(PC), PF
Date of post(s): CENT(PP) before AD15, MT before AD15, IP(PLA) before AD15, IP(PCAST) before AD15, NP(PC) before AD15, PF before AD15
Primary evidence: CIL 10.4868 = ILS 2688 (Venafrum, Regio 1, Italia)

P. Aurarius P.f. Pol(lia) Crass[us]
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** A202 bis: (1976-1977) 140, (1987) 1453, (1993) 2018; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 137; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Rebbechi (1975) 216-219
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD42
Primary evidence: AE 1975, 394 = AE 2003, +654-660 = Pellegrini and Pulini (2002) no. 2 = EDH HD007114 (Mutina, Regio 8, Italia)
Relevant text: P. Aurarius P. f. Pol(lia) Crass[us] / tr(ibunus) mil(itum) VIuir aid(ilis)
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Claudian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

52 L. Aurelius Sex.f.
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** A203: (1976-1977) 140, (1987) 1453, (1993) 2018; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 138; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Torelli (1975) 188 n.1
Post(s): PF, MT(AP)
Date of post(s): PF before AD15, MT(AP) before AD15
Primary evidence: AE 1969-1970, 188 (Tarquinia, Regio 7, Italia)

53 M. Aureli(us) M.f. Vol(tinia) (?Scaurus)
Catalogues: SUO: A169; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.35; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 216
Further bibliography: Cichorius (1922) 149 no. 13; Criniti (1970) 111-112
Post(s): ?MT
Date of post(s): ?MT in 89BC
Future career: ?Quaestor 70BC
Primary evidence: Criniti (1970) 16-26 = CIL 6.37045 = CIL 1.709 = CIL 16, p.145 = ILLRP 515 = ILS 8888 = AE 1909, 30 = AE 1910, +126 = AE 1910, +153 = AE 1910, +162 = AE 1910, 207 = AE 1910, 218 = AE 1911, 126 = AE 1912, +10 = AE 1912, +117 = AE 1912, +287 = AE 1920, +130 = AE 1923, +103 = AE 2003, +831 = EDH HD019742 (Roma)
Note: See the discussion of *consilia* in ch. 1.

[- - - ?Aus]picatus
Catalogues: SUO: A361, C335, C336; **DEV:** A283: (1976-1977) 171, (1987) 1467, (1993) 2028-2029; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 413; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Devijver (1986) 173 no. 11
Further bibliography: Robinson (1926) 225
Post(s): MT, PF, ?EP(PE)
Date of post(s): MT before AD42, PF before AD42, ?EP(PE) before AD42
Primary evidence: AE 1927, 172 = Demougin (1992) 339 (Antiocha, Pisidia)
Relevant text: [- - - ?Aus]/picato IIui[r(o) quinq(uennali)] / aug(uri) trib(uno) mil(itum) [leg(ionis) X] / Fretensis pr[aef(ecto) fa]/brum II praef(ecto) [equit(um)] / praef(ecto) Corn[eli Sullae] / Felicis gener[i Germa]/[n]ici Caesar[is IIuiri] / [?co]hortis [- - -]
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Claudian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

L. Autronius T.f. Clu(stumina) Causus
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** A262: (1976-1977) 163, (1987) 1464, (1993) 2026; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 60; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD42
Primary evidence: CIL 11.4184 (Interamna Nahars, Regio 6, Italia)
Relevant text: L. Autronius / T. f. Clu(stumina) Causus / tr(ibunus) mil(itum) IIIIuir / i(ure) d(icundo)
Reason for exclusion: Dated by Demougin to the Augustan period on stylistic grounds, and on the grounds of his holding of the quattuorvirate (Demougin (1992) 72), like a number of military tribunes from Interamna Nahars (for a full list, see [- - -] Aufidi[us - - -] (CIL 11.4183a)), it is perhaps best to be more circumspect in ascribing a date (cf. Devijver (1976-1977) 163). Given his voting tribe, Autronius was probably a native of Interamna Nahars, although Autronii are also found in Etruria (Devijver (1976-1977) 163; Forni (1982a) 37; Demougin (1992) 72).

[.] Baebius P.f.
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** B6: (1976-1977) 174-175, (1987) 1470, (1993) 2023; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 139; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Maxfield (1981) 216
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD42
Primary evidence: CIL 5.1882 = IR.Concor 60 (Concordia, Regio 10, Italia)
Relevant text: C. Baebius P. f. Cla(udia) / P. Baebius P. f. Cla(udia) / P. Baebius P. f. Cla(udia) / leg(ionis) XIII Geminai(!) eques / armill[is - - -] // Pedania L. f. / Secunda / mater // [.] Baebius P. f. / pater honorib(us) / ussus(!) [t]r(ibunus) mil(itum)
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Claudian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

54 C. Baebius T.f. Clu(stumina)
Catalogues: SUO: A266, C210; **DEV:** B4: (1976-1977) 173-174, (1987) 1469, (1993) 2031-2032; **BRO:** 2.423; **DEM:** 37; **RE/PIR:** RE 12
Other reference works: Saddington (1980) 269 no 3, (1988a) 308 no. 31, (1999) 306 no. 8
Further bibliography: Schmitthenner (1958) 120; Bollini (1975) 341-345; Le Roux (1982) 59 no. 197
Post(s): MT, MP(GC)
Date of post(s): MT before 31BC, MP(GC) in 31BC
Primary evidence: CIL 11.623 = ILS 2672 = AE 1978, 335 = EDH HD005009 (Forum Liuii, Regio 8, Italia)
Relevant text: C. Baebius T. f. Clu(stumina) / tr(ibunus) mi[l(itum) leg(ionis ?X]XX praef(ectus) / ora[e marit(imae) Hi]span(iae) / citer[(ioris) Galliae b *aut* ioris b]ello / Actiensi IIIIuir i(ure) d(icundo) / arb(itratu) M. Sappini L. f. et Gallae l(ibertae)
Note: A military tribune in, (probably) Legio XX (the tentative suggestion in Bollini ((1975) 341) that this might be read as Legio XXX should almost certainly be rejected as there is not enough space on the line, cf. Le Roux (1982) 59 no. 197, Demougin (1992) 51), Baebius was assigned to the command of the coast of Hispania Citerior during the Actium campaign, serving under either Ap. Claudius Pulcher or Caluisius Sabinus, who were in charge of the province (cf. Schmitthenner (1958) 120). It is interesting to note that this position is also found in AD68-69, where Q. Pomponius Rufus held the position recorded as "praef(ectus) orae marit(imae) Hispan(iae) Citer(ioris) Gallia[e] N[a]rbon(ensis) bello qu[od Imp(erator)] Galba p[ro r(e) p(ublica)?] gessit" (CIL 8.13 = IRT 537 = ILS 1014 = AE 1948, 3 = AE 1952, +104 = AE 1962, 34 = EDH HD019665 (Lepcis Magna, Tripolitania); cf. Bollini (1975) 343; Devijver (1987) 1469), although this inscription should probably not be taken as proof that Baebius was also responsible for the coast of Narbonnese Gaul (Bollini's restoration suggesting this is uncertain, cf. Bollini (1975) 343-344). As Barbieri suggests, this post should be seen as an extraordinary post in a time of civil war, rather than a regular position, although similar posts were occasionally assigned in more peaceful times in order to combat banditry (Barbieri (1941) 274-278). Given his family name and voting tribe, he was probably from Umbria, although not from Forum Liuii (cf. Demougin (1992) 51).

55 P. Baebius P.fil. Pobl(ilia) Tuticanus
Catalogues: SUO: A309, C271; **DEV:** B13: (1976-1977) 177, (1987) 1472, (1993) 2034; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 140; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Pflaum (1960-1961) 130; Nicolet (1967) 33-34 no. 2; Sasel (1974) 470 no. 3; Holder (1980) 242 no. E7
Post(s): MT(AP), EP(PE)
Date of post(s): MT(AP) before AD15, EP(PE) before AD15
Future career: Pro legato
Primary evidence: CIL 5.3334 = ILS 2677 (Arusnates, Regio 10, Italia)

M. Bennius M.f. Rufus
Catalogues: SUO: C272; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 141; **RE/PIR:** PIR 90; PIR(2) 107
Other reference works: Pflaum (1960-1961) 1092
Post(s): CP
Date of post(s): CP before AD15
Future career: Procurator
Primary evidence: CIL 10.1684 = ILS 1375 (Puteoli, Regio 1, Italia); cf. CIL 10.3713 (Cumae,

Regio 1, Italia)
Reason for exclusion: This individual held a civilian position.

56 L. Blatius L.f. Serg(ia) Ventinus
Catalogues: SUO: A310; **DEV:** B25: (1976-1977) 183-184, (1987) 1474, (1993) 2036; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 72; **RE/PIR:** 12.1570, 1687
Further bibliography: Garcia y Bellido (1961) 123; Castillo Garcia (1965) 42 no. 73; Roldán Hervás (1974b) 199, 320 no. 777; Le Roux (1982) 305 no.2; Campos and González (1987) 145; Curchin (1990) 147-148 no. 105; González Fernández (1992) 36-37
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before 15BC
Primary evidence: CIL 2.1176 = Vives (1971-1972) no. 6039 = Fernández (1992) 2.1.20 = Campos and González (1987) 145-146 no.4 (Hispalis, Baetica, Hispania)

Boiocalus
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** PIR(2) 140
Other reference works: Saddington (1980) 30 no. 13
Post(s): -
Date of post(s): [before AD69]
Primary evidence: Tacitus, *Ann*. 13.55
Reason for exclusion: This individual was not a Roman citizen, and therefore should not be considered to be a junior officer.

L. Bouius L.f. L.n. Fal(erna) Celer
Catalogues: SUO: A311, C273, C274; **DEV:** B27: (1976-1977) 184, (1987) - , (1993) - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 12.1514; PIR(2) 149
Other reference works: Pflaum (1960-1961) 126-128 no. 55; Devijver (1975) 40 no. 26
Post(s): PF, MT
Date of post(s): PF circa AD81, MT circa AD81
Future career: Procurator
Primary evidence: CIL 10.1685 = ILS 1397; cf. CIL 10.1686 (Puteoli, Regio 1, Italia)
Relevant text: CIL 10.1685: L. Bouius L. f. L. n. Fal(erna) Celer / IIuir q(uin)q(uennalis) augur / praef(ectus) fabr(um) trib(unus) milit(um) leg(ionis) III Cyr(enaicae) / procur(ator) ludi famil(iae) glad(iatorum) Caesaris / Alexandreae ad Aegyptum adlectus / inter selectos ab Imp(eratore) Caes(are) Aug(usto) / sibi et / Sextiae L. f. Nerulae uxori / optimae cum qua a pueritia / sine offensa uixit annis XXXI
Reason for exclusion: This inscription is dated to the Domitiantic period by Pflaum on the basis of the double filiation and the presence of a legionary cognomen. The use of the phrase "Imp(eratore) Caes(are) Aug(usto)" does not, Pflaum argues, refer to Augustus himself, but to an emperor who suffered *damnatio memoriae* (Pflaum (1960-1961) 126-128; cf. D'Arms (1974) 122; Demougin (1975) 147-148 no. 5; Devijver (1975) 40. For other examples of the use of "Imp. Augustus" as a circumlocution, see T. Clodius C.[f. ?C.n.] Pro[culus]; CIL 3.10224; CIL 14.3612; AE 1950, 66). Given the name of his tribe, Bouius probably originated from Puteoli (D'Arms (1974) 122; Demougin (1975) 147 no. 5), and the order of his posts suggests that he pursued a municipal career before becoming *praefectus fabrum*, a military tribune in Legio III Cyrenaica (then based in Egypt, possibly as a *sexagenarius* (Pflaum (1960-1961) 126)), then a procurator in Egypt, and finally one of the *iudices selecti* in Rome. He is also known from two inscriptions commemorating the deaths of his wife (CIL 10.1685) and eight-year-old daughter (CIL 10.1686).

L. Brutt[ienus L.f.] (1)
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** B28: (1976-1977) 184-185, (1987) - , (1993) 2037; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 349; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD42
Primary evidence: CIL 11.4120 (Narnia, Regio 6, Italia)
Relevant text: L. Brutt[ieno L. f.] / pontif(ici) t[r(ibuno) mil(itum)] / L. Bruttie[nus L. f.] / tr(ibunus) mil(itum) [- - -]
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Claudian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

L. Bruttie[nus L.f.] (2)
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** B29: (1976-1977) 185, (1987) - , (1993) 2037; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 350; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD42
Primary evidence: CIL 11.4120 (Narnia, Regio 6, Italia)
Relevant text: L. Brutt[ieno L. f.] / pontif(ici) t[r(ibuno) mil(itum)] / L. Bruttie[nus L. f.] / tr(ibunus) mil(itum) [- - -]
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Claudian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

L. Caecilius L.f.
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Devijver (1976-1993) 1479; Calbi (1981) 252-257; Saddington (1996a) 161-162
Post(s): -
Date of post(s): [before 31BC]
Primary evidence: CIL 11.6940 = NS 1899, 124 = AE 1983, 420 (Placentia, Regio 8, Italia)
Relevant text: L. Caecilius L. f. / Flaccus pater / q(uaestor) tr(ibunus) <?milit(um)> aug(ur) curator / aedis Iouis faciund(ae) // Petronia C. f. / mater // L. Caecilius L. f. / Flaccus fra(ter) / IIIIuir i(ure) d(icundo) / aug(ur) // Q. Caecilius / L. f. decur(io) / {a populo / } aug(ur) tr(ibunus) milit(um) < / a populo > / praef(ectus) fa[b]r(um) / III fieri iu[ssit]
Reason for exclusion: On L. Caecilius L.f., see Q. Caecilius L.f.

57 Q. Caecilius L.f.
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** C5: (1976-1977) 190, (1987) 1477, (1993) 2039; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 142; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Nicolet (1967) 46-47 no. 29; Saddington (1985) 531 no. 24
Further bibliography: Calbi (1981) 252-257; Saddington (1996a) 161-162
Post(s): MT|MT(AP), PF
Date of post(s): MT|MT(AP) before AD15, PF before AD15
Primary evidence: CIL 11.6940 = NS 1899, 124 = AE 1983, 420 (Placentia, Regio 8, Italia)
Relevant text: L. Caecilius L. f. / Flaccus pater / q(uaestor) tr(ibunus) <?milit(um)> aug(ur) curator / aedis Iouis faciund(ae) // Petronia C. f. / mater // L. Caecilius L. f. / Flaccus fra(ter) / IIIIuir i(ure) d(icundo) / aug(ur) // Q. Caecilius / L. f. decur(io) / {a populo / } aug(ur) tr(ibunus) milit(um) < / a populo > / praef(ectus) fa[b]r(um) / III fieri iu[ssit]
Note: This inscription, commemorating a family of considerable status in Placentia (cf. Demougin (1992) 140), and part of a rotunda-shaped monument similar in form to the mausoleum of Augustus (cf. Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 88), is highly controversial. The final part of the inscription reads as follows: "Q. Caecilius / L. f. decur(io) / a populo / aug(ur) tr(ibunus) milit(um) / praef(ectus) fa[b]r(um)..." (cf. the image at Calbi (1981) 252). It has long been argued that this was a mistake by the stonecutter for "Q. Caecilius / L.f. decur(io) / aug(ur) tr(ibunus) milit(um) / a populo / praef(ectus) fa[b]r(um)...", as the phrase "decurio a populo" is otherwise unattested (cf. Gatti, NS 1899, 124; Nicolet (1967) 46-47; Devijver (1976-1977) 190; Demougin (1992) 139-140). Calbi, however, has argued that the original reading should stand (Calbi (1981) 256-257; cf. Saddington (1996a) 161-162), pointing out that it would be strange for such an obvious error to have stood uncorrected. Instead, Calbi points to the fact that the father appears to have held his local magistracies before the city was refounded as a veteran colony in the Augustan period (cf. Keppie (1983) 17, 22, 86), and the two brothers held theirs afterwards: he argues that the phrase "decurio a populo" was used to emphasise that Q. Caecilius was elected with the support of all citizens, not just the new colonists (Calbi (1981) 257; cf. Saddington (1996a) 162). Without further attestation of the phrase "decurio a populo", the reconstructed form of the inscription should probably be accepted; that a member of such a high-status family should become *tribunus militum a populo* would hardly be surprising, and is consistent with the high municipal status of many others who held the post. If so, then Q. Caecilius was *tribunus militum a populo*, and three times *praefectus fabrum*, during the Augustan period, probably, given the fact that Placentia was a veteran colony, during the first half of Augustus' reign. Saddington's suggestion ((1996a) 162) that his equestrian posts are given in inverse order should probably be rejected: while the position of *praefectus fabrum* does often precede the military tribunate in the Augustan period, it would be far more unusual to find an equestrian cursus in inverse order in this period. Calbi suggests ((1981) 254; also accepted by Saddington ((1996a) 162); cf. Devijver

(1976-1993) 1479) that the stonecutter did make one mistake on the inscription, and that Q. Caecilius' father, L. Caecilius, also held a military tribunate between his quaestorship and his augurate. If so, then, as his son was probably a *tribunus militum a populo*, he would have been *tribunus militum* in the Triumviral period. However, while it would not be unprecedented for a municipal career to be interrupted in this way (cf. L. Firmius L.f. (CIL 10.5713)), this is sufficiently rare to make it unlikely that Calbi is correct.

58 Q. Caecilius Q.f. A[nien(si)] (1)
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 52; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before 20BC
Future career: XXVIuir
Primary evidence: AE 1967, 55 = EDH HD014068 (Tellenae, Regio 1, Italia)
Relevant text: Q. Caecilio Q. f. A[nien(si)] / tr(ibuno) mil(itum) XXVI uiru[m] / Q. Caecilio Q. / f. / An[ien(si)] / praef(ecto) fabr(um)
Note: This inscription commemorates two junior officers, both with the name Q. Caecilius. The former, as he was a *XXVIuir*, can be dated to the period before 20BC (de Rossi (1967) 148; cf. fig. 354; Demougin (1992) 64), while the latter, possibly a cousin or a younger brother who adopted his elder brother's praenomen when the former died, is presumably of similar date. Given that the former appears to have been of senatorial rank, it has been suggested that the two individuals were members of the family of Q. Caecilius Metellus (cos. 57), but this is only speculation (de Rossi (1967) 148; Demougin (1992) 64).

59 Q. Caecilius Q.f. An[ien(si)] (2)
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 52; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before 20BC
Future career: XXVIuir
Primary evidence: AE 1967, 55 (Tellenae, Regio 1, Italia)
Note: On Q. Caecilius Q.f. An[ien(si)] (2), see Q. Caecilius Q.f. A[nien(si)] (1) (AE 1967, 55).

60 Q. Caecilius Q.f. Atticus
Catalogues: SUO: A268; **DEV:** C8: (1976-1977) 192, (1987) 1478, (1993) 2040; **BRO:** 3.35; **DEM:** 39; **RE/PIR:** RE 12.1829
Other reference works: Saddington (1999) 305 no. 4
Further bibliography: Keppie (1983) 26-27, 28, 176-177; Büjükkolanci and Engelmann (1991) 142 no. 8
Post(s): ?MP, MT
Date of post(s): ?MP before 44BC, MT before 29BC
Primary evidence: CIL 11.4650 = ILS 2230; CIL 11.4651; cf. CIL 11.4652-5653 (Tuder, Regio 6, Italia); Büjükkolanci and Engelmann (1991) 142 no. 8 = BE 1992, 409 (Ephesus, Asia)

61 L. Caecilius L.f. Flaccus
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** C13 bis; (1976-1977) - , (1987) 1479, (1993) - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): ?MT
Date of post(s): ?MT before AD15
Primary evidence: CIL 11.6940 = NS 1899 124 = AE 1983, 420 (Placentia, Regio 8, Italia)
Note: On L. Caecilius L.f. Flaccus, cf. Q. Caecilius L.f. (CIL 11.6940).

L. Caecilius L.f. Metellus
Catalogues: SUO: A203; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 75
Further bibliography: Prag (2007) 84-85
Post(s): -
Date of post(s): [circa 70BC]
Future career: Tribunus plebis 49BC
Primary evidence: Cicero, *Verr*. 2.3.159; CIL 10.7258 = CIL 1.843 = ILLRP 446 (Eryx, Sicilia); CIG 5501 = IG 14.282 (Sicilia)
Relevant text: Cicero: Nam quod scribit Metelli filium puerum esse, uehementer errat; non enim ad omnis praetorum filios idem aditus sunt. O Timarchide, Metelli est filius in prouincia non puer,

sed adulescens pudens ac bonus, dignus illo loco ac nomine; uester iste puer praetextatus in prouincia quem ad modum fuisset non dicerem si pueri esse illam culpam ac non patris existimarem. Tune, cum te ac tuam uitam nosses, in Siciliam tecum grandem praetextatum filium ducebas, ut, etiamsi natura puerum a paternis uitiis atque a generis similitudine abduceret, consuetudo tamen eum et disciplina degenerare non sineret?; CIL 10.7258: [- - -] / [q(uaestor)] pro pr(aetore) / [mi]litesque in monte / Eruco fecerunt / tr(ibunus) mil(itum) [- - -]eus Pr[- - -]; CIG 5501: Τῇ πιτάνῃ Λευκίου / Λευκίου υἱοῦ Μετέλλου κρατοῦντος / Παίων Δεκίου Εὐρίων[ο]/ς Ἐγεσταῖος χιλιαρχήσας
Reason for exclusion: Both of these inscriptions name individuals who were probably not military tribunes in Roman legions, but the commanders of native Scilian units who took the title "tribunus militum", possibly as a translation of the term χιλίαρχος (cf. CIL 10.7258 adnot.). There is no evidence from either inscription that L. Caecilius Metellus, the son of the praetor L. Caecilius Metellus, was a military tribune in Sicily, despite Suolahti's suggestion (cf. Suolahti (1955) 349).

62 Q. Caecilius Metellus Celer
Catalogues: SUO: A190; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.87, 3.37; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 86
Post(s): MT|MP|SEN
Date of post(s): MT|MP|SEN in 78BC
Future career: Consul 60BC
Primary evidence: Sallust, *Hist*. 1.135M
Relevant text: iussu Metelli Celeris cornicines occanuere tubis
Note: No title is given for Metellus Celer in this passage, and he may have been a quaestor at the time of this episode (cf. Maurenbrecher (1893) 53). However, as Broughton suggests, it is more likely that he had not yet held senatorial office, and he was probably either a military tribune or a military prefect ((1951-1986) 3.37; cf. RE Caecilius 83).

63 L. Caedicius
Catalogues: SUO: C240; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 116; **RE/PIR:** RE 4; PIR(2) 113
Other reference works: Saddington (1996b) 246 no. 5
Post(s): IP(PCAST)
Date of post(s): IP(PCAST) in AD9
Primary evidence: Velleius 2.120.4; Frontinus, *Strat*. 4.7.8
Note: On L. Caedicius, who should probably be viewed as a *praefectus castrorum* and not as a *primipilus* (cf. Dobson (1978) 129), see L. Eggius (Velleius, 2.119.4).

64 P. Caelius
Catalogues: SUO: C63; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.51; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 13
Further bibliography: Tibiletti (1953) 76
Post(s): MP(GC)
Date of post(s): MP(GC) in 87BC
Primary evidence: Valerius Maximus 4.7.5

65 Q. Caerellius M.f. Qui(rina)
Catalogues: SUO: A269; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.468, 481; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 2; PIR(2) 155
Other reference works: Saddington (1999) 306 no. 7
Further bibliography: Wiseman (1971) 219 no. 81
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before 31BC
Future career: Praetor
Primary evidence: CIL 6.1364 = ILS 943 (Rome)

Sex. Caesius
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 3.45; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 13
Further bibliography: Marshall (1975) 148
Post(s): CP
Date of post(s): CP in 62BC
Primary evidence: Cicero, *Flacc*. 68
Relevant text: Apameae manifesto comprehensum ante pedes praetoris in foro expensum est auri pondo c paulo minus per Sex. Caesium, equitem Romanum, castissimum hominem atque integerrimum, Laodiceae xx pondo paulo amplius per hunc L. Peducaeum, iudicem nostrum,

Adramytii <c> per Cn. Domitium legatum, Pergami non multum.
Reason for exclusion: One of those responsible for accounting for the Jewish gold which Flaccus was accused of stealing. While Caesius may well have been a prefect of some kind, there is no evidence that he was a junior officer; cf. L. Peducaeus.

66 M. Caesius Scaeua
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** S93: (1976-1977) 768, (1987) - , (1993) - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): CENT(PP), EP(PE)
Date of post(s): CENT(PP) before 44BC, EP(PE) before 44BC
Primary evidence: CIL 10.6011 = CIL 1.1569 = ILS 2490 = ILLRP 498 (Minturnae, Regio 1, Italia); Caesar, *B.C.* 3.53.3-5; Valerius Maximus 3.2.23
Relevant text: CIL 10.6011: Q. Anchari(us) / C. f. Pol(lia) / Narbone(n)s(is) eques / euocatus annor(um) / nat(us) XXIII ala / Scaeuae; Caesar, *B.C.* 3.53.3-5: sed in castello nemo fuit omnino militum quin uulneraretur, quattuorque ex una cohorte centuriones oculos amiserunt. et cum laboris sui periculique testimonium adferre uellent, milia sagittarum circiter XXX in castellum coniecta Caesari renumerauerunt, scutoque ad eum relato Scaeuae centurionis inuenta sunt in eo foramina CXX. quem Caesar, ut erat de se meritus et de re publica, donatum milibus CC . . . atque ab octauis ordinibus ad primum pilum se traducere pronuntiauit - eius enim ope castellum magna ex parte conseruatum esse constabat - cohortemque postea duplici stipendio, frumento, ueste, cibariis militaribusque donis amplissime donauit.; Valerius Maximus 3.2.23: classicam Acilii gloriam terrestri laude M. Caesius Scaeua eiusdem imperatoris centurio subsecutus est: cum pro castello enim, cui praepositus erat, dimicaret, Gnaeique Pompei praefectus Iustuleius summo studio et magno militum numero ad id eum capiendum niteretur, omnes, qui propius accesserant, interemit ac sine ullo regressu pedis pugnans super ingentem stragem, quam ipse fecerat, conruit. cuius capite, umero, femine saucio, oculo eruto, scutum C et XX ictibus perfossum apparuit.
Note: As Ancharius served in an *ala Scaeuae*, it is likely that his unit was commanded at some time by a man named Scaeua. This Scaeua has often been linked with M. Caesius Scaeua (Caesar, *B.C.* 3.53; Valerius Maximus 3.2.23; cf. ILS 2490 adnot.; Mommsen (1884) 142; Cheesman (1914) 24; Devijver (1976-1977) 768; Saddington (1980) 28; Keppie (1983) 142; Spaul (1994) 20), a centurion under Caesar who was rewarded with a promotion to *primipilus* after Dyrrachium (cf. Birley (1978) 257; Dobson (1978) 4; Maxfield (1981) 236). While there is no direct evidence that M. Caesius Scaeua was a junior officer, we should probably assume that he was later promoted again to *praefectus equitum*, even though, as Birley points out, it is not the case that all early cavalry *alae* were commanded by *primipilares* (Birley (1978) 257; cf. von Domaszewski (1908) 122ff.). As Keppie and Spaul suggest (Keppie (1983) 142; Spaul (1994) 20), it is likely that Ancharius predates Actium, and probable that his recall to the standards took place soon after Caesar's death: while the cognomen Scaeua was not uncommon, it seems unlikely that there were two notable Scaeuae at the time, and that, therefore, this M. Caesius Scaeua went on to command the *ala Scaeuae*.

Cn. Calpurnius Piso
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** PIR(2) 287
Other reference works: Saddington (1999) 299, 306 no. 12
Further bibliography: Seager (1972) 15; Levick (1976) 20
Post(s): -
Date of post(s): [26BC], [25BC]
Future career: Consul 7BC
Primary evidence: Tacitus, *Ann.* 3.16
Relevant text: per quinque et quadraginta annorum obsequium, per collegium consulatus quondam diuo Augusto parenti tuo probatus et tibi amicus nec quicquam post haec rogaturus salutem infelicis filii rogo
Reason for exclusion: Tiberius and Piso may have been consuls together, but there is no evdience to support Saddington's suggestion that Piso was a military tribune at the same time as Tiberius (cf. Saddington (1999) 299, 306 no. 12).

C. Caluisius Sabinus
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** PIR(2) 338
Other reference works: Saddington (1988a) 306 no. 4
Post(s): SEN|NP

Date of post(s): SEN|NP in 38BC
Primary evidence: Appian, *B.C.* 5.80-81
Relevant text: Μηνόδωρόν τε ἐλθόντα ἐλεύθερον εὐθὺς ἀπέφηνεν ἐξ ἀπελευθέρου καὶ ὧν αὐτὸς ἦγαγε νεῶν, ἐπέτρεπεν ἡγεῖσθαι, ὑποστρατηγοῦντα τῷ ναυάρχῳ Καλουισίῳ
Reason for exclusion: As Pompeius Medodorus' superior officer, Caluisius Sabinus should not be considered as a junior officer.

67 Sex. Campatius M.f. M.n.
Catalogues: SUO: A312, C275; **DEV:** - : (1976-1977) 220, (1987) - , (1993) - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** PIR(2) 377
Further bibliography: Syme (1964a) 114; Torelli (1969) 320; Wiseman (1971) 162
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD15
Future career: XXuir
Primary evidence: CIL 11.3610-3611 (Caere, Regio 7, Italia)

P. Caninius Co[r.] Alexiadae f. Agrippa
Catalogues: SUO: C276; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 494; **RE/PIR:** PIR(2) 387
Other reference works: Pflaum (1960-1961) 1070
Post(s): CP
Date of post(s): CP after AD41
Future career: Procurator
Primary evidence: AE 1919, 5 = Corinth 8.2.65; AE 1919, 6 = Corinth 8.2.66 (Corinthus, Achaia); cf. AE 1934, 163 (Pellene, Achaia)
Reason for exclusion: This individual held a civilian position.

68 D. Carfulenus
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 3.50; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 1
Further bibliography: Syme (1939) 132
Post(s): MP
Date of post(s): MP in 47BC
Future career: Tribunus plebis 44BC
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.Alex.* 31; cf. Cicero, *ad Fam.* 10.33.4, *ad Att.* 15.4.1; Appian, *B.C.* 3.66-69

P. Carisius
Catalogues: SUO: C192; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.404, 3.35; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 1
Other reference works: Saddington (1988a) 307 no. 18
Post(s): SEN|LEG|NP
Date of post(s): SEN|LEG|NP in 36BC
Future career: ?Legatus pro praetore
Primary evidence: Appian, *B.C.* 5.111
Relevant text: καὶ τὸ μὲν δεξιὸν ἐπέτρεπε Τιτινίῳ, τὸ δὲ λαιὸν Καρισίῳ
Reason for exclusion: Given the rank held by Titinius, that of legate (cf. Broughton (1951-1986) 2.404), as well as the senior positions held by the freedmen under Sextus Pompeius (cf. Cn. Pompeius Menecrates), it is likely that Carisius was a legate or a senior officer, although it is possible that he should be regarded as a junior naval officer.

69 C. Caristanius C.f. Ser(gia) Fronto Caesianus Iulius
Catalogues: SUO: A287, C220, C221, C222; **DEV:** C81: (1976-1977) 225, (1987) 1488, (1993) 2049; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 118; **RE/PIR:** RE 12.1708; PIR(2) 425
Other reference works: Pflaum (1960-1961) A(8); Holder (1980) 243 no. E8; Saddington (1980) 29 no. 6, (1985) 530 no. 9; Devijver (1986) 174 no. 14
Further bibliography: Cheesman (1913) 253-255; Spaul (2000) 343; Christol et al. (2001) 8-9; Saddington (1996a) 166
Post(s): PF, MT, IP(PCOH)
Date of post(s): PF before AD3, MT after AD9, IP(PCOH) after AD9
Primary evidence: AE 2001, 1918 = AE 2003, +1014; AE 1913, 235 = AE 1922, +78 = AE 1922, +79 = AE 2001, 1919 = ILS 9502; cf. AE 1914, 260 = AE 1922, +79 = AE 1930, +127 = AE 2001, 1920 = ILS 9503 (Antiocha, Pisidia)

[- - -]f. Ser(gia) Cascellius
Catalogues: SUO: A313; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** PIR(2) 457
Further bibliography: Pflaum (1963) 234; Rickman (1980) 213, 215; Wiseman (1971) 222 no. 106
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD55
Future career: Proconsul
Primary evidence: CIL 9.3666 (Marruuium, Regio 4, Italia)
Relevant text: [- - -] f. Ser(gia) Cascellius / [proco(n)s(ul) p]rouinc(iae) Siciliae / [praef(ecus) fru]menti dandi pr(aetor) / [- - - qu]aest(or) tr(ibunus) mil(itum) leg(ionis) VIII / [?Aug(ustae) II]IIuir uiarum cur(andarum) / [quinq(uennalis) I]I delat(u) dec(urionum) et populi
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Neronian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

70 L. Cassius
Catalogues: SUO: C129; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.283; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 14
Post(s): NP
Date of post(s): NP in 48BC
Primary evidence: Suetonius, *Iul*. 63; cf. Dio 42.6.2; Appian, *B.C*. 2.88, 111

Cassius Barba
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 3.51; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): ?MP
Date of post(s): ?MP in 45BC
Primary evidence: Cicero *ad Att*. 13.52.1, cf. *Phil*. 13.3
Relevant text: sane sum commotus quid futurum esset postridie; ac mihi Barba Cassius subuenit, custodes dedit. castra in agro, uilla defensa est
Reason for exclusion: Possibly an officer in Caesar's bodyguard, no title is preserved for Cassius Barba. He may have been the son of a legate (cf. Broughton (1951-1986) 3.51).

71 L. Cassius L.f. Corneo[lus]
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Buonapare and Eck (1994) 198, 713-714; Bandelli (2000) 152
Post(s): CENT(PP), MT, IP(PCAST)lPF
Date of post(s): CENT(PP) before AD15, MT before AD15, IP(PCAST)lPF before AD15
Primary evidence: CIL 5.8845 = AE 1985, 460 = AE 1994, 713 = AE 2000, +251 (Arusnates, Regio 10, Italia)

C. Cassius Longinus
Catalogues: SUO: C113, C130; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.270, 3.51; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 59
Post(s): SENlLEG
Date of post(s): SENlLEG in 49BC, SEN in 48BC
Future career: Praetor 44BC
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.C*. 3.5.3; cf. Auct. Vir. Ill. 83.5
Reason for exclusion: This individual held a senior officer position.

72 L. Cassius (?Longinus)
Catalogues: SUO: A204; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.133, 3.50; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 13
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT in 69BC
Future career: ?Praetor 66BC
Primary evidence: Cicero, *Verr*. 1.30
Relevant text: M. Crepereius ex acerrima illa equestri familia et disciplina, L. Cassius ex familia cum ad ceteras res tum ad iudicandum seuerissima, Cn. Tremellius, homo summa religione et diligentia, tres hi homines ueteres tribuni militares sunt designati; ex Kalendis Ianuariis non iudicabunt.
Note: Possibly to be associated with the praetor of 66BC, in which case he was probably already a senator in 70BC (cf. Broughton (1951-1986) 3.50), L. Cassius was one of the jurors at the trial of Verres; cf. M. Crepereius.

73 A. Castricius Myriotalenti f.
Catalogues: SUO: A284, C217; **DEV:** C99: (1976-1977) 232, (1987) 1491, (1993) 2052; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 53; **RE/PIR:** RE 9, cf. 2; PIR(2) 541, cf. 540
Other reference works: Pflaum (1960-1961) 29 no. 1; Holder (1980) 243 no. E9; Saddington (1980) 31 no. 18, (1987) 270 no. 4, (1988) 309 no. 32
Further bibliography: Syme (1939) 367 n.2; De Laet (1941) 99 no. 452; Stockton (1965) 27; Wiseman (1971) 222-223 no. 12, (1985) 196
Post(s): MT, EP(PE), NP(PC)
Date of post(s): MT before 20BC, EP(PE) before 20BC, NP(PC) before 20BC
Future career: XXVIuir
Primary evidence: CIL 14.2105 = ILS 2676 (Lanuuium, Regio 1, Italia); cf. Suetonius, *Aug*. 56

74 C. Castricius T.f. Caluus
Catalogues: SUO: A314; **DEV:** C100: (1976-1977) 233, (1987) 1491, (1993) 2053; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 143; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Donati (1982) 302, (1996) 199-202; Sabbatini (1983) 41-49; Cenerini (1992) 43
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD15
Primary evidence: CIL 11.600 = AE 1983, 413 = AE 1984, 402 = AE 1996, 665 (Forum Liuii, Regio 8, Italia)
Relevant text: C. Castricius T. f. Caluus trib(unus) [mil(itum) leg(ionis) - - -] / beneuolus Stellatina [agri]cola bonoru[m libertorum patronus] / maxsimeque eorum qui agros bene [et strenue colant qui] / corporis cultus quod maxime opus est [agricolis curam gerant] / qui se alant cetera quaequomque habe[nt tueantur] / praecepta uera qui uolt uer[e] bene et libere u[iuere haec habeto] / primum est pium esse [domino bene] cupias uere[re parentes - - -] / [- - - f]idem bonam [praestes - - -] / [noli maledicere ne male] audias / inn[ocens et fidus qui erit] suauem uitam [et offensa carentem] / hon[este l]ae[teque] peraget haec non a d[octeis uireis institutus sed] / [m]atura sua e[t us]u Agricola / meminisse docet uos L. Castricio L. C. l. [- - -] / ob merita quod eius mortem dolui et fu[nus feci et locum dedi] / [ide]mque monumentum hoc ei feci ut cu[rent omnes liberti fidem] / [pr]aestare patroneis / [item Ca]striciae C. l. Helenae quod et [ipsa pia fuit]
Note: On the amendment of this inscription, marked by underlined text, cf. Donati (1996) 199-202.

75 C. Catius Vestinus
Catalogues: SUO: A254; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.35; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 13
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT in 43BC
Primary evidence: Cicero, *ad Fam*. 10.23.5

76 P. Caucilius
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.312; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Tibiletti (1953) 78
Post(s): IP\|IP(PCAST)
Date of post(s): IP\|IP(PCAST) before 45BC
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.Hisp*. 32.7

77 Ceionius
Catalogues: SUO: C241; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 115; **RE/PIR:** RE 1; PIR(2) 597
Other reference works: Saddington (1996b) 247 no. 6
Post(s): IP(PCAST)
Date of post(s): IP(PCAST) in AD9
Primary evidence: Velleius 2.119.4
Note: On Ceionius, cf. L. Eggius (Velleius 2.119.4).

78 L. Cellius L.f. Men(enia)
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** C105: (1976-1977) 234, (1987) - , (1993) 2055; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 144; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Castrén (1975) 97; Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 92; Mouritsen

(1990) 101
Post(s): MT(AP)
Date of post(s): MT(AP) before AD15
Primary evidence: Ambrosio and De Caro (1983) 4EN (Pompeii, Regio 1, Italia)

M. Cestius P.f. Cla(udia)
Catalogues: SUO: A252, A315, C277; **DEV:** C107: (1976-1977) 235, (1987) 1493, (1993) 2056; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 354; **RE/PIR:** RE 1*
Other reference works: Dobson (1978) 178 no. 24
Further bibliography: Dobson (1966) 71-72; Wilson (1990) 39; Bivona (1981) 41, (1985) 98-99
Post(s): CENT(PP), PF, MT
Date of post(s): CENT(PP) before AD42, PF before AD42, MT before AD42
Primary evidence: Bivona (1994) 124-125 no. 12 = CIL 10.7348 (Thermae Himeraeae, Sicilia)
Relevant text: M. Cestio P. f. Cla(udia) / primo pilo praef(ecto) / fabrum trib(uno) mil(itum) / IIuir(o) ex d(ecreto) d(ecurionum)
Reason for exclusion: M. Cestius was a member of a prominent family from Thermae Himeraeae, although the family, which probably originated from Italy, is best known in Africa (Wilson (1990) 39; Bivona (1981) 41, (1985) 98-99). Despite the arguments of Bivona (Bivona (1994) 124-125), he was probably not one of the military tribunes involved in the founding of the colony in the Augustan period (cf. Cn. Pollienus Cn.f.; [- -]ius Sex. f. [- - -]), as we might otherwise expect a mention of this role in his civic honours, and a more general pre-Claudian date should be preferred (cf. Dobson (1978) 178; Demougin (1992) 297). Instead, we are left with the impression of a man who retired to Thermae Himeraeae after a successful military career (Dobson (1978) 178; Demougin (1992) 297). Despite the suggestion of Devijver (Devijver (1976-1977) 235), it is unlikely that he was an ancestor of the senator L. Cestius Gallus Cerrinus Iustus Lutatius Natalis (CIL 10.3722; PIR2 692-693; cf. Demougin (1992) 297). He was probably not the Cestius named on coinage from 43BC (cf. Grant (1949) 190; RRC 497).

?Chumstinctus
Catalogues: SUO: A316; **DEV:** I44: (1976-1977) 447, (1987) 1596, (1993) - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** PIR(2) 729
Other reference works: Saddington (1980) 29 no. 2
Post(s): -
Date of post(s): [11BC]
Primary evidence: Livy, *Per*. 141
Relevant text: Bellum aduersus transrhenanas gentes a Druso gestum refertur, in quo inter primores pugnauerunt Chumstinctus et Auectius tribuni ex ciuitate Neruiorum.
Reason for exclusion: The name Chumstinctus is likely to be corrupt, and is rendered in different manuscripts variously as Chunistanus and Chunistinctus (PIR(2) 729). Chumstinctus and Auectius (PIR(2) 1377) were two native commanders of the Neruii who served with distinction under Drusus against Germanic tribes in 11-10BC. The two were almost certainly not Roman citizens, nor Roman officers, but native commanders of auxiliary forces. They probably did not hold the title of "tribunus militum", as the title "tribunus" might be applied to themselves by commanders of allied forces without holding the formal position (e.g. Holleaux (1919) 321 l.2-3, cf. 328; cf. Prag (2007) 84-85), and they should not be considered as Roman officers (Saddington (1982) 78; cf. contra Devijver (1976-1977) 447).

[- - - P]ol(lia) Cimber
Catalogues: SUO: A317; **DEV:** C276: (1976-1977) 314, (1987) - , (1993) 2086; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 418; **RE/PIR:** RE 12.1701
Post(s): ?MT
Date of post(s): ?MT before AD42
Primary evidence: CIL 5.7158 (Augusta Taurinorum, Regio 11, Italia)
Relevant text: [- - - P]ol(lia) Cimber / [?trib(unus) ?mil(itum) ?leg(ionum) ?VII] I et XI aed(ilis) IIuir / [- - -] Cimbri / [- - -]unt
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Claudian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

79 M. Cincius L.f. Hor(atia)
Catalogues: SUO: A278; **DEV:** C110: (1976-1977) 237, (1987) 1493, (1993) 2056; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 23; **RE/PIR:** RE 12.1596

Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before 29BC
Primary evidence: AE 1895, 153 (Falerii, Regio 7, Italia)
Relevant text: M. Cincius M. l. Eros / M. Cincio L. f. Hor(atia) / IIIIuir(o) i(ure) d(icundo) trib(uno) milit(um) / legionis Gemellae
Note: The Legio Gemella named in this inscription is otherwise unknown. It is often considered to be Legio VI Gemella (Ritterling, RE 12.1596; cf. [- - -] Tro(mentina) Maximus (CIL 9.2648 = ILS 2228)) or another of the civil war or Triumviral legions, possibly a Pompeian legion (Devijver (1976-1977) 237; Demougin (1992) 36). Other members of Cincius' family are known from Falerii, including the *patronus municipi* Q. Tullius Q.f. Hor(atia) Cincius Priscus (CIL 11.3125 = ILS 3111), who may also date from the same period (Devijver (1987) 1493; Demougin (1992) 37).

80 L. Cirpinius T.f. Vel(ina)
Catalogues: SUO: C279; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 313; **RE/PIR:** RE 12.1793-1794; PIR(2) 740
Other reference works: Pflaum (1960-1961) 16 no. 3; Dobson (1978) 191-192 no. 57; Saddington (1996b) 251 no. 39
Post(s): CENT(PP), IP(PCAST)
Date of post(s): IP(PCAST) before AD15
Primary evidence: CIL 9.5748 = ILS 2687 (Ricina, Regio 5, Italia)
Relevant text: L. Cirpinio T. f. Vel(ina) / pri(mo) pil(o) iter(um) praef(ecto) / leg(ionis) XXII IIuir(o) iterum / quinq(uennali) / municipes
Note: Cirpinius' early career can be dealt with swiftly: he was *primipilus* twice, possibly in Legio XXII (Deiotariana), and probably in one of the Eastern legions, before being promoted to the position of "praefectus legionis XXII" (on his centurionate career, cf. Dobson (1982) 325 ff.; Demougin (1992) 266). As with many other Egyptian military officers in the early Julio-Claudian period, Cirpinius' position as "praefectus legionis XXII" is unclear and somewhat controversial. It is generally considered that the term means here the post of *praefectus castrorum*: use of the term *praefectus legionis* to mean *praefectus castrorum legionis* was common in the second century, although it is not usually found in earlier inscriptions (Pflaum (1960-1961) 16; Devijver (1974b) 459; Dobson (1974) 415, (1982) 322-323). The issue is confused by the existence of the post *praefectus castrorum Aegypti*, which was the command of the legionary camp in Alexandria, and which, given the absence of senatorial legates, was second in command only to the *praefectus Aegypti* (on the post of *praefectus castrorum Aegypti*, see Dobson (1974) 415-416, (1982) 332ff.; Letta (1978) 5-7; Keppie (1996a) 109). However, the lack of a personal or legion cognomen suggests an early date for Cirpinius (cf. Demougin (1992) 266), and the inscription almost certainly predates the creation of Legio XXII Primigenia under Caligula in AD39 (Dobson (1978) 191; Franke (2000) 95). Moreover, as Legio XXII Deiotariana was stationed in Alexandria along with Legio III Cyrenaica from the late-Augustan/early-Tiberian period (Devijver (1974b) 455ff.; Dobson (1982) 332; Speidel (1982) 123-124), then it seems likely that Cirpinius, like possibly C. Musanus, was commander of one of the three legionary camps, or simply of one of the three legions (XXII Deiotariana, III Cyrenaica and XII Fulminata) that served in Egypt during the Augustan period, under the overall command of the *praefectus Aegypti* (on Roman forces in Egypt in the Augustan period, cf. Syme (1933) 24-25; Devijver (1974b) 455ff.; Speidel (1982) 122). Taken with the career of C. Musanus, who held the curious title of *praefectus stratopedarchos*, the picture created is confusing but, perhaps, one that should not be over-analysed: it is probably the result of the difficulties of creating a new command structure without senatorial legates, and of doing so in a newly conquered province with its own complex power structures. Faced with these challenges, posts and responsibilities might easily have been created for different individuals that were similar, but which varied as necessary according to, for example, the needs of the situation or the status of the individual. The situation probably stabilised with the reduction in the number of the Egyptian legions and the posting of Legio XII Fulminata to Africa Proconsularis (probably before AD3, cf. Passienus Rufus (CIL 8.26580)), which eventually resulted in the creation of a camp at Alexandria for both XXII Deiotariana and III Cyrenaica and the creation of the *praefectus castrorum Aegypti* to command it. Given that Virgius Marsus was *praefectus castrorum Aegypti* before commanding a praetorian cohort at the end of Augustus' reign, Cirpinius' service in Egypt probably dates to some point in the Augustan era, probably quite some time after the end of the Thebaid revolt of 29BC, when the upper Nile was stable enough to concentrate troops in the North (cf. Speidel (1982) 122). While Devijver ((1974b) 459) does not consider Cirpinius' post to have been equestrian in rank, it is hard to see how C. Musanus might have been promoted from the military tribunate to the position of *praefectus stratopedarchos* if the latter position, with which

Cirpinius' was probably equivalent, was not an equestrian position. On the basis of his voting tribe, Cirpinius was probably from Ricina, although no other members of his *gens* are known from there (Pflaum (1960-1961) 16; Demougin (1992) 266).

81 L. Cispius (?Laeuus)
Catalogues: SUO: C147; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.303, 3.53; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 3, cf. 6
Post(s): NP
Date of post(s): NP in 46BC
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.Afr*. 62, 67.1
Relevant text: *B.Afr*. 62: Caesar L. Cispium cum classe XXVII nauium ad Thapsum...mittit itemque Q. Aquilam cum XIII nauibus longis...praemittit; *B.Afr*. 67.1: Cispio Aquilaeque classe tradita
Note: On L. Cispius, cf. Q. Aquila; on his possible cognomen, see Broughton ((1951-1986) 3.53).

82 Ap. Claudius
Catalogues: SUO: A180; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.49; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 12
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT in 87BC
Future career: ?Praetor 57BC
Primary evidence: Appian, *B.C*. 1.68; cf. Livy, *Per*. 80

M. Claudius Marcellus
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** PIR(2) 925
Other reference works: Saddington (1999) 299, 306 no. 11
Further bibliography: Seager (1972) 15; Levick (1976) 20
Post(s): -
Date of post(s): [26BC], [25BC]
Future career: Aedilis 23BC
Primary evidence: Dio 53.26.1
Relevant text: τοῖς δὲ τὴν στρατεύσιμον ἡλικίαν ἔτ'ἔχουσι θέας τινὰς διά τε τοῦ Μαρκέλλου καὶ διὰ τοῦ Τιβερίου ὡς καὶ ἀγορανομούντων ἐν αὐτοῖς <τοῖς> στρατοπέδοις ἐποίησε
Reason for exclusion: Despite Saddington's suggestion (Saddington (1999) 299, 306 no. 11), there is no direct evidence that Marcellus was a military tribune.

83 Ti. Claudius Nero
Catalogues: SUO: A282; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** PIR(2) 941
Other reference works: Saddington (1999) 299, 306 no. 10
Further bibliography: Seager (1972) 15; Levick (1976) 20
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT in 26BC, MT in 25BC
Future career: Emperor AD14-37
Primary evidence: Suetonius, *Tib*. 9.1; cf. Dio 53.26.1; Pliny, *N.H*. 14.64

C. Claudius C.f. C.n. Sardus
Catalogues: SUO: C208; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 728; **RE/PIR:** RE 330; PIR(2) 1009
Other reference works: Pflaum (1960-1961) 1042
Post(s): NP(PC)
Date of post(s): NP(PC) before AD69
Primary evidence: CIL 6.3166 = ILS 2675 (Roma)
Relevant text: C. Claudius C. f. C. n. / Sardus / praefectus cla(ssis)
Reason for exclusion: Given the lack of information provided by this inscription, and of any other dating criteria, it is difficult to be precise about the date of Sardus' prefecture. Demougin's suggestion that Sardus should be dated more generally to the Julio-Claudian period is preferred here (Demougin (1992) 625).

84 Clodius
Catalogues: SUO: C165; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.367; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 3
Post(s): NP|IP

Date of post(s): NPlIP in 42BC
Primary evidence: Appian, *B.C.* 5.2

85 C. Clodius
Catalogues: SUO: C158; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.355; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 8
Post(s): ?MP
Date of post(s): ?MP in 43BC
Primary evidence: Dio 47.24.2, 4

86 L. Clodius
Catalogues: SUO: C103; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.246, 3.58; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 9, cf. 18
Other reference works: Welch (1995) 137-138 no. viii; Badian (1997) 6 no. ix
Post(s): PF
Date of post(s): PF in 51BC
Primary evidence: Cicero, *ad Fam.* 3.8.5; cf. 3.4.1-2, 3.5.3, 3.6.2

87 Clodius Arquitius
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.313; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): EP
Date of post(s): EP in 45BC
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.Hisp.* 10.1; cf. 23.8
Relevant text: Arguetius ex Italia cum equitatu uenit. Is signa Saguntinorum rettulit quinque, quae ab oppidanis cepit. Suo loco praeteritum est quod equites ex Italia cum Asprenate ad Caesarem uenissent.
Note: Responsible for bringing cavalry to Caesar (cf. L. Nonius Asprenas), he was later wounded in a cavarly engagement (Caesar, *B.Hisp.* 23.8).

88 A. Clodius A.f. Men(enia) Flaccus
Catalogues: SUO: A318; **DEV:** C198: (1976-1977) 279, (1987) 1519, (1993) 2073; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 96; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Nicolet (1967) 41-42 no. 20
Further bibliography: Sabbatini Tumolesi (1980) n.21
Post(s): MT(AP)
Date of post(s): MT(AP) before AD15
Primary evidence: CIL 10.1074d = ILS 5053 = Sabbatini Tumolesi (1980) no.1 = AE 2003, +312; cf. CIL 10.793, 936, 960, 890 (Pompeii, Regio 1, Italia)

89 T. Clodius C.[f. ?C.n.] Pro[culus]
Catalogues: SUO: A319, C280; **DEV:** C204: (1976-1977) 282, (1987) 1520, (1993) 2074-2075; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 145; **RE/PIR:** RE 12.1562
Other reference works: Pflaum (1960-1961) 1050; Saddington (1980) 534 no. 75
Further bibliography: Magalhaes (2003) 144-146
Post(s): MT, PF
Date of post(s): MT before AD15, PF before AD15
Future career: Sent "pro censore" to the Lusitani by Augustus
Primary evidence: Magalhaes (2003) 144 no. 13 (fig. 57) = CIL 10.680 (Surrentum, Regio 1, Italia)

90 P. Clodius Pulcher
Catalogues: SUO: A210; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.164, 3.58; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 48
Post(s): ?MT, NP
Date of post(s): ?MT in 67BC, NP in 67BC
Future career: Aedilis curulis 56BC
Primary evidence: As a possible military tribune: Plutarch, *Luc.* 34.2-4; Dio 36.14.4; as a naval prefect: Dio 36.17.2-3; cf. Cicero, *Harus. Resp.* 42
Relevant text: Plutarch, *Luc.* 34.2-4: τότε δὲ τῷ Λευκόλλῳ συστρατεύων οὐχ ὅσης αὐτὸν ἠξίου τιμῆς ἐτύγχανεν· ἠξίου δὲ πρῶτος εἶναι, καὶ πολλῶν ἀπολειπόμενος διὰ τὸν τρόπον, ὑπῳκούρει τὴν Φιμβριανὴν στρατιὰν καὶ παρώξυνε κατὰ τοῦ Λευκόλλου, χρηστοὺς εἰς οὐκ ἄκοντας οὐδ' ἀήθεις τοῦ δημαγωγεῖσθαι διαδιδούς. οὗτοι γὰρ ἦσαν οὓς καὶ πρότερον ἀνέπεισε Φιμβρίας ἀποκτείναντας τὸν ὕπατον Φλάκκον αὐτὸν ἑλέσθαι στρατηγόν. διὸ καὶ

τὸν Κλώδιον ἡδέως ἐδέχοντο καὶ φιλοστρατιώτην προσηγόρευον, ἀγανακτεῖν προσποιούμενον ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν εἰ πέρας οὐδὲν ἔσται πολέμων τοσούτων καὶ πόνων, ἀλλὰ παντὶ μὲν ἔθνει μαχόμενοι, πᾶσαν δὲ γῆν πλανώμενοι κατατρίψουσι τὸν βίον, οὐδὲν ἄξιον ἐκ τηλικαύτης φερόμενοι στρατείας, ἀλλὰ τὰς Λευκόλλου παραπέμποντες ἁμάξας καὶ καμήλους, ἐκπωμάτων χρυσῶν καὶ διαλίθων γεμούσας, οἱ δὲ Πομπηίου στρατιῶται δῆμος ὄντες ἤδη που μετὰ γυναικῶν καὶ τέκνων κάθηνται, γῆν εὐδαίμονα καὶ πόλεις ἔχοντες, οὐ Μιθριδάτην καὶ Τιγράνην εἰς τὰς ἀοικήτους ἐμβαλόντες ἐρημίας, οὐδὲ τῆς Ἀσίας τὰ βασίλεια καταρρίψαντες, ἀλλὰ φυγάσιν ἀνθρώποις ἐν Ἰβηρίᾳ καὶ δραπέταις ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ πολεμήσαντες; Dio 36.14.4: καὶ μάλισθ'ὅτι Πούπλιός τις Κλώδιος, ὃν Κλαύδιόν τινες ἐκάλεσαν, συνεστασίαζέ σφας ὑπ' ἐμφύτου νεωτεροποιίας, καίπερ τῆς ἀδελφῆς αὐτοῦ τῷ Λουκούλλῳ συνοικούσης· ἐταράχθησαν δὲ καὶ τότε ἄλλως τε καὶ ἐπειδὴ τὸν Ἀκίλιον τὸν ὕπατον, ὃς τῷ Λουκούλλῳ διάδοχος δι'ἅπερ εἶπον ἐξεπέμφθη, πλησιάζοντα ἐπύθοντο· ἐν γὰρ ὀλιγωρίᾳ αὐτὸν ὡς καὶ ἰδιωτεύοντα ἤδη ἐποιοῦντο; Dio 36.17.2-3: Μάρκιος δὲ Λουκούλλῳ μὲν οὐκ ἐπεκούρησε, πρόσχημα τοὺς στρατιώτας ὡς οὐκ ἐθελήσαντάς οἱ ἀκολουθῆσαι ποιησάμενος, ἐς δὲ τὴν Κιλικίαν ἀφικόμενος Μενέμαχόν τινα ἀπαυτομολήσαντα τοῦ Τιγράνου ἐδέξατο, καὶ τὸν Κλώδιον ἀποστάντα ἀπὸ τοῦ Λουκούλλου δέει τῶν ἐν τῇ Νισίβι γενομένων ἐπὶ τὸ ναυτικὸν ἐπέστησεν· ἀδελφὴν γάρ τινα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκεῖνος γυναῖκα εἶχε. καὶ ὁ μὲν ἁλούς τε ἐς καταποντιστάς, καὶ ἀφεθεὶς ὑπ'αὐτῶν πρὸς τὸν ἐκ τοῦ Πομπηίου φόβον, ἔς τε τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν τῆς Συρίας ἦλθεν ὡς καὶ πρὸς τοὺς Ἀραβίους, πρὸς οὓς τότε διεφέροντο, συμμαχήσων σφίσι, κἀνταῦθα στασιάζων τινὰς ὁμοίως ὀλίγου διεφθάρη.
Note: Clodius was involved in a mutiny among Lucullus' troops in 67BC. While no post is given, it is possible that he was a military tribune at the time. This would explain why he was talking to the troops during the early stages of a mutiny: if he was talking to the men about their grievances (which appear to have been real enough) before bringing them to the attention of Lucullus, this would not have been irresponsible behaviour for a military tribune. Moreover, Lucullus was his brother-in-law, and Clodius would have little reason to attack him in this way. This would also explain Lucullus' apparent failure to punish him for a serious offence, and why, after such behaviour, Marcius Rex (another brother-in-law) was content to take him on as a naval prefect. Given his subsequent reputation, it is not hard to imagine that his status as a military tribune, and a more moderate portrayal of his behaviour, might have been lost from the record. As Hillard argues ((1987) 40-47), Lucllus' apologists, principally, in all probablility, Archias, were ready to blame L. Licinius Murena for many of Lucllus' failiures, so it is more than possible that Archias was also strong in his criticisms of Clodius, and may have - for the reasons above - obscured the fact that Clodius was a military tribune at the time. Cicero's subsequent portrayal of Clodius' rapacious behaviour in Gaul under Metellus should, likewise, be taken with a pinch of salt - although no title is preserved for him during that period either (cf. Cicero, *Harus. Resp.* 42). Clodius' naval prefecture is much more certain, but does not appear to have been a success: captured and released by pirates (Dio 36.17.2-3; Cicero, *Harus. Resp.* 42), he was sent to Antioch to aid Syria in its struggle with the Arabians, but appears to have caused yet more problems (though Dio's account here, as before, seems to have been heavily influenced by Clodius' later reputation).

[C]n. Clouatius Cn.f.
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** C207: (1976-1977) 283, (1987) - , (1993) 2075; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 147; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD38
Primary evidence: CIL 10.1065 (Pompeii, Regio 1, Italia)
Relevant text: [C]n. Clouatio Cn. f. IIuir(o) i(ure) d(icundo) tr(ibuno) mil(itum) loc[- - -]
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Gaian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

P. Clusius P.f. Oufentina Gallus
Catalogues: SUO: A233; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 3.58-59; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Broughton (1951-1986) 3.58-59; Suolahti (1958) 153 no. 6
Further bibliography: Ben Zeev (1998) 155-156
Post(s): -
Date of post(s): [49BC]
Primary evidence: Josephus, *A.J.* 14.228-230, 236-240
Reason for exclusion: See the discussion of *consilia* in ch. 1.

C. Cluuius
Catalogues: SUO: C155; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.313; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 4
Post(s): CP
Date of post(s): CP in 45BC
Primary evidence: RRC 476 = Grueber, CRRBM 1.539
Reason for exclusion: This individual held a civilian position.

P. Coelius P.f. Etruscus
Catalogues: SUO: A324; **DEV:** C214 bis: (1976-1977) 347 , (1987) - , (1993) 2076; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 148; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD38
Primary evidence: Torelli (1975) 108, 122 no. 6 = CIL 11.7566 = AE 1899, 62b (Tarquinii, Regio 7, Italia)
Relevant text: Torelli (1975) no. 6: [fu]lmine pr[ocurauit ostenta suo] / [c]armine et augurales di[uinationes] / complures fecit post o[bitum huius] / sub (decem)uiros ea discipulin[a relata est] / P. Coelius P.f. Etruscus t[rib(unus) mil(itum)] / [a]psen[s creatus] per priscum [ritum - - -] / [- - -] / E[- - -]ndumq[ue curauit]
Reason for exclusion: A member of the *ordo LX haruspicum* in Tarquinii (cf. Torelli (1975) 116), Coelius Etruscus was long known from only one half of one fragment of a larger inscription (AE 1899, 62b), and confused with the unknown military tribune of another fragment (cf. [- - -]scus (Torelli (1975) no. 11)). Torelli's reconstruction of the fragments, as well as his study of the inscription, separates the two individuals (Torelli (1975) 105ff.) and dates them to the Augustan or Tiberian eras, considering the Augustan period perhaps the more likely of the two (Torelli (1975) 117-118; cf. Demougin (1992) 144, 266). The fact that neither individual's legion is identified supports the suggestion of an early date, but it is not possible to date them more precisely than to the pre-Gaian period. Coelius Etruscus probably came from a family of some status in the region (Demougin (1992) 144; cf. CIL 11.3384), and the *ordo LX haruspicum*, dedicated to the Etruscan religious practice, was a major religious organisation from the first century BC until the late Empire (Torelli (1975) 116ff.).

91 P. Considius
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 5
Further bibliography: Welch (1998) 101
Post(s): MP
Date of post(s): MP in 58BC
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.G.* 1.21, cf. 22

92 Coponius (1)
Catalogues: SUO: C91; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.232; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 3, 9
Further bibliography: Tibiletti (1953) 76
Post(s): MP(GC)
Date of post(s): MP(GC) in 53BC
Primary evidence: Plutarch, *Crass.* 27.7-8

Coponius (2)
Catalogues: SUO: C237; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 110; **RE/PIR:** RE 2; PIR(2) 1285
Other reference works: Pflaum (1960-1961) 1082
Further bibliography: Syme (1939) 338; Wiseman (1971) 226 no. 133
Post(s): CP
Date of post(s): CP in AD6
Future career: Procurator
Primary evidence: Josephus, *B.J.* 2.117, *A.J.* 18.2
Reason for exclusion: This individual held a civilian position.

93 C. Cornelius C.f.
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 3.61; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Detchev (1950) 59ff.; Tibiletti (1953) 70ff.; Ñaco del Hoyo (2009)
Post(s): MP(GC)

Date of post(s): MP(GC) in 72BC
Primary evidence: BE 1952, 87 = BE 1954, 177 (Mesembria, Thracia)

94 Cn. Corneli(us) Cn.f. Pal(atina)
Catalogues: SUO: A170; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.35, 3.62; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 22a, Supp. B 3.258
Further bibliography: Cichorius (1922) 147-148. no. 11; Criniti (1970) 108-109
Post(s): ?MT
Date of post(s): ?MT in 89BC
Future career: Praetor or Consul 81BC
Primary evidence: Criniti (1970) 16-26 = CIL 6.37045 = CIL 1.709 = CIL 16, p.145 = ILLRP 515 = ILS 8888 = AE 1909, 30 = AE 1910, +126 = AE 1910, +153 = AE 1910, +162 = AE 1910, 207 = AE 1910, 218 = AE 1911, 126 = AE 1912, +10 = AE 1912, +117 = AE 1912, +287 = AE 1920, +130 = AE 1923, +103 = AE 2003, +831 = EDH HD019742 (Roma)
Note: See the discussion of *consilia* in ch. 1.

95 L. Cornelius L.f. Vot(uria)
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 3.62; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Welch (1995) 133 no. ii; Badian (1997) 3 no. ii; Cerva (2000) 180ff.; Verzár Bass (2000) 204
Post(s): PF
Date of post(s): PF in 78BC
Primary evidence: CIL 6.40910 = CIL 1.2961 = AE 1971, 61 = AE 2000, +251 = AE 2003, +19 = EDH HD010465 (Roma)
Relevant text: L. Cornelius L. f. Vot(uria) / Q. Catuli co(n)s(ulis) praef(ectus) fabr(um) / censoris architectus
Note: *Praefectus fabrum* under the consul Q. Lutatius Catulus in 78BC, and then architect under him during Catulus' censorship of 65BC (cf. Badian (1997) 3). The link between the role of architect and that of *praefectus fabrum* is, as Badian notes (Badian (1997) 3), interesting. He may, given his nomen, have been of freedman descent, and given his voting tribe he was from Ostia (cf. Badian (1997) 3).

96 P. Cornelius
Catalogues: SUO: C148; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.303; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 45
Post(s): MP(GC)
Date of post(s): MP(GC) in 46BC
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.Afr*. 76.1, cf. 75

97 L. Cornelius Balbus
Catalogues: SUO: C81a, C83a; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 3.63; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 69
Other reference works: Welch (1995) 135-136 no. vi; Badian (1997) 5 no. vi
Post(s): PF
Date of post(s): PF in 62BC, ?PF in 61BC, PF in 59BC
Future career: Consul (suffectus) 40BC
Primary evidence: Cicero, *Balb*. 63; cf. 41, 43

[?L.] C[orn]elius C.[f.] Bocchus (1)
Catalogues: SUO: A320, C281, C282; **DEV:** C228: (1976-1977) 292, (1987) 1525, (1993) 2079-2080; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 512-513; **RE/PIR:** PIR(2) 1333
Other reference works: Saddington (1985) 534 no. 76
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD55
Primary evidence: CIL 2.35 = AE 1967, 195 = ILS 2920 = d'Encarnação (1984) no.185 = AE 2002, +662 (Salacia, Lusitania); cf. CIL 2.2479 = CIL 2.5617 = d'Encarnação (1984) no.189 = HEp. 7.1202 = HEp. 12.668 = AE 2002, +662 (Aqua Flauia, Lusitania); CIL 2.5184 = ILS 2921 = d'Encarnação (1984) no. 207 = AE 2002, +662 (Caetobriga, Lusitania); AE 1999, 857 = AE 2002, +662 (Olispo, Lusitania)
Relevant text: CIL 2.35: [?L.] C[orn]elio C.[f.] Boccho / [fl]am(ini) pro[u]inc(iae) tr(ibuno) mil(itum) / [co]lonia Scallabitana / [ob e(ius)] m[e]rita in colon(iam); CIL 2.2479: [?L. Cornelius ?C. f. Boc]chus pr(aefectus) Caesarum bis / [flam(en) prouinc(iae) pon]t(ifex) perp(etuus) flamen perp(etuus) / [?duumuir ?aedilis] II pr(aefectus) fabr(um) V tr(ibunus) mil(itum) / d(e) s(ua)

p(ecunia) f(ecit); CIL 2.5184: [. C]ornelio [.]f. / [B]occho / [flami]ni prouinc(iae) / [tr(ibuno)] mil(itum) leg(ionis) III Aug(ustae) / [- - -]; AE 1999, 857: L. Cornelio / L. f. Gal(eria) Boccho / Salaciensi / flamini proui[n]/ciae Lusitania[e] / praef(ecto) fabrum V / trib(uno) milit(um) leg(ionis) VII / Aug(ustae) / d(ecreto) d(ecurionum)
Reason for exclusion: Each of these four inscriptions from Lusitania refers to a Cornelius Bocchus. To take each inscription separately: (1) CIL 2.35 names a [?L.] C[orn]elius C.[f.] Bocchus who was *flamen prouinc(iae)* and military tribune; (2) CIL 2.2479 names a [?L. Cornelius ?C. f. Boc]chus, who was *praefectus Caesarum* twice, *flamen prouinc(iae)*, *praefectus fabrum* five times, and a military tribune; (3) CIL 2.5184 names a [. C]ornelius [.]f. [B]occhus, where the filiation has been variously restored as "C." or "L." (although, as d'Encarnação ((1984) 207) notes, it is impossible to tell which it is): he was *flamen prouinc(iae)* and a military tribune in Legio III Augusta; (4) AE 1999, 857 names a L. Cornelius L.f. Bocchus of the tribe Galeria, who was *flamen prouinciae*, *praefectus fabrum* five times, and a military tribune in Legio VII Augusta. Inscriptions 1-3 have been taken as referring to one, two, or three, related individuals (one individual: ILS 2921 adnot.; PIR(2) 1337; Saddington (1985) 534; Curchin (1990) 177; two or three related individuals: Etienne (1958) 122-124; d'Encarnação (1984) 207; le Bohec (1989) 136; Demougin (1992) 423-426; Devijver (1993) 2079-2080). However, the newly discovered inscription 4 cannot pertain to the same individual as inscription 1, and the argument that inscriptions 1-3 refer to the same individual rested largely on the improbability that two separate Cornelii Bocchi would have such a similar cursus, and one which is rarely attested in Lusitania (Curchin (1990) 177). Therefore, as Demougin and González Herrero propose (Demougin (1992) 424-426; González Herrero (2002)), the inscriptions probably record a family of Cornelii Bocchi. It is unlikely that inscriptions 1-3 refer to the same person, as the post of *praefectus fabrum* is absent from inscriptions 1 and 3, and it would not ordinarily have been omitted had that post been held (d'Encarnação (1984) 258; Demougin (1992) 425). Inscriptions 1 and 3 might belong to the same individual, but this is unlikely, as the inscriptions appear to be from different eras, as well as different towns (Etienne (1958) 122-124; d'Encarnação (1984) 207; Le Bohec (1989) 136; Demougin (1992) 423-426; Devijver (1993) 2079-2080). The inscriptions all belong to the first century AD, although only inscription 4 can be dated more precisely, as Legio VII Augusta became Legio VII Claudia under Claudius. Stylistically, inscription 1 is probably the earliest, and is generally dated to the Tiberian or Claudian eras, with the others probably Claudian (Etienne (1958) 124, cf. 212; Le Bohec (1989) 136; Demougin (1992) 424). However, dating by stylistic criteria is unreliable, and the only inscription with a confirmed Julio-Claudian date gives both the legion number and cognomen, and the name of the province in full - normally indicators of a later date (cf. d'Encarnação (1984) 263-264). The "Caesares" of inscription 2 might be one of a number of possible combinations: Caesar and Augustus (d'Encarnação (1984) 263-264), Nero and Drusus (Demougin (1992) 424-425), and Titus and Vespasian are all possibilities, although Nero and Drusus, disgraced in AD31, are by far the most likely pair. While the family trees proposed by Demougin and González Herrero (Demougin (1992) 424-426; González Herrero (2002)) are both plausible, there is not enough evidence to be certain of the relationship between these individuals. The Lusitanian Cornelius Bocchus cited by Pliny (*N.H.*16.216; 37.24, 97, 127) and Solinus (1.92; 2.11; 2.18) almost certainly belonged to this family, and was writing in the pre-Claudian era, but he cannot be identified securely with any one of the individuals referred to in these inscriptions (Devijver (1993) 2080; contra, Syme (1969) 220-221; Curchin (1990) 177). It is interesting to note, however, the high status of the family throughout Lusitania, with inscriptions 1, 2 and 4 recording public honours in different towns, and all four inscriptions recording the title of *flamen prouinciae*, the highest position recorded in any of the inscriptions (Demougin (1992) 424). The impression gained from these four inscriptions, therefore, is of a powerful Lusitanian family who held a number of junior officer positions during the middle of the Julio-Claudian period, but there is no evidence to show clearly that any one individual served under Augustus.

[?L. Cornelius ?C.f. Boc]chus (2)
Catalogues: SUO: A320, C281, C282; **DEV:** C228: (1976-1977) 292, (1987) 1525, (1993) 2079-2080; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 512-513; **RE/PIR:** PIR(2) 1333
Other reference works: Saddington (1985) 534 no. 76
Post(s): MT, PF
Date of post(s): MT before AD55, PF before AD55
Primary evidence: CIL 2.2479 = CIL 2.5617 = d'Encarnação (1984) no.189 = HEp. 7.1202 = HEp. 12.668 = AE 2002, +662 (Aqua Flauia, Lusitania)

Reason for exclusion: On [?L. Cornelius ?C. f. Boc]chus (2), see [?L.] C[orn]elius C.[f.] Bocchus (1).

[. C]ornelius [?L.]f. [B]occhus (1)
Catalogues: SUO: A320, C281, C282; **DEV:** C229: (1976-1977) 292, (1987) 1525, (1993) 2080; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 512-513; **RE/PIR:** PIR(2) 1333
Other reference works: Saddington (1985) 534 no. 76
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD55
Primary evidence: CIL 2.5184 = ILS 2921 = d'Encarnação (1984) no. 207 = AE 2002, +662 (Caetobriga, Lusitania)
Reason for exclusion: On [. C]ornelius [?L.]f. [B]occhus (1), see [?L.] C[orn]elius C.[f]. Bocchus (1).

L. Cornelius L.f. Bocchus (2)
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): MT, PF
Date of post(s): MT before AD42, PF before AD42
Primary evidence: AE 1999, 857 = AE 2002, +662 (Olispo, Lusitania)
Reason for exclusion: On L. Cornelius L.f. Bocchus (2), see [?L.] C[orn]elius C.[f.] Bocchus (1).

98 P. Cornelius P.f. Sabat(ina) Cicatricula
Catalogues: SUO: A321, C283, C284, C285; **DEV:** C232: (1976-1977) 294, (1987) 1525, (1993) 2080; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 356; **RE/PIR:** PIR(2) 1337
Other reference works: Dobson (1978) 182 no. 38; Holder (1980) 246 no. E44; Saddington (1987) 273 no. 47, (1988a) 311 no. 54
Post(s): MT, IP(PCOHORTIUM)lIP(PCOH), EP(PE), NP(PC)
Date of post(s): MT before AD15, IP(PCOHORTIUM)lIP(PCOH) before AD15, EP(PE) before AD15, NP(PC) before AD15
Primary evidence: CIL 11.6344 = ILS 2693 (Pisaurum, Regio 6, Italia)
Relevant text: P. Cornelio P. f. / Sab(atina) Cicatriculae / prim(o) pil(o) bis praefect(o) / equit(um) praef(ecto) clas(sis) / praef(ecto) cohortium / ciuium Romanor(um) / quattuor in Hispan(ia) / trib(uno) mil(itum) IIuiro et / IIuir(o) quinq(uennali) pont(ifici) / d(ecreto) d(ecurionum) / public(e)
Note: Cornelius Cicatricula, a successful officer who held no fewer than four junior officer positions, is extremely difficult to date. Garcia y Bellido (Garcia y Bellido (1961) 147) argues that he belongs to the third century AD, while Le Glay (Le Glay (1972) 218) proposes a first- or second-century date. In all likelihood, however, Cornelius Cicatricula belongs to the Augustan era. Le Roux points out that the position of *praefectus classis* was only an equestrian rank until the Claudian era, and that the language of the inscription, especially the relatively long renderings of "praefect(o)", "praef(ecto)", and "quattuor in Hispan(ia)" push the inscription to the first decades of the first century AD (Le Roux (1982) 91); that we are not given legion numbers, legion *cognomina*, and the name of the unit he commanded while *praefectus equitum*, also suggests an early date, particularly as we have a relatively long description of his command of four cohorts of Roman citizens. The four cohorts mentioned are not cohorts in the Flavian sense (permanently organised auxiliary units), but a more temporary group of citizen soldiers organised into cohorts for a specific role (Le Roux (1982) 91; Alföldy (1985) 398), as with the cohorts of 500 men raised during the chaos of the Social War that were never assigned to legions, or the *cohortes uoluntariorum* raised in the mid-Augustan period (cf. ch. 2 and ch. 5). The order of Cornelius Cicatricula's cursus is most unusual, but it is unlikely that his military tribunate was, as Dobson suggests (Dobson (1978) 182-183; cf. Le Glay (1972) 218), the position of *tribunus cohortis praetoriae*, as we would expect the inscription to be explicit were that so (as in the case of the only other known *praefectus cohortium*, Cn. Manlius Cn.f. Pap(iria); cf. Demougin (1992) 299). His career can be more plausibly reconstructed thus: having been *primipilus* twice, *praefectus equitum* and *praefectus classis*, he then left the army, returning in an emergency to command a levy of Roman citizens, after which he held the position of military tribune; he then retired to Pisaurum and held local office there. While he was probably not originally from Pisaurum, as his tribe is not normally found in that town, he was almost certainly Umbrian (Demougin (1992) 299; Devijver (1987) 1525).

99 C. Cornelius Cn.f. Gallus
Catalogues: SUO: C175, C207; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.376, 3.65; **DEM:** 40; **RE/PIR:** RE 164; PIR(2) 1369
Other reference works: Saddington (1985) 530 no. 4; Welch (1995) 143-144 no. xvi; Badian (1997) 10 no. xvi
Further bibliography: Thomasson (1984) 341 no. 1; Fishwick (1987) 66ff.; Alföldy (1990) 33ff; Verzár-Bass (2000) 201, 209
Post(s): PF
Date of post(s): PF circa 30BC
Future career: Praefectus Aegypti
Primary evidence: AE 1964, 255 = AE 1980, 46 = AE 1987, 103 = AE 1991, +63 = AE 1994, 1815 (Roma); cf. CIL 3.14147(5) = ILS 8995 = IGR 1.1293 = AE 1896, 29 = AE 1896, 43 = AE 1896, 72 = AE 1896, 114 = AE 1896, 117 = AE 1896, 118 = AE 1992, 1725 = AE 1997, 1569 = AE 2001, +2027 (Syene, Aegyptus); cf. Dio 51.17; Servius on Vergil, *Ec*. 6.64
Relevant text: AE 1964, 255: Iussu Imp(eratoris) Caesaris diui f. / C. Cornelius Cn. f. Gallus / praef(ectus) fabr(um) Caesaris diui f. / forum Iulium fecit
Note: This inscription, originally in bronze lettering, was removed and replaced with the one (CIL 6.882 = ILS 115) that now stands on the Vatican obelisk that was brought to Rome by Caligula in AD40 (on the reconstruction of the inscription see AE 1964, 255 adnot.; Fishwick (1987) 65-66; Alföldy (1990) 15-27; Verzár-Bass (2000) 201, 209). It shows that Gallus held the position of *praefectus fabrum* before his appointment as *praefectus Aegypti*; the inscription was almost certainly raised in Alexandria, and probably involved the completion and redesignation of a complex originally begun by Cleopatra, possibly for M. Antonius (cf. Fishwick (1987) 66ff.; Alföldy (1990) 33ff.). He had considerable military experience before taking up the post of *praefectus Aegypti*, winning over the army of L. Pinarius and gaining a military victory against Antonius, as Badian and Welch note (Dio 51.9; Welch (1995) 144; Badian (1997) 10) - it is unclear, however, if he did this while *praefectus fabrum*and it is likely that he did not (contra, Broughton (1951-1986) 3.65). His previous role as part of a commission responsible for assigning land to veternas should not be considered as a junior officer position (Servius on Vergil, *Ec*. 6.64, cf. 9.10; cf. Broughton (1951-1986) 2.367-377; contra, Suolahti (1955) 328).

100 [. ?Corne]lius Alexidis f. Cor(nelia) Menodor(us)
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Saddington (1999) 308 no. 23
Further bibliography: Knibbe et al. (1993) 137; Eck (1997) 111-112
Post(s): PF, MT
Date of post(s): PF before 31BC, MT before 31BC
Primary evidence: AE 1993, 1479 = AE 1997, 1436 (Ephesus, Asia)
Relevant text: [. Corne]lius Alexidis f. Cor(nelia) Menodor(us) / praef(ectus) fabr(um) tr(ibunus) mil(itum) primus ex is qui in Asia habitant / [- - - don]ati sunt monimentum(!) factum ex testamento arbitratu Corneliae Namnis uxoris / h(oc) m(onumentum) h(eredem) n(on) s(equetur) / praeter Corneliam Namnem quoi(!) inferri licebit
Note: This inscription from Ephesus records the junior officer, and, as his filiation suggests, new citizen (cf. Saddington (1999) 299), Cornelius Alexidis Menodorus (on his *nomen*, cf. Eck (1997) 111), who was "praef(ectus) fabr(um) tr(ibunus) mil(itum) primus ex is qui in Asia habitant". It is unclear, as Eck points out, what Cornelius was claiming to be the first of: he may have been the first military tribune from Asia, or the first man from Asia to hold both the posts of *praefectus fabrum* and*tribunus militum* (cf. Eck (1997) 111-112). If it is the latter, which would be a somewhat obscure claim, then he can be dated to the Augustan period, as Fabricius Tuscus, from Alexandreia Troas, was both *tribunus militum* and *praefectus fabrum* (cf. C. Fabricius C.f. Ani(ensi) Tuscus (AE 1973, 501)). However, given that the natural reading of the line is that Cornelius Menodorus was claiming to be the first man from Asia to hold the office of military tribune, then he at least predates Q. Pinarius, who probably served during the late Triumviral or early Augustan period (cf. Q. Pinarius L.f. Aem(ilia) (AE 1992, 1581); Saddington (1999) 308 no. 23). Cornelius Menodorus probably, therefore, dates from the Triumviral period (cf. Knibbe et al. (1993) 137; Eck (1997) 112; Saddington (1999) 299). On the lacuna at the start of the third line, see the discussion in Eck ((1997) 112; cf. Knibbe et al. (1993) 137). The use of the word "arbitratu" also suggests an early date (cf. Demougin (1992) 320).

101 [P. Corneli]us Orestinus
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD15
Primary evidence: CIL 6.41050 = AE 1992, 186 = AE 1994, 144 (Roma)
Note: On [P. Corneli]us Orestinus, see [- - -] (CIL 6.41050) (1).

L. Cornelius Scipio
Catalogues: SUO: C60; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.28; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 226
Post(s): LEG|MP(GC)
Date of post(s): LEG|MP(GC) in 90BC
Future career: Consul 83BC
Primary evidence: Appian, *B.C.* 1.41
Relevant text: Οὐέττιος μὲν Σκάτων Σέξστον Ἰούλιον τρεψάμενός τε καὶ δισχιλίους κτείνας ἐπὶ Αἰσερνίαν ἤλασε ῥωμαΐζουσαν: καὶ αὐτὴν οἱ μὲν συντάττοντες, Λεύκιός τε Σκιπίων καὶ Λεύκιος Ἀκίλιος θεραπόντων ἐσθῆτας ὑποδύντες ἀπέδρασαν
Reason for exclusion: In command of Aesernia along with Acilius (cf. L. Acilius), it is likely that both were legates (cf. Broughton (1951-1986) 2.28).

102 Faustus Cornelius Sulla
Catalogues: SUO: A214; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.17; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 377
Post(s): MT|MP
Date of post(s): MT|MP in 63BC
Future career: Quaestor 54BC
Primary evidence: Josephus, *A.J.* 14.69; cf. *A.J.* 73, *B.J.* 1.149

Q. Coruius Q.f. Flaccus
Catalogues: SUO: C226; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 101; **RE/PIR:** PIR(2) 1519
Post(s): CP
Date of post(s): CP in 4BC
Future career: Epistrategos
Primary evidence: IGR 1.1109 (8 January 4BC, Mahemdieh, Aegyptus)
Reason for exclusion: This individual held a civilian position.

Cotus
Catalogues: SUO: C97; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 4.1678
Post(s): -
Date of post(s): [52BC]
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.G.* 7.67.7
Reason for exclusion: This individual was not a Roman citizen, and therefore should not be considered to be a junior officer.

103 M. Crepereius
Catalogues: SUO: A205; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.133; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 1
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT in 69BC
Primary evidence: Cicero, *Verr.* 1.30

T. Crustidius T.f. Briso
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** C257: (1976-1977) 307-308, (1987) - , (1993) - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Saddington (1980) 20 bis (cf. Saddington (1996a) 159 n.8)
Post(s): EP(PE)
Date of post(s): EP(PE) before AD42
Primary evidence: CIL 6.3516 (Roma)
Relevant text: T. Crustidius T. f. Fab(ia) Briso / praef(ectus) equit(um) uixit ann(os) XIX / ex testamento pro parte dimidia
Reason for exclusion: Given that he died at a young age, Briso may have been advanced to the position of *praefectus equitum* by the initiative established by Augustus to promote young men of senatorial rank to positions of military importance (Suetonius, *Aug.* 38; cf. CIL 6.3516 adnot.;

Devijver (1976-1977) 307-308). He is therefore probably to be dated to the early Principate, and possibly to the Augustan period.

Curius
Catalogues: SUO: C199; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.410; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 3
Post(s): -
Date of post(s): [35BC]
Primary evidence: Appian, *B.C.* 5.137
Relevant text: καὶ ταῦτα λέγων Ἀηνόβαρβον ὅμως ἐπενόει συλλαβεῖν ἐκ προδοσίας Κουρίου τινὸς τῶν ἀμφὶ τὸν Ἀηνόβαρβον, ἐλπίζων ἐς ἀντίδοσιν αὐτοῦ μεγάλην ἕξειν μοῖραν Ἀηνόβαρβον. γνωσθείσης δ᾽οὖν τῆς προδοσίας, Κούριος μὲν ἐν τοῖς παροῦσι Ῥωμαίων ἐλεγχθεὶς ἀπέθανε, Πομπήιος δὲ Θεόδωρον ἐξελεύθερον, ὃς μόνος οἱ συνῄδει τὸ βούλευμα, ὡς ἐξειπόντα ἔκτεινεν.
Reason for exclusion: A member of Ahenobarbus' entourage who plotted with Pompeius to kill Ahenobarbus, no title is preserved for Curius. He may have been a legate or a prefect (cf. Broughton (1951-1986) 2.410), but in the absence of any further evidence, Appian's description of him as "τινὸς τῶν ἀμφὶ τὸν Ἀηνόβαρβον" should be taken as evidence that he held no formal post.

[- ?Cu]rtilius C.f. Aem(ilia)
Catalogues: SUO: A322, C286, C287, C288; **DEV:** C259: (1976-1977) 308, (1987) 1532, (1993) 2084; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 359; **RE/PIR:** RE 12.1556, 1612
Other reference works: Dobson (1978) 179 no. 28; Holder (1980) 246 no. E45
Post(s): CENT(PP), MT, IP(PCOH), EP(PE), PF
Date of post(s): CENT(PP) before AD38, MT before AD38, IP(PCOH) before AD38, EP(PE) before AD38, PF before AD38
Primary evidence: CIL 10.5583 (Fabrateria Noua, Regio 1, Italia)
Relevant text: [. ?Cu]rtilius C(ai) f(ilius) A<e=I>m(ilia) / [pr]im(us) pil(us) leg(ionis) VI praef(ectus) c(o)hortis / [.2-3.] tr(ibunus) mil(itum) praef(ectus) equit(um) praef(ectus) / [f]abr(um) IIuir q(uaestor *uel* uinquennalis) Aug(ustalis) funus / [p]ublice ex d(ecreto) d(ecurionum) Aquinatium / arbitratu / [A]nterotis et Cosmi libert(orum)
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Gaian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

104 M. Curtius Postumus
Catalogues: SUO: A222; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.225; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 26
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT in 53BC
Future career: Praetor 47 or 46BC
Primary evidence: Cicero, *ad Q.F.* 2.13.3, 3.1.10; cf. *ad Att.* 9.6.2

P. Curtius (Salassus)
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 3.79; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 10
Post(s): -
Date of post(s): [45BC]
Primary evidence: Cicero *ad Fam.* 6.18.2
Relevant text: scripserat etiam Messalla Q. Salasso P. Curtium, fratrem eius, iussu Pompei inspectante exercitu interfectum, quod consensisset cum Hispanis quibusdam, si in oppidum nescio quod Pompeius rei frumentariae causa uenisset, eum comprehendere ad Caesaremque deducere
Reason for exclusion: The brother of Q. Curtius Salassus (q.v.), P. Curtius was publicly executed by Pompeius for disloyalty. However, despite Broughton's suggestion ((1951-1986) 3.79), there is no evidence that he was a junior officer at the time.

105 Q. Curtius Salassus
Catalogues: SUO: C176; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.376-377; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 32
Post(s): MP
Date of post(s): MP in 41BC
Primary evidence: Jerome, *Chr. ad ann.* 42, p.146 Helm; cf. Dio 48.24.3, 41.4-6

T. Decidius Domitianus
Catalogues: SUO: C289; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 563; **RE/PIR:** PIR(2) 22

Post(s): CP
Date of post(s): CP after AD54
Future career: Procurator
Primary evidence: AE 1935, 5 = AE 2002, +929 (Emerita, Lusitania)
Reason for exclusion: On T. Decidius Domitianus, see T. Pompeius T.f. Trom(entina) Albinus (CIL 12.2327; AE 1935, 5).

C. Decimius
Catalogues: SUO: C149; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.303; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 2
Post(s): SEN
Date of post(s): SEN in 46BC
Future career: [Previously Quaestor before 46BC]
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.Afr*. 34.2
Reason for exclusion: This individual held a senior officer position.

Q. Decius Q.f. M.n. Saturninus
Catalogues: SUO: A394, C290; **DEV:** D4: (1976-1977) 320, (1987) 1540, (1993) 2087; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 269; **RE/PIR:** PIR(2) 27
Other reference works: Saddington (1980) 532 no. 34, (1985) 532 no. 34
Further bibliography: Eck (1979b) 491-492; Duthoy (1984-1986) 142 no. 133; Saddington (1996a) 162-163
Post(s): MT, PF
Date of post(s): MT before AD38, PF before AD38
Primary evidence: CIL 10.5393 = ILS 6286; CIL 10.5394; cf. CIL 10.5392 (Aquinum, Regio 1, Italia)
Relevant text: CIL 10.5393: Q. Decio Q. f. M. n. / Saturnino / pontif(ici) minori Romae tubicini / sacror(um) publ(icorum) p(opuli) R(omani) Quirit(ium) praef(ecto) fabr(um) co(n)s(uli) / ter curatori uiarum Labic(anae) / et Latinae / trib(uno) mil(itum) praef(ecto) fabr(um) i(ure) d(icundo) et sortiend(is) / iudicibus in Asia / IIIIuir(o) i(ure) d(icundo) Veronae / q(uaestori) bis IIuir(o) i(ure) d(icundo) IIuir(o) iter(um) quinq(uennali) praef(ecto) / quinq(uennali) Ti. Caesaris Augusti iter(um) / Drusi Caesaris Ti. f. tertio Neronis / Caesaris Germanici f. pontif(ici) flamini / Romae et diui August(i) perpetuo ex auctor(itate) / Ti. Caesaris Augusti et permissu eius / cooptato coloniae patrono / publice d(ecreto) d(ecurionum); CIL 10.5394: [Q.] Decius Q. f. M. [n. Saturninus pontif(ex) minor Romae tubicen] / sacror(um) pub(licorum) p(opuli) R(omani) Qu[irit(ium) praef(ectus) fabr(um) co(n)s(ul) ter cur(ator) uiar(um) Labic(anae) et Latin(ae) / trib(unus) mil(itum) praef(ectus) fab(rum) i(ure) d(icundo) [et sortiendis iudicibus in Asia] / ei honorem IIIIuir(i) detu[lerunt Veronenses ratione habita] / absentis eius extra or[dinem praef(ectus) quinq(uennalis) Ti. Caesaris Aug(usti)] / [ite]r(um) Drusi Caesaris Ti. [f. tertio Neronis Caesaris Germanici f.]
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Gaian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

106 Cn. Domitius
Catalogues: SUO: C114; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.271; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 11
Post(s): EP(PE)
Date of post(s): EP(PE) in 49BC
Future career: [?Previously Praetor 54BC]
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.C*. 2.42.3

107 Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus
Catalogues: SUO: C157; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.332; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 23
Post(s): NP
Date of post(s): NP in 44BC
Future career: Consul 32BC
Primary evidence: Cicero, *ad Att*. 16.4.4; cf. *Phil*. 10.13, *ad Brut*. 1.5.3, 7.2, 14.1

L. Dudistius L.f. Vol(tinia) Nouanus
Catalogues: SUO: C291; **DEV:** D36: (1976-1977) 337-338, (1987) 1545, (1993) - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** PIR(2) 204
Other reference works: Pflaum (1960-1961) 179-180 no. 82
Further bibliography: Pflaum (1978) 220-221 no. 15; Thomasson (1984) 65 no. 3

Post(s): EP(PA)
Date of post(s): EP(PA) after AD64
Future career: Procurator
Primary evidence: CIL 12.408 = ILS 1392 (Massilia, Gallia Narbonensis)
Relevant text: L. Dutistio L. f. Vol(tinia) / Nouano / pontif(ici) Laurentinorum / orn(amentis) flamin(atus) colon(iae) Aquens(is) / exorn(ato) praef(ecto) alae Hispanae / adiutori adcensus prouin<c=O>(iae) / Lugudunens(is) proc(uratori) Aug(usti) Alpium / Cottiar(um) Dudisti(us) Eglectus et / Apthonetus patrono optumo
Reason for exclusion: Probably originally from Aquae Sextiae (on the basis of his voting tribe and of the place where he received local honours (PIR(2) 204; Pflaum (1960-1961) 179, (1978) 221)) Dudistius was a cavalry prefect and later a procurator. As his procuratorship must have taken place after AD64, when the Alpes Cottiae were annexed, it is highly unlikely that Dudistius was a junior officer in the Augustan period, and his career is generally dated to the end of the first century (Devijver (1976-1977) 338; Pflaum (1960-1961) 179-180, (1978) 221); Thomasson (1984) 65).

Dumnorix
Catalogues: SUO: C83; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 1
Post(s): -
Date of post(s): [58BC]
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.G.* 1.18.10
Reason for exclusion: This individual was not a Roman citizen, and therefore should not be considered to be a junior officer.

108 Cn. Dupilius Cn. f. Hor(atia)
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** D37: (1976-1977) 338, (1987) 1545, (1993) 2092; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 24; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before 31BC
Primary evidence: CIL 14.2169 = ILS 6193 (Aricia, Regio 1, Italia)

109 L. Eggius
Catalogues: SUO: C242; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 114; **RE/PIR:** RE 1; PIR(2) 4
Other reference works: Saddington (1996b) 247 no. 6
Post(s): IP(PCAST)
Date of post(s): IP(PCAST) in AD9
Primary evidence: Velleius 2.119.4
Relevant text: At e praefectis castrorum duobus quam clarum exemplum L. Eggius, tam turpe Ceionius prodidit, qui, cum longe maximam partem absumpsisset acies, auctor deditionis supplicio quam proelio mori maluit
Note: Eggius is one of three *praefecti castrorum* known from Velleius' account of the aftermath of the defeat of Quinctilius Varus (for the other two, cf. L. Caedicius and Ceionius). Of the three, it is Caedicius, in command of a fortress in the rear, whose role is most clearly defined: he was in independent command of a garrison protecting the Roman advance, and possibly providing winter quarters for one of the legions (Syme (1932) 111). Eggius and Ceionius' roles are obscured by their use as rhetorical opposites by Velleius, and it may be that they were with the main force, or that they were also in command of fortresses or (possibly) erecting encampments on the route of march (cf. Syme (1932) 110ff.). Nothing direct is known of their origins, although they were probably Italian (cf. Demougin (1992) 118; cf. Dobson (1978) 129).

110 Egnatius
Catalogues: SUO: C92; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.232; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 5
Post(s): ?EP
Date of post(s): ?EP in 53BC
Primary evidence: Plutarch, Crassus 27.8; cf. 27.6-7

Egnatius Caluinus
Catalogues: SUO: C292; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 732; **RE/PIR:** PIR(2) 16
Other reference works: Pflaum (1960-1961) 1047; Saddington (1987) 272 no. 28
Post(s): MP(GC)

Date of post(s): MP(GC) before AD68
Primary evidence: Pliny, *N.H.* 10.134

111 M'. Ennius
Catalogues: SUO: C238, C293; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 200; **RE/PIR:** PIR(2) 62
Other reference works: Dobson (1978) 172-173 no. 13; Saddington (1996b) 247 no. 13
Post(s): IP(PCAST)|MP(GC), IP(PCAST)
Date of post(s): IP(PCAST)|MP(GC) in AD8, IP(PCAST) in AD14
Primary evidence: Dio 55.33.2; Tacitus, *Ann.* 1.38.2
Relevant text: Dio 55.33.2 (AD8): καὶ Σκενόβαρδός τέ τις προσποιησάμενος μεταστήσεσθαι, καὶ πέμψας κατ᾽αὐτὸ τοῦτο πρὸς Μάνιον Ἔννιον φρούραρχον Σισκίας; Tacitus, *Ann.* 1.38.2 (AD14): iusserat id M'. Ennius castrorum praefectus, bono magis exemplo quam concesso iure. deinde intumescente motu profugus repertusque, postquam intutae latebrae, praesidium ab audacia mutuatur: non praefectum ab iis, sed Germanicum ducem, sed Tiberium imperatorem uiolari. simul exterritis qui obstiterant, raptum uexillum ad ripam uertit, et si quis agmine decessisset, pro desertore fore clamitans, reduxit in hiberna turbidos et nihil ausos.
Note: As Dobson remarks, Ennius' position in AD8 in command of Siscia is unclear (Dobson (1978) 173; cf. Demougin (1992) 176-177). The term φρούραρχος does not translate precisely to any formal Roman position, and the standard translation of 'garrison commander' (LSJM, sv. φρουραρχέω) allows for both the positions of *praefectus castrorum* and the position of a prefect in charge of a garrison. Given the diplomatic overtures made to him, as well as his subsequent position as *praefectus castrorum*, it is more likely that he was a *praefectus castrorum* at the time, performing a similar role to that of Aufidienus Rufus in AD14 (Saddington (1996b) 247; cf. Aufidienus Rufus (Tacitus, *Ann.* 1.20)). Dobson suggests that he may have been a*primipilus* who was in charge of the legionary camp (Dobson (1978) 172, 173). His position in AD14, as *praefectus castrorum*, is certain, and while this might suggest an earlier centurionate career, this does not mean that he was a centurion or a*primipilus* in AD8. In both cases, it is clear that he was trusted with a considerable amount of independence in the conduct of his duties, as he appears to have been the senior Roman officer present on both occasions. Following the modern consensus, the reading of "M'. Ennius" for "Mennius" in the manuscript of Tacitus is accepted here (PIR(2) E62; Suolahti (1955) 359; Dobson (1978) 173; Demougin (1992) 176-177).

112 C. Ennius C.f. Vol(tinia) Marsus
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** E11: (1976-1977) 345-346, (1987) 1548-1549, (1993) 2094; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: van Wonterghem (1982) 120; Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 87; Gaggiotti (1991) 495-500
Post(s): MT, PF
Date of post(s): MT after AD6, PF after AD6
Primary evidence: AE 1930, 121 = AE 1950 +145; Gaggiotti (1991) 500 (Beneuentum, Regio 2, Italia)

Eros
Catalogues: SUO: C295; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** PIR 86; PIR(2) 86
Post(s): -
Date of post(s): [before AD15]
Future career: ?Procurator
Primary evidence: Plutarch, *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* p.207 B
Relevant text: Ἀκούσας δὲ ὅτι Ἔρως ὁ τὰ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ διοικῶν ὄρτυγα τὸν κρατοῦντα πάντων ἐν τῷ μάχεσθαι καὶ ἀήττητον ὄντα πριάμενος ὀπτήσας κατέφαγε, μετεπέμψατο αὐτὸν καὶ ἀνέκρινεν· ὁμολογήσαντα δ᾽ἐκέλευσεν ἱστῷ νηὸς προσηλωθῆναι.
Reason for exclusion: Eros may, despite this somewhat fantastical anecdote, have been a real person and a procurator in Egypt, but there is no evidence that he was a junior officer.

113 Erucius
Catalogues: SUO: A182; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.55; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 1
Post(s): MP(GC)|MP|MT
Date of post(s): MP(GC)|MP|MT in 86BC
Primary evidence: Plutarch, *Sulla* 16.8, 18.1; cf. 17.6-7, 18.1
Note: On Erucius, cf. A. Gabinius

Q. Etuuius Sex.f. Volt(inia) Capreolus
Catalogues: SUO: C296; **DEV:** E14: (1976-1977) 346-347, (1987) 1549-1550, (1993) 2095; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 12.1362-1363, 1558
Other reference works: Saddington (1980) 58 no. 77 ter
Further bibliography: Alföldy (1968) 213 no. 155; Bogaers (1974) 449; Dusanic (1978) 472-475, (1982) 155, 156 n.20; Pflaum (1978) 213 no. 4; Reusser (1985) 127ff. no. 7, fig. 8; Brusin (1991-1993) 915; Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 90 n.174; Saddington (1996a) 159
Post(s): IP(PCOH)
Date of post(s): IP(PCOH) circa AD52
Primary evidence: AE 1902, 41 = ILS 9090 = Brusin (1991-1993) (Inscr.Aqu.) 915 no. 2744 (Aquileia, Regio 10, Italia)

114 Fabia[nus(?) - - - S]ab(atina) M.f.
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - : (1976-1977) - , (1987) - , (1993) 2113; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 35; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 82-83 n.124
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before 28BC
Primary evidence: AE 1931, 95 (Scansano, Regio 7, Italia)

Fabius
Catalogues: SUO: C159, C166; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.356, 367; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 3, cf. 100
Further bibliography: Tibiletti (1953) 79
Post(s): SEN|LEG|MP(GC)
Date of post(s): SEN|LEG|MP(GC) in 43BC, SEN|LEG|MP(GC) in 42BC
Primary evidence: Josephus, *A.J.* 14.295, cf. 297; cf. *B.J.* 1.236, 239
Relevant text: *A.J.* 14.295: Ἡρώδης δὲ παρὰ Φάβιον ἐπορεύετο ἐν Δαμασκῷ στρατηγοῦντα, καὶ βουλόμενος προσδραμεῖν πρὸς τὸν ἀδελφὸν ὑπὸ νόσου κωλύεται
Reason for exclusion: The commander of Damascus under Cassius, Fabius' role is paralleled by an (unknown) commander at Antioch (cf. Cicero, *ad Fam.* 12.15.7) and by Helix in Jerusalem (cf. Helix). His rank is unclear, and he may have been a legate: the title given by Josephus, "στρατηγός" (Josephus, *B.J.* 1.236), suggests that he was of high rank, but it is too generic a term to allow certainty.

115 C. Fabricius C.f. Ani(ensi) Tuscus
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** F18: (1976-1977) 335-336, (1987) 1555, (1993) 2099; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 216; **RE/PIR:** PIR 18; PIR(2) 80
Other reference works: Dobson (1966) 78 n.58; Devijver (1975) 58-59 no. 52 bis, (1986) 122 no. 41; Holder (1980) 243 no. E10; Saddington (1980) 30 no. 11, (1985) 530 no. 12
Further bibliography: Saddington (2003) 22-23
Post(s): IP(PCOH), MT, PF, EP(PEA)
Date of post(s): IP(PCOH) before AD15, MT before AD15, PF before AD15, EP(PEA) before AD15
Primary evidence: AE 1973, 501 = AE 1975, 806 = AE 1978, 790 = Ricl (1997) (IK-53) 34 (Alexandreia Troas, Asia)
Relevant text: C. Fabricio C. f. / Ani(ensi) Tusco IIuir(o) augur(i) / praef(ecto) cohort(is) Apulae et / operum quae in colonia iussu / Augusti facta sunt trib(uno) mil(itum) leg(ionis) III / Cyr(enaicae) VIII trib(uno) dilectus ingenuorum / quem Romae habuit Augustus et / Ti. Caesar praef(ecto) fabr(um) IIII praef(ecto) equit(um) / alae praet(oriae) IIII hasta pura et corona / aurea donatus est a Germanico / Caesare Imp(eratore) bello Germanico / d(ecreto) d(ecurionum)
Note: Fabricius Tuscus began his military career in command of the *cohors Apula*. This *cohors* is also known from an inscription at Side (Bean (1965) 155), naming a L. Saluius L.f. Ser(gia), and it was stationed in or near Alexandreia Troas in the Augustan period (Brunt (1974) 180; Saddington (1982) 82; Demougin (1992) 190). That he commanded the *cohors* as a *praefectus* and not as tribune should not cause great surprise: formally organised citizen cohorts were a new phenomenon, and too much should not be read into the title given to their commanding officer - it is worth noting that a commander of a similar cohort, the *cohors Lusitanorum*, was also a *praefectus cohortis* (M. Sufenas Proculus (AE 1978, 830)), and that the *cohortes classicae* (raised in 28BC) were also commanded by *praefecti* (Speidel (1976) 340-341, 345). While commanding this *cohors*, he was sent on Augustus' orders to oversee some work in

Alexandreia Troas itself - whether or not members of his cohort were also sent is unclear (cf. Saddington (1982) 57; Ricl (1997) 67). He then served for eight years as a military tribune in Egypt, an unusually long time to serve in such a post (Brunt (1974) 173; Ricl (1997) 67), but, interestingly, paralleled by another officer from Alexandreia Troas (cf. T. Iunius D.f. Ani(ensi) Montanus (AE 1938, 173 = AE 1939, +261 = AE 1992, 687 = EDH HD022326)). His role as a *tribunus dilectus* is unlikely in itself to have been a formal post, as no such equivalent post is known, and it is more likely that as a military tribune he had some role in overseeing the enlistment of a number of Roman citizens (whether they were conscripts or not, cf. Brunt (1974) 184): certainly the historical links between such a role and the role of the military tribunes in the *dilectus* of Polybius (cf. ch. 3) are rather interesting. Following this, he was a *praefectus fabrum* for four years, again an unusually long tenure, and then the commander of an *ala* of cavalry; given the nature of the title (*praefectus equitum alae* is an extremely rare formula, and the praetorian cohorts were not *alae*), it is likely that he was in charge of the *ala praetoria* known from CIL 6.41050, probably stationed in Germany (cf. [- - -] (CIL 6.41050) (1); cf. Spaul (1994) 187), although it is possible that the unit represents the personal bodyguard of a legion, or army, commander (Brunt (1974) 184; Speidel (1975) 165; Saddington (1982) 57). He was awarded *hasta pura* and *corona aurea* by Germanicus, both standard military honours for equestrian officers (cf. Maxfield (1981) 161). How do we date his career? His role in overseeing the dilectus in Rome has to have taken place in either AD6 or AD9-10, as such levies were rare (Brunt (1974) 161; on *dilectus libertinorum*, implied by the inscription, cf. Dio 55.31.1; Pliny, *N.H.* 7.149; Velleius 2.111.1; Suetonius, *Aug.* 25). If it was the former (Brunt (1974) 182; Demougin (1992) 190), then (assuming that he held all of his posts successively) he would have been *praefectus fabrum* from AD7 to AD10, and then *praefectus equitum* from AD11 to AD14. As the inscription does not name Augustus as *diuus*, this might, as Brunt argues, suggest that the inscription dates from before AD14 (Brunt (1974) 174). However, as Brunt and Orth point out (Brunt (1974) 185; Orth (1978) 58; cf. Ricl (1997) 67), 'Caesar' is also missing from Augustus' name, and there are a number of inscriptions known from the early part of Tiberius' reign which do not name Augustus as *diuus* - probably because they refer to titles held while Augustus was alive. Moreover, as Orth argues, Fabricius is unlikely to have received military honours during the German campaigns, and a better date for his donatives would be AD17 (Orth (1978) 59), which would mean that he was *praefectus equitum* from AD14 to AD17, *praefectus fabrum* from AD10 to AD13, and involved in the *dilectus* of AD9-10. Both chronologies assume that he served continuously in the army without a break, which may not have been the case. A native of Alexandreia Troas (Brunt (1974) 173; Demougin (1992) 190), he may have been the Fabricius Tuscus of Pliny, but this, as Brunt argues, cannot be proven (Pliny, *N.H.* Ind. I, III, IV, VI; cf. Brunt (1974) 173; Devijver (1976-1977) 356; Saddington (2003) 22).

116 Facundus
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** F102 - F103: (1976-1977) 393, (1987) 1571, (1993) 2113-2114; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 208; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Devijver (1975) 119 nos 3-4; Saddington (1980) 28 no. iv
Post(s): IP(PCOH)
Date of post(s): IP(PCOH) in AD14
Primary evidence: IGR 1.1366 = Ruppel, *Dakke* no. 54 (Pselkis, Aegyptus); IGR 1.1249 = I.Koptos 133 (Foakhir, Aegyptus)
Note: On Facundus, cf. M. Florus (IGR 1.1250).

L. Fannius C.f. Tro(mentina)
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** F23: (1976-1977) 356, (1987) - , (1993) 2100; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 80
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD42
Primary evidence: CIL 9.2647 (Aesernia, Regio 4, Italia)
Relevant text: L. Fannio C. f. / Tro(mentina) IIIIuir(o) i(ure) d(icundo) / iter(um) quinq(uennali) tr(ibuno) / mil(itum) patri
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Claudian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

P. Fannius M.f.
Catalogues: SUO: C297; **DEV:** F24: (1976-1977) 357-358, (1987) 1555, (1993) 2100; **BRO:** -

; **DEM:** 362; **RE/PIR:** RE 12.1362-1363
Other reference works: Dobson (1978) 179 no. 29; Holder (1980) 246 no. E46
Post(s): CENT(PP), EP(PE)
Date of post(s): CENT(PP) before AD42, EP(PE) before AD42
Primary evidence: CIL 5.3366 (Arusnates, Regio 10, Italia)
Relevant text: P. Fannius M. f. / prim(us) pil(us) leg(ionis) VI / praef(ectus) equit(um) IIIIuir i(ure) d(icundo) / Annia P. f. Auillia uxo[r]
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Claudian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

C. Felginas
Catalogues: SUO: A241; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 6.2162
Post(s): -
Date of post(s): [48BC]
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.C.* 3.71
Relevant text: Duobus his unius diei proeliis Caesar desiderauit milites DCCCCLX et notos equites Romanos Tuticanum Gallum, senatoris filium, C. Felginatem Placentia, A. Granium Puteolis, M. Sacratiuirum Capua, tribunos militum <et> centuriones XXXII
Reason for exclusion: Given that Felginas, Tuticanus Gallus, Granius, and Sacratiuir are explicitly named as equestrians, in contrast to the military tribunes and centurions immediately following, they were probably not junior officers (cf. Tuticanus Gallus, A. Granius, M. Sacratiuir).

117 M. Feridius
Catalogues: SUO: A259; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.375; **DEM:** 8; **RE/PIR:** RE 1
Further bibliography: Nicolet (1974) 2.876 no 142. Demougin (1992) 27 no. 8
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT in 41BC
Primary evidence: CIL 11.6721 no. 25 = ILLRP 1115 (Perusia, Regio 7, Italia); cf. Cicero, *ad Fam.* 8.9.4

118 L. Firmius L.f.
Catalogues: SUO: A270; **DEV:** F26: (1976-1977) 358-359, (1987) 1555, (1993) 2100; **BRO:** 3.91; **DEM:** 12; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Dobson (1978) 165 no. 1; Saddington (1999) 306 no. 9
Further bibliography: Syme (1939) 353-354; Nicolet (1974) 878 no. 145; Keppie (1983) 26-27, 109, 136; Wierschowski (1986) 288 no. 1; Demougin (1988) 589
Post(s): CENT(PP), MT
Date of post(s): CENT(PP) before 29BC, MT before 29BC
Primary evidence: CIL 10.5713 = ILLRP 498a = ILS 2226 (Sura, Regio 1, Italia)

119 C. Flacc[inius? C.]f. C[.n.] Flaccus
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** F27: (1976-1977) 359, (1987) 1556, (1993) 2100; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 150; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD15
Primary evidence: AE 1975, 246 = Mello and Voza (1968) (I.Paestum) 105 no. 68 = EDH HD009321; = AE 1996, 471 (Paestum, Regio 3, Italia)
Relevant text: C. Flacc[inio? *uel* eius? C.] f. C[. n. Maec(ia)] / Flacco tr(ibuno) mil(itum) II[IIuir(o)] / quinquen(nali) patr[ono] / municipi(i)
Note: It is difficult to be certain which municipal magistracy Flaccus held before becoming *quinquennalis*. If it was the quattuorvirate, then he is likely to date to the Augustan period; the lack of unit identification also lends weight to this suggestion (Mello and Voza (1968) 105; AE 1975, 246 adnot.; Devijver (1976-1977) 359; Demougin (1992) 145 (corrigendum); Torelli (1996) 166). On his cognomen, see Torelli ((1996) 166).

120 [?Flaminius] Flamma
Catalogues: SUO: C115; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.271; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 8
Post(s): NP
Date of post(s): NP in 49BC
Primary evidence: Appian, *B.C.* 2.46; cf. Cicero, *ad Att.* 12.52.1, 14.16.4; Caesar, *B.C.* 2.43

L. Flaminius L.f. Hister
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** F29: (1976-1977) 359-360, (1987) 1556, (1993) 2100-2101; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 151; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD42
Primary evidence: CIL 5.913 = Inscr.Aqu. 1.63 (Aquileia, Regio 10, Italia)
Relevant text: L. Flaminius L. f. / Hister aug(ur) tr(ibunus) mil(itum) / Titia P. f. uxsor / Babullia T. f. mater / Q. Flaminius L. f. / Hister tr(ibunus) mil(itum) / Sex. Flaminius L. f. / Hister tr(ibunus) mil(itum)
Reason for exclusion: This inscription records three Flaminii, either brothers or a father with two sons. The inscription can be dated to the early imperial period by letter-forms, while the lack of unit identifiers and the lack of a voting tribe suggest a pre-Claudian date, but it is not possible to be more precise (Devijver (1976-1977) 360; Demougin (1992) 145-146). Despite the arguments of Bandelli, the letter-forms alone are not enough to establish a Triumviral date (Bandelli (1983) 199).

Q. Flaminius L.f. Hister
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** F30: (1976-1977) 360, (1987) 1556, (1993) 2101; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 152; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD42
Primary evidence: CIL 5.913 = Inscr.Aqu. 1.63 (Aquileia, Regio 10, Italia)
Reason for exclusion: On Q. Flaminius L.f. Hister, see L. Flaminius L.f. Hister (CIL 5.913).

Sex. Flaminius L.f. Hister
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** F31: (1976-1977) 360, (1987) 1556, (1993) 2101; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 153; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD42
Primary evidence: CIL 5.913 = Inscr.Aqu. 1.63 (Aquileia, Regio 10, Italia)
Reason for exclusion: On Sex. Flaminius L.f. Hister, see L. Flaminius L.f. Hister (CIL 5.913).

121 C. Flauius
Catalogues: SUO: C167; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.367; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 11
Other reference works: Saddington (1985) 529 no. 2; Welch (1995) 143 no. xv; Badian (1997) 8-9 no. xv
Post(s): PF
Date of post(s): PF in 42BC
Primary evidence: Plutarch, *Brut*. 51.2

122 C. Flauius Fimbria
Catalogues: SUO: C64, C67; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.49, 3.92; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 88
Post(s): EP(PE), LEG|EP(PE)
Date of post(s): EP(PE) in 87BC, LEG|EP(PE) in 85BC
Primary evidence: 87BC: Livy, *Per*. 80; 85BC: Florus 2.9.14; Velleius 2.24.1

123 Flauius Gallus
Catalogues: SUO: A263; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.404; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 94
Post(s): MP
Date of post(s): MP in 36BC
Primary evidence: Plutarch, *Ant*. 42-43

124 M. Florus
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** F110 - F111: (1976-1977) 396-397, (1987) 1572-1573, (1993) 2114; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 121; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Devijver (1975) 119-120 no. 5-6; Saddington (1980) 28 no. iii
Further bibliography: Birley (1961) 128ff.; Speidel (1976) 512-515; Daris (1988) 757; Spaul (2000) 445
Post(s): IP(PCOH)
Date of post(s): IP(PCOH) in AD11

Primary evidence: IGR 1.1250 (Wadi Hammamat, Aegyptus); cf. AE 1910, 207 = SEG 20.670 = SB 10173 (Wadi Semna, Aegyptus)
Relevant text: IGR 1.1250: Λουκεῖος / Καικέλιος / Σωκράτης σπί/ρης Μά/ρκου Φρώ/ρου κεν/τυρεία/ς Μόμμου; AE 1910, 207: ἔτους μ′ Καίσαρος, Παῦνι α′· / ἀγαθῇ τύχηι· ἐπεὶ {ἐπὶ} Ποπλίου / Ἰουεντίου Ῥούφου χιλιάρ/χου τῆς τερτιανῆς λε/γεῶν(ος) καὶ ἐπάρχου Βερνίκη/ς καὶ ἀρχιμεταλλάρχου / τῆς ζμαράγδου καὶ βα/ζίου καὶ μαργαρίτου καὶ / πάντων τῶν μετάλλων / τῆς Αἰγύπτου, ἀνέθηκε / ἐν τῶι Ὀφιάτηι ἱερὸν / Πανὶ θεῶι μεγίστωι / καὶ αὐτῶι Ποπλίωι Ἰουεντίω̣ [ι] / Ἀγαθόποδι ἀπελευθέρ[ωι αὐ]/τοῦ καὶ ἐπιτρόπωι καὶ προ/νοητοῦ καὶ εὐεργέτηι / πάντων τῶν μετάλλων / τῆς Αἰγύπτου // τὸ προσκύνημα Θολεμαί/ου κουράτορος σπίρης Φλώ/ρου κεντυρίας Βάσσου ὁ καὶ / ἐπιστήσας // τὸ [προσ]/κύν[ημ]/α Μ[έρσι] / καὶ [Σω]/τῆ[ρος] / ἀμφ[ο]/τέρ[ων] / ἀρχι[τε]/κτόν[ων] / οἱ καὶ [ἐπι]/στήσ[αν]/τες τὸ / ἔργον
Note: The eponymous commander of a cohort of auxiliary troops (Speidel (1977) 514; cf. Demougin (1992) 126; contra, Lesquier (1918) 530), M. Florus was, given the use of the genitive, probably in command of his unit at the time the inscriptions were set up (Speidel (1977) 514-515). That cohorts were often named after their commanders in the early Principate is a well established principle (cf. Fink (1953) 210ff.; Birley (1961) 128ff.), and Florus was the first of three men so named in inscriptions from Wadi Hammamat, the other two being Facundus in AD14 (IGR 1.1366, 1249; cf. Facundus (IGR 1.1366); Speidel (1976) 512; Demougin (1992) 183) and Niger in AD15-18 (cf. Niger (?Camerensis) (IGR 1.1236); Speidel (1977) 512; Demougin (1992) 194-195), and these three would appear to be successive commanders of the same cohort, responsible for garrisoning the Eastern desert (cf. Speidel (1977) 512). More evidence is required to prove, as Speidel argues (Speidel (1977) 515), that auxiliary units were named after their commaning officer at the time, until, when the practice ended, they sometimes took the names of their last commander as their permanent names. It does, however, demonstrate that infantry as well as cavalry units could take the names of their commanders (cf. Cheesman (1914) 24, 45). The infantry cohort in question may have become either the cohors I Thebaeorum, or possibly the cohors II Ituraeorum (Speidel (1977) 515; Daris (1988) 757; Demougin (1992) 126; Spaul (2000) 445). On P. Iuuentius Rufus, cf. P. Iuuentius Rufus (AE 1910, 207).

125 A. Fonteius
Catalogues: SUO: A248; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.299; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 5
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT in 46BC
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.Afr*. 54.4

126 Q. Fufidius Q.f.
Catalogues: SUO: A229, A231; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.243, 2.252; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 7
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT in 51BC, MT in 50BC
Primary evidence: Cicero, *ad Fam*. 13.12.1, cf. 13.11

127 L. Fuluius L.f. Lesso
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** F93: (1976-1977) 388, (1987) 1568, (1993) 2111; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 154; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Saddington (1999) 308 no. 20
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD15
Primary evidence: CIL 2.14.336 = CIL 2.3852 = ELST 46 (Saguntum, Hispania citerior)

128 Fuluius Postumus
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 3.95; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 103
Post(s): ?MP
Date of post(s): ?MP before 48BC
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.C*. 3.52.4
Relevant text: ad eas munitiones Caesar Lentulum Marcellinum quaestorem cum legione VIIII positum habebat. huic, quod ualetudine minus commoda utebatur, Fuluium Postumum adiutorem submiserat.
Note: Given that he may have had to command troops in the event of Lentulus Marcellinus' being

too ill to do so, it is likely that Fuluius Postumus held a formal position, probably a military prefecture (cf. Broughton (1951-1986) 3.95).

129 C. Fundili(us) C.f. Q[ui(rina)])
Catalogues: SUO: A171; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.35; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 1
Further bibliography: Cichorius (1922) 153-154 no. 21; Criniti (1970) 120-121
Post(s): ?MT
Date of post(s): ?MT in 89BC
Primary evidence: Criniti (1970) 16-26 = CIL 6.37045 = CIL 1.709 = CIL 16, p.145 = ILLRP 515 = ILS 8888 = AE 1909, 30 = AE 1910, +126 = AE 1910, +153 = AE 1910, +162 = AE 1910, 207 = AE 1910, 218 = AE 1911, 126 = AE 1912, +10 = AE 1912, +117 = AE 1912, +287 = AE 1920, +130 = AE 1923, +103 = AE 2003, +831 = EDH HD019742 (Roma)
Note: See the discussion of *consilia* in ch. 1.

130 A. Gabinius
Catalogues: SUO: A183; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.55, 3.97; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 10
Further bibliography: Tibiletti (1953) 76; Badian (1959) 87ff.
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT in 86BC
Future career: Consul 58BC
Primary evidence: Plutarch, *Sull*. 16.8, 18.1; cf. 17.6-7, 18.1
Relevant text: 16.8: ἐπεὶ δὲ ἀποκρουσθεὶς ἐκεῖθεν ὁ Ἀρχέλαος ὥρμησεν ἐπὶ τὴν Χαιρώνειαν, οἱ δὲ συστρατευσάμενοι τῶν Χαιρωνέων ἐδέοντο τοῦ Σύλλα μὴ προέσθαι τὴν πόλιν, ἐκπέμπει τῶν χιλιάρχων ἕνα Γαβίνιον μετὰ τάγματος ἑνὸς καὶ τοὺς Χαιρωνεῖς ἀφίησι, βουληθέντας μέν, οὐ μὴν δυνηθέντας φθῆναι τὸν Γαβίνιον. οὕτως ἦν ἀγαθὸς καὶ προθυμότερος εἰς τὸ σῶσαι τῶν σωθῆναι δεομένων. ὁ δὲ Ἰόβας οὐ Γαβίνιόν φησι πεμφθῆναι, ἀλλὰ Ἐρίκιον. ἡ μὲν οὖν πόλις ἡμῶν παρὰ τοσοῦτον ἐξέφυγε τὸν κίνδυνον; 18.1: Ἐν δὲ τούτῳ τῶν Χαιρωνέων Ἐρίκιον ἄρχοντα παρὰ τοῦ Σύλλα λαβόντων καὶ περιελθόντων ἀδήλως τὸ Θούριον, εἶτα ἐπιφανέντων, θόρυβος ἦν πολὺς καὶ φυγὴ τῶν βαρβάρων καὶ φόνος ὑπ’ἀλλήλων ὁ πλεῖστος.
Note: A military tribune appointed by Sulla to garrison Chaeroneia - Plutarch's home town - with a legion, Gabinius later greeted Sulla with a laurel wreath. Plutarch adds, however, that, according to Juba, it was not Gabinius but Erucius (cf. Erucius) who was sent to garrison the town. If so, then Erucius' rank is uncertain. He may, like Gabinius, have been a military tribune. According to Plutarch, Erucius was subsequently placed in charge of the Chaeroneians themselves, rather than the town, which suggests that he may have been a prefect. Given that this is an account of a series of engagements that took place near his home town, Plutarch's own account may be preferable. Plutarch also remarks that Gabinius praised the men under his command for their courage and trustworthiness (Plutarch, *Sull*. 17.7). He was later used by Sulla as an envoy to Murena in 81BC (on his later senatorial career, cf. Badian (1959) 87ff.; Broughton (1951-1987) 3.97).

131 C. Gallonius
Catalogues: SUO: C116; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.270; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 1
Further bibliography: Tibiletti (1953) 77
Post(s): MP(GC)
Date of post(s): MP(GC) in 49BC
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.C*. 2.18.2; cf. 2.20.2-3

L. Gauius
Catalogues: SUO: C110; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.254; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 3
Further bibliography: Tibiletti (1953) 77
Post(s): CP
Date of post(s): CP in 50BC
Primary evidence: Cicero, *ad Att*. 6.1.4, 6.3.6
Relevant text: *ad Att*. 6.1.4: ego tamen quas per te Bruto promiseram praefecturas, M. Scaptio, L. Gauio, qui in regno rem Bruti procurabant, detuli; nec enim in prouincia mea negotiabantur. tu autem meministi nos sic agere ut quot uellet praefecturas sumeret, dum ne negotiatori. itaque duas ei praeterea dederam. sed ii quibus petierat de prouincia decesserant; *ad Att*. 6.3.6: Gauius est quidam cui cum praefecturam detulissem Bruti rogatu multa et dixit et fecit cum quadam mea contumelia, P. Clodi canis. is me nec proficiscentem Apameam prosecutus est nec, cum postea in

castra uenisset atque inde discederet, num quid uellem rogauit et fuit aperte mihi nescio qua re non amicus. hunc ego si in praefectis habuissem, quem tu me hominem putares? qui, ut scis, potentissimorum hominum contumaciam numquam tulerim, ferrem huius adseculae? etsi hoc plus est quam ferre, tribuere etiam aliquid benefici et honoris. is igitur Gauius, cum Apameae me nuper uidisset Romam proficiscens, me ita appellauit Culleolum uix auderem, 'Vnde' inquit me 'iubes petere cibaria praefecti?' respondi lenius quam putabant oportuisse qui aderant me non instituisse iis dare cibaria quorum opera non essem usus. abiit iratus.
Reason for exclusion: An agent of M. Brutus in Cilicia, there is no evidence that Gauius held a military prefecture.

132 Q. Gau[i]us A.f. Aqui[l]a
Catalogues: SUO: A325; **DEV:** G5: (1976-1977) 401-402, (1987) - , (1993) 2116; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 156; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Nicolet (1967) 33 no. 1
Further bibliography: Brusin (1991-1993) 978
Post(s): MT(AP)
Date of post(s): MT(AP) before AD15
Primary evidence: Brusin (1991-1993) (Inscr.Aqu.) 978-979 no. 2859 = CIL 5.916 (Aquileia, Regio 10, Italia)

133 Q. Gauius T.f. Cla(udia) Pedo
Catalogues: SUO: A326, C300, C301; **DEV:** G10: (1976-1977) 405, (1987) 1578, (1993) 2117; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 157; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Nicolet (1967) 37 no. 7; Holder (1980) 243 no. E13; Saddington (1985) 531 no. 25
Further bibliography: Dobson (1966) 71-72; Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 80-81; Segenni (1992) 58; Saddington (1996a) 162
Post(s): MT(AP), PF, EP(PE)
Date of post(s): MT(AP) before AD15, PF before AD15, EP(PE) before AD15
Primary evidence: CIL 9.4519 = ILS 6545 (Amiternum, Regio 4, Italia)

P. Gessius P.f. Rom(ilia)
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; (1976) - , (1987) - , (1993) 2118; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Devijver and Van Wonterghem (1990) 65-66 Fig. 3; Kockel (1993) 155-157 (J1); Keppie (1997) 4-5
Post(s): CENT
Date of post(s): CENT circa 35BC
Primary evidence: CIL 1.3356a = ILLRP 503 = AE 2001, +76 (Ferentinum, Regio 7, Italia)
Relevant text: Ex testam(ento) / P. Gessi P. l. / Primi // Gessia P. l. Fausta P. Gessius P. f. Rom(ilia) P. Gessius P. l. Primus // arbit[ratu] / Gessia[e P. l.] / Fausta[e]
Reason for exclusion: Gessius is known from a relief generally dated to the first half of the first century BC which depicts him in military dress (Devijver and Van Wonterghem (1990) 65-66; Devijver (1993) 2118; Kockel (1993) 155-157 (J1); Keppie (1997) 4-5). However, Keppie's analysis of the relief strongly suggests that Gessius is depicted wearing not an officer's cuirass (cf. Devijver and Van Wonterghem (1990) 65-66) but the mailed shirt of a centurion (Keppie (1997) 4-5), and should therefore not be considered a junior officer.

134 [- - - Ca]m(ilia) Glabeo
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Antolini (2000) 254
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD15
Primary evidence: AE 2000, 538 = Antolini (2000) 353-354 no. 1 (Supp.It. 18.S.1) (Suassa, Regio 6, Italia)

A. Granius
Catalogues: SUO: A242; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 2
Post(s): -
Date of post(s): [48BC]

Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.C.* 3.71
Reason for exclusion: On A. Granius, cf. C. Felginas.

M. Granius M.f. M.n. Cordus
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** G23: (1976-1977) 410, (1987) 1580, (1993) 2119; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 502; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Dobson (1966) 72-73; Holder (1980) 243 no. E14
Further bibliography: Torelli (1982) 179; Parma (1990) 110
Post(s): MT, EP(PE), PF
Date of post(s): MT before AD42, EP(PE) before AD42, PF before AD42
Primary evidence: AE 1990, 223b = EDH HD016323; CIL 9.2353 = ILS 6513 (Allifae, Regio 4, Italia)
Relevant text: AE 1990, 223b: Flauoniae L. f. Pollae / Cordus uxori / M. Granius M. f. M. n. Cordus trib(unus) mil(itum) / [praef(ectus) eq(uitum) praef(ectus) fab]r(um) IIuir quinq(uennalis) iter(um) / [aed(ilis) q(uaestor) curat(or) aqu]ae ducend(ae) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum); CIL 9.2353: M. Granio M. f. / M. n. Cordo frat(ri) / tr(ibuno) mil(itum) praef(ecto) equit(um) / praef(ecto) fabr(um) IIuiro / ter quinq(uennali) aed(ili) q(uaestori) cur(atori) / aquae ducendae Allifis / d(ecreto) d(ecurionum) // Oppidiae / C. f. Rufae / matri
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Claudian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

135 Q. Granius M.f. Labeo
Catalogues: SUO: A327; **DEV:** G25: (1976-1977) 411, (1987) - , (1993) 2119; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 158; **RE/PIR:** RE 12.1503, 1530
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD15
Primary evidence: CIL 6.3521 (Roma)

Gratus
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** PIR(2) 22
Other reference works: Saddington (1980) 29 no. 4
Post(s): -
Date of post(s): [4BC]
Primary evidence: Josephus, *B.J.* 2.52; cf. *A.J.* 17.294, *B.J.* 2.74
Reason for exclusion: On Gratus, see Volumnius (Josephus, *B.J.* 1.535, *A.J.* 16.332).

Helix
Catalogues: SUO: C168; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.368; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Tibiletti (1953) 79
Post(s): SEN|LEG|MP(GC)
Date of post(s): SEN|LEG|MP(GC) in 42BC
Primary evidence: Josephus, *A.J.* 14.294-296; cf. *B.J.* 1.236
Relevant text: Κασσίου δ᾽ἐκ Συρίας ἀπάραντος ταραχὴ γίνεται κατὰ τὴν Ἰουδαίαν: Ἔλιξ γὰρ ὑπολειφθεὶς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις μετὰ στρατιᾶς ὥρμησεν ἐπὶ Φασάηλον ὅ τε δῆμος ἔνοπλος ἦν.
Reason for exclusion: On Helix, cf. Fabius.

N. Herennius N.f. Men(enia) Celsus
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 160; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Castrén (1975) 174 no. 191
Post(s): PF
Date of post(s): PF before AD42
Primary evidence: AE 1911, 71 = NS 1910, 390 (Spano, G.) = EDH HD028767 (Pompeii, Regio 1, Italia)
Relevant text: N. Herennius N. f. Men(enia) / Celsus d(uum)u(ir) i(ure) d(icundo) iter(um) praef(ectus) / fabr(um) / Aesquilliae C. f. Pollae / uxori uixit annos XXII / locus sepulturae publice datus / d(ecreto) d(ecurionum) // Felicio cum fructo hac // Diane(n)sis
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Claudian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

136 M. Holconius M.f. Rufus
Catalogues: SUO: A328; **DEV:** H21: (1976-1977) 426, (1987) - , (1993) 2126; **BRO:** -

; **DEM:** 117; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Nicolet (1967) 40-41 nos. 14-18
Post(s): MT(AP)
Date of post(s): MT(AP) before 2BC
Primary evidence: CIL 10.830 = ILS 6361b; CIL 10.837 = ILS 6361; CIL 10.838 = ILS 6361a; CIL 10.839, 947; cf. CIL 10.890 (Pompeii, Regio 1, Italia)

137 Q. Horatius Flaccus
Catalogues: SUO: A255, A257; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.350, 353; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 10; PIR(2) 198
Other reference works: Saddington (1999) 305 no. 4
Further bibliography: Fraenkel (1957) 9-11
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): ?MT in 43BC, MT in 42BC
Primary evidence: Suetonius, *uit. Horat.* 1; Horace, *Sat.* 1.6.45-52; cf. *Carm.* 2.7, *Sat.* 1.7

138 Q. Hortensius Hortalus
Catalogues: SUO: A172; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.35; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 13
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT in 89BC
Future career: Consul 69BC
Primary evidence: Cicero, *Brut.* 304; cf. Velleius 2.16.3; Plutarch, *Luc.* 1.5

139 Hostilius Rufus
Catalogues: SUO: C223; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 74; **RE/PIR:** RE 21; PIR 163; PIR(2) 227
Other reference works: Saddington (1996b) 246 no. 1
Post(s): IP(PCAST)
Date of post(s): IP(PCAST) in 11BC
Primary evidence: Iulius Obsequens 72; cf. Pliny, *N.H.* 11.55; Dio 54.33.2

140 C. Insteius
Catalogues: SUO: C72; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.95, 3.104; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 1
Further bibliography: Konrad (1994) 56
Post(s): EP(PE)
Date of post(s): EP(PE) in 76BC
Primary evidence: Livy, *Per.* 91 Fr. 8.22
Relevant text: C. Insteium, praefectum equitum, Segouiam et in Vaccaeorum gentem ad equitum conquisitionem misit, iussum cum equitibus Contrebiae sese opperiri
Note: Responsible for raising native cavalry for Sertorius, C. Insteius appears to have served as a cavalry prefect. Given his cognomen, he was possibly from Gallia Cisalpina (Suolahti (1955) 285). He may well have been the brother of L. Insteius, who commanded Contrebia, also under Sertorius. Suolahti's suggestion ((1955) 257) that the two brothers were related to Insteius Capito, a leader of the *socii* in the Social War, is intriguing, and may to some degree explain the presence of both in the army of Sertorius (although cf. Criniti (1970) 150-151).

141 L. Insteius L.f. Fal(erna)
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.95, 3.104; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 2
Further bibliography: Criniti (1970) 150-151; Konrad (1994) 56
Post(s): MP(GC)
Date of post(s): MP(GC) in 77BC
Primary evidence: Livy, *Per.* 91 Fr. 8.8; cf. Criniti (1970) 16-26 = CIL 6.37045 = CIL 1.709 = CIL 16, p.145 = ILLRP 515 = ILS 8888 = AE 1909, 30 = AE 1910, +126 = AE 1910, +153 = AE 1910, +162 = AE 1910, 207 = AE 1910, 218 = AE 1911, 126 = AE 1912, +10 = AE 1912, +117 = AE 1912, +287 = AE 1920, +130 = AE 1923, +103 = AE 2003, +831 = EDH HD019742 (Roma)

M. Insteius
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.421; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 3
Other reference works: Saddington (1988a) 308 no. 27
Post(s): SEN|LEG|NP
Date of post(s): SEN|LEG|NP in 31BC

Primary evidence: Plutarch, *Ant*. 65
Reason for exclusion: On M. Insteius, cf. M. Octauius

C. Iulius Aquila
Catalogues: SUO: C244; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 120; **RE/PIR:** PIR(2) 165
Post(s): SEN
Date of post(s): SEN in AD10
Future career: Praefectus Aegypti
Primary evidence: CIL 3.12046 = ILS 5759 = IGR 1.1055 (Alexandria, Aegyptus); cf. ILS 9370 = IGR 1.1056 (Alexandria, Aegyptus); PSI 1149
Reason for exclusion: This individual held a senior officer position.

(C. Iulius) Arminius
Catalogues: SUO: C239; **DEV:** I25: (1976-1977) 438-439, (1987) 1592, (1993) 2131-2132; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 113; **RE/PIR:** PIR(2) 1063
Other reference works: Saddington (1980) 30 no. 12, (1991a) 3536 no. 4
Further bibliography: Timpe (1970) 21ff.; Alföldy (1977) 10; Saddington (2003) 20
Post(s): -
Date of post(s): [AD9]
Primary evidence: Tacitus, *Ann*. 2.10.3; Velleius 2.118.2
Reason for exclusion: This individual was not a Roman citizen, and therefore should not be considered to be a junior officer.

142 C. Iulius Caesar
Catalogues: SUO: A199; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.125, 3.105-108; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 131
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT in 72BC
Future career: Consul 59BC
Primary evidence: Plutarch, *Caes*. 5.1; Suetonius, *Iul*. 5

143 L. Iulius Caesar
Catalogues: SUO: C117, C131; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.270, 283; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 144
Post(s): NP
Date of post(s): NP in 49BC, NP in 48BC
Future career: Quaestor 47BC
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.C*. 2.23.3

144 Sex. Iulius Caesar
Catalogues: SUO: A234; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.264; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 153
Post(s): MP
Date of post(s): MP in 49BC
Future career: ?Quaestor 48BC
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.C*. 2.20.7

(?C. ?Iulius) Charioualda
Catalogues: SUO: C278; **DEV:** I43: (1976-1977) 447, (1987) 1596, (1993) 2134; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** PIR(2) 716
Other reference works: Saddington (1980) 34 no. 37, (1991a) 3537 no. 6
Further bibliography: Alföldy (1968) 13, 91; Timpe (1970) 57-58
Post(s): -
Date of post(s): [AD14]
Primary evidence: Tacitus, *Ann*. 2.11
Reason for exclusion: This individual was not a Roman citizen, and therefore should not be considered to be a junior officer.

(C. Iulius) Demetrius
Catalogues: SUO: C182; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.390; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): CP
Date of post(s): CP in 39BC

Primary evidence: Dio 48.40.6; cf. Macrobius 1.11.18
Reason for exclusion: This individual held a civilian position.

[C. Iulius Cotti f. D]onni re[gis n. Donnus]
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** PIR(2) 275
Other reference works: Saddington (1987) 270 no. 9
Post(s): CP
Date of post(s): CP before AD13
Primary evidence: EDH HD003613 = AE 1899, 209 = AE 1976, 264 = AE 1981, 462 = AE 1994, 753 (Augusta Taurinorum, Regio 11, Italia)
Relevant text: [C. Iulius Cotti f. D]onni re[gis n. Donnus] praef(ectus) [ci]u[itatium Cottianorum quibus pa]ter eius praefuit / [C. Iulius Donni f. C]otti n(epos) [Cottius port]icum cum [omnibus ornamentis et do]mus dederunt
Reason for exclusion: C. Iulius Donnus, the ruler of the Alpes Cottiae, was, despite his title, probably not a military officer (his role more closely parallels the civilian prefects who governed towns or areas in the Republic, cf. ch. 2), and probably did not command Roman citizen troops. Like his father before him (cf. M. Iulius Cottius Regis Donni f. Victor CIL 5.7231 = Pais 942 = ILS 94), the title "praefectus ciuitatium", while found elsewhere (cf. Sex. Iulius S.f. Pol(lia) Rufus (CIL 14.2954)), refers in this case to the title under which he controlled the area his ancestors had ruled as kings.

(?C. ?Iulius) Flauus
Catalogues: SUO: C298; **DEV:** I63: (1976-1977) 157-458, (1987) -, (1993) 2139; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 2; PIR(2) F450
Other reference works: Saddington (1991a) 3536 no. 3
Post(s): -
Date of post(s): [before AD16]
Future career: Ductor popularium
Primary evidence: Tacitus, *Ann.* 2.9, 10; cf. 11.16
Relevant text: Tacitus, *Ann.* 2.9: Flumen Visurgis Romanos Cheruscosque interfluebat. eius in ripa cum ceteris primoribus Arminius adstitit, quaesitoque an Caesar uenisset, postquam adesse responsum est, ut liceret cum fratre conloqui orauit. erat is in exercitu cognomento Flauus, insignis fide et amisso per uulnus oculo paucis ante annis duce Tiberio. tum permissu progressusque salutatur ab Arminio; qui amotis stipatoribus, ut sagittarii nostra pro ripa dispositi abscederent postulat, et postquam digressi, unde ea deformitas oris interrogat fratrem. illo locum et proelium referente, quodnam praemium recepisset exquirit. Flauus aucta stipendia, torquem et coronam aliaque militaria dona memorat, inridente Arminio uilia seruitii pretia; Tacitus, *Ann.* 2.10: ...ni Stertinius adcurrens plenum irae armaque et equum poscentem Flauum attinuisset. cernebatur contra minitabundus Arminius proeliumque denuntians; nam pleraque Latino sermone interiaciebat, ut quis Romanis in castris ductor popularium meruisset.
Reason for exclusion: Any analysis of Flauus' role and rank is, as Timpe points out, complicated by the rhetorical context in which Tacitus describes him (Timpe (1970) 41-42; cf. Saddington (1991a) 3536 n.82): Flauus is characterised as the loyal opposite of his brother Arminius, and this makes it difficult to be certain of any analysis of technical terminology, such as the *dona* Flauus is said to have been awarded. Taking Tacitus' description literally, it seems that Flauus was a cavalryman in charge of a levy of Cheruscans ("ductor popularium"), possibly a decurion (Saddington (1991a) 3536 n.82). This does not, however, mean that he was in charge of an *ala* in or before AD16, and the military *dona* he is said to have received rank below those granted to a centurion (Timpe (1970) 42; Maxfield (1981) 125). He may have gone on to command an *ala*, as the *ala Gallorum Flauiana* may have been named after him, but this is unlikely, and there are a number of other possible reasons for the name of the *ala* (Birley (1978) 166-167; Spaul (1994) 115; cf. Timpe (1970) 42 n.92). Flauus was made a Roman citizen at some point, as his son was born a citizen (Tacitus, *Ann.* 11.16; cf. Timpe (1970) 43; Maxfield (1981) 124-125), but the award of *dona*should not, in itself, be taken as proof that he was already a citizen in AD16: as Maxfield points out, there is no mention of Roman citizenship in Flauus' speech, and this would be a curious omission in such a passage (Maxfield (1981) 124, 125; contra Timpe (1970) 42-43; Saddington (1991a) 3502 n.69).

145 C. Iulius Helenus
Catalogues: SUO: C177; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.384; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE Helenus 8

Other reference works: Saddington (1988a) 306 no. 3
Post(s): NP|LEG
Date of post(s): NP|LEG in 40BC, NP|LEG in 39BC
Primary evidence: Appian, *B.C.* 5.66; cf. Dio 48.30.8, 45.5; CIL 10.5808 = ILS 6267 (Aletrium, Regio 1, Italia)

Iulius Indus
Catalogues: SUO: C307; **DEV:** I69: (1976-1977) 460-461, (1987) 1604, (1993) 2140; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 240; **RE/PIR:** PIR(2) 358
Other reference works: Saddington (1980) 35 no. 44, (1991a) 3537 no. 7
Further bibliography: Alföldy (1968) 19; Drinkwater (1979) 98; Birley (1978) 267; Spaul (1994) 153
Post(s): EP
Date of post(s): EP in AD21
Primary evidence: Tacitus, *Ann.* 3.42, 46

M. Iulius Laterensis
Catalogues: SUO: A211; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 16
Post(s): -
Date of post(s): [circa 62BC]
Future career: Praetor 51BC
Primary evidence: Cicero, *Planc.* 2
Relevant text: iudices, mihi uenit in mentem admirandum esse M. Laterensem, hominem studiosissimum et dignitatis et salutis meae, reum sibi hunc potissimum delegisse quam metuendum ne uobis id ille magna ratione fecisse uideatur.
Reason for exclusion: No evidence that this individual held a junior officer position

C. Iulius Licinus
Catalogues: SUO: C313; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** PIR L193; PIR(2) I381
Post(s): CP
Date of post(s): CP before AD15
Future career: Procurator
Primary evidence: Dio 50.21.3; cf. Seneca, *Apoc.* 6.
Reason for exclusion: This individual held a civilian position.

C. Iulius Ag[e]dili [f. Fabi]a Macer
Catalogues: SUO: C308; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Saddington (1980) 28 no. ii
Further bibliography: Birley (1981) 28-29; Maxfield (1981) 97, 120, 210-211, 213; Le Roux (1986) 128; Maurin (1994) 110ff.; Wrobel (2009) 79-80
Post(s): ?IP
Date of post(s): ?IP before AD15
Primary evidence: CIL 13.1041 = ILS 2531 = AE 1888, 51 = Maurin (1994) (ILA-Sant.) 110-118 no. 14 (Mediolanum Santonum, Aquitania)
Relevant text: C. Iulio Ag[e]dili [f. Fabi]a Macro [ex ciuitate] / Sant(onum) duplicario alae Atectorigianae [Gallorum] / stipendi(i)s emeritis XXXII aere incisso euocato [diui Aug(usti) ?pr(aefecto)] / gesatorum DC Raetorum castello Ircauio clupeo [- - -] / coronis aenulis aureis donato a commilitonib[us suis] / Iulia Matrona f. C. Iul. Primulus l. h(eredes) e(x) t(estamento) [fac(iendum) cur(averunt)]
Reason for exclusion: As Iulius Macer's command does not appear to have been a formal post, he should not be considered as a junior officer (cf. Wrobel (2009) 79-80).

C. Iulius Naso
Catalogues: SUO: C218; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** PIR(2) 437
Post(s): -
Date of post(s): [before AD100]
Primary evidence: IG 12.5.941 = ILS 9220 = ILGR 27 = AE 1902, 165 (Tenos, Achaia)
Relevant text: C. Iulius Naso / praef(ectus) tesserar(iarum) / in Asia nau(ium) / Γάιος Ἰούλιος Νά/σων ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν τεσ/σαραρίων ἐν Ἀσίᾳ / πλοίων
Reason for exclusion: Probably referring to the command of dispatch boats (Spaul (2002) 46, 48),

the title of *praefectus tesserariarum* is otherwise unattested. Given the comparatively low rank of Roman naval officials, Naso should probably not be regarded as a junior officer.

146 C. Iulius Papius
Catalogues: SUO: C209; **DEV:** - : (1975) 121 no. 9; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 376
Post(s): ?MP
Date of post(s): ?MP before 25BC
Primary evidence: CIG 3.4931-4932 = Bernand and Bernand (1969) (I.Philae) 334 no. 63 = SB 5.8427 = IGR 1.1300 (Philae, Aegyptus)
Relevant text: Γάιος Ἰούλιος Παπεῖς ἔπαρχος / ἥκω καὶ προσκεκύνηκα τὴν κυσι/ὰν Ἶσιν, σὺν Ἰουλίωι τῶι υἱῶι καὶ ὑ/πὲρ Γαίωνος τοῦ νεωτέρου υἱοῦ ἔ/τι δὲ καὶ σὺν τοῖς φίλοις καὶ συν/αποδήμοις Συμμάχωι Εὐμένει / Ἀπολλωνίωι Χάρητος καὶ υἱῶι Ἀπελλᾶι / καὶ Ἀπίωγι[- - -] καὶ [- - -] καὶ [τοῖς] / κεντορίωσι Ῥούφωι Δημητρίωι Νίγρωι / Οὐαλερίωι Λαβύωνι Τερεντίωι / Νικάνορι Βαρωνᾶτι καὶ τῶν παι/δαρίων μου πάντων / (ἔτους) κ´ το(ῦ) καὶ ε´ Φαμ(ενὼδ) λ´
Note: Possibly the son of C. Papius, author of the *lex Papia* (Bernand and Bernand (1969) 336), C. Iulius Papius held some form of prefecture in Egypt (or possibly in another Eastern province) in the period 32-26BC (on the possible dates of the inscription, see Bernand and Bernand (1969) 339ff.; cf. Devijver (1976-1977) 472). This prefecture was not that of *praefectus Aegypti*, held by Cornelius Gallus at the time, and was presumably a junior military or civilian prefecture. The presence of so many centurions suggests that Papius held some form of military command, and although the absence of any other junior officers (and the presence of Roman legionary troops rather than auxiliary forces) might suggest otherwise, it is most likely that he held a military prefecture; beyond this we cannot be certain (cf. Suolahti (1955) 266; Bernand and Bernand (1969) 337ff.; Cavenaile (1970) 265 no. 1.1226; Devijver (1975) 121, (1976-1977) 472).

147 [.] Iulius Po[s]idonius
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** I98: (1976-1977) 474, (1987) 1611, (1993) 2144; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 162; **RE/PIR:** PIR(2) 479
Other reference works: Devijver (1986) 124 no. 55; Saddington (1999) 308 no. 19
Further bibliography: Birley (1969) 80; Holtheide (1983) 263 no. D83.2
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD15
Primary evidence: IGR 4.1626 (Philadelphia, Asia)

Sex. Iulius S.f. Pol(lia) Rufus
Catalogues: SUO: C309; **DEV:** I114: (1976-1977) 482, (1987) 1614, (1993) 2146; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Holder (1980) 247 no. E48; Saddington (1980) 33 no. 32, (1987) 270 no. 10
Further bibliography: Meloni (1958) 272 no. 104; Birley (1981) 28-29; Zucca (1988) 349ff.; Le Bohec (1990) 28; Saddington (1992) 268; Spaul (2000) 50
Post(s): IP(PCOH), MP(GC)
Date of post(s): IP(PCOH) before AD38, MP(GC) before AD38
Primary evidence: CIL 14.2954 = ILS 2684 (Praeneste, Regio 1, Italia)
Relevant text: Sex. Iulius S. f. Pol(lia) Rufus / euocatus diui Augusti / praefectus <I=T> cohortis / Corsorum et ciuitatum / barbariae in Sardinia
Reason for exclusion: A member of the praetorian guard under Augustus, Iulius Rufus re-enlisted and was sent to Sardinia (Birley (1981) 28-29; Le Bohec (1990) 28; Saddington (1992) 268; he was probably not, as Spaul suggests (Spaul (2000) 50), a centurion). His role in Sardinia was twofold: as the commander of cohors I Corsorum (as the inscription should probably be read, cf. Meloni (1958) 78; Saddington (1982) 59; Le Bohec (1990) 108-109) he was in charge of a unit of auxiliary infantry, and as *praefectus ciuitatum barbariae in Sardinia* he was a garrison commander in charge of a part of the local (non-Roman) populace. He probably held the two positions concurrently, but they should be looked on, initially at least, as two independent positions (cf. Le Bohec (1990) 28). Cohors I Corsorum was comprised of either Corsican troops or ethnic Corsicans from Southern Sardinia (Meloni (1958) 88; Le Bohec (1990) 28; Saddington (1992) 266; cf. Pliny, *N.H.* 3.7.85; Pausanias 10.17.8-9; Ptol. 3.3.6). The unit was, presumably, levied in response to the various uprisings in Sardinia in the early first century AD (Spaul (2000) 50). A major effort to suppress brigandage was launched in AD6 under the command of a στρατίαρχος ἱππεῖς (Dio

55.28; cf. Thomasson (1972) 73-75; Saddington (1992) 269), and although this term is not easily translated, it clearly connotes a military commander of equestrian rank, perhaps a *praefectus pro legato* (Thomasson (1972) 75; Saddington (1992) 269; cf. Loreto (2000) 25). In AD13-14 the region was under the control of a *pro legato* (EE 8.742 = ILS 105 cf. Meloni (1958) 16ff.; Thomasson (1972) 74-75; Zucca (1988) 349-350; Saddington (1992) 269), and this may imply that Roman legionaries were present on the island (Thomasson (1972) 73), although, as Saddington points out, it may be due to the fact that two of the auxiliary cohorts present, cohors I Sardorum and cohors I Ligurum, may well have been units of citizen troops or, at least, high-status units, which could account for the title (Saddington (1992) 269). In AD19, Tiberius banished a number of freedmen, possibly Jews, to the island, and many of these were conscripted into service (Tacitus, *Ann*. 2.85; Suetonius, *Tib*. 36; Josephus, *A.J*. 18.3.5. 361; cf. Saddington (1992) 265); units of such an anomalous status (not a *cohors uoluntariorum*, but not a *cohors* of non-citizens either) would help to explain the presence of a *pro legato* on the island. Througout the Principate, Sardinia almost always had some form of military governor, and this surely reflects continuing problems with the stability of the island. It is these problems which explain the title *praefectus ciuitatum barbariae in Sardinia*: Iulius Rufus was placed in control of an infantry cohort, and was then placed in control of a region of Sardinia (the exact region is debated, cf. Zucca (1988) 349ff.) which was proving hard to govern (cf. Strabo 5.2.7; Zucca (1988) 349; Saddington (1992) 268). The title is found in another inscription, presumably of late-Augustan (or possibly Tiberian) date: AE 1921, 86 (= ILSard. 1.188) [- - - Caesa]ri Aug(usto) p[ont(ifici) max(imo) - - -] / [- - - ciu]itates Barb[ariae - - -] / [- - - prae]f(ecto) prouincia[e Sard(iniae) - - -] (Tiberian: Demougin (1992) 218). It was certainly not uncommon in the Julio-Claudian period for military commanders to be put in charge of troublesome or newly-pacified areas, and there are examples of both *tribuni militum* and *praefecti* acting in this capacity (cf. Leveau (1973) 181-182; Saddington (1987) 268ff., (1992) 268; Demougin (1992) 619 n.2). While he may have had a comparatively modest status before holding the office, Spaul's suggestion (Spaul (2000) 50) that the appointment of Iulius Rufus is a sign of increasing desperation on the part of Augustus or Tiberius in the face of a shortage of suitable commanders should probably not be accepted; had the emperor wished to choose a higher-ranked individual for the post, he could undoubtedly have done so, and the choice of Iulius Rufus is more likely to reflect Rufus' experience and trustworthiness (cf. Birley (1981) 28ff.), as well as perhaps his links to the emperor as a member of the praetorian guard, than a lack of other candidates. He may have held his prefectures at the end of the Augustan period, but it is more likely that his equestrian career belongs to the Tiberian period, although it is not possible to be more precise than this (Meloni (1958) 18; Zucca (1988) 350; Le Bohec (1990) 27; Demougin (1992) 218; Spaul (2000) 50). He was probably not originally from Praeneste, as he has the wrong voting tribe (Le Bohec (1990) 28), and a lack of information about the inscription makes its purpose unclear (cf. Mastino (1984) 80).

Ti. Iulius C.f. Fab(ia) Viator
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** I139: (1976-1977) 495-496, (1987) 1620, (1993) 2150; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 299; **RE/PIR:** PIR(2) 625
Other reference works: Holder (1980) 244 nos. E18, E40; Saddington (1980) 33 no. 31
Further bibliography: Saddington (1982) 59; Spaul (2000) 65 n.2
Post(s): IP(PCOH), EP(PCE)
Date of post(s): IP(PCOH) after AD15, EP(PCE) after AD15
Primary evidence: ILS 2703; cf. AE 1895, 36 = Inscr.Aqu. 1.123 (Aquileia, Regio 10, Italia)
Relevant text: Ti. Iulio C. f. / Fab(ia) Viatori / subprae[f(ecto)] coh(ortis) III / Lusitanorum / IIIIuir(o) iur(e) dic(undo) / praef(ecto) coh(ortis) Ubior(um) / equitatae / Erboniae Sex. f. / Gratae uxori / C. Iulius Aug(usti) l. / Linus filio et / nurui; AE 1895, 36: [- - -] / c(o)hor(tis) III Lusit(anorum) / curat(or) pro prae(fecto) / c(o)hortis I Astur(um) / aedil(is) desig(natus) / Belino / u(otum) s(oluit)
Reason for exclusion: The son of an imperial freedman (Saddington (1988a) 70; Demougin (1992) 255), Iulius Viator's junior officer career probably dates to the Tiberian era, although it is likely that he held his first post before AD23, when the sons of freedmen were prevented from becoming equestrians (PIR(2) 625; Devijver (1976-1997) 495-496; Demougin (1992) 255). He held the unusual post of subpraefectus, and is one of the four (out of five known) subpraefecti from Aquilea: the post served as a base for Illyrian forces which, perhaps, required a different command structure (cf. Saddington (1988a) 71). The use of cohort numbering, as Saddington notes, is unusually early (Saddington (1982) 59). The association between Iulius Viator and AE

1895, 36 is disputed, and may not be correct (cf. Roldán Hervás (1974a) 65-66, 79; Holder (1980) 246; Demougin (1992) 255; Spaul (2000) 65 n.2).

C. Iulius Cognometodubni f. Volt(inia) Victor Ag[ed]omopatis n.
Catalogues: SUO: A331, C310; **DEV:** I141: (1976-1977) 496-497, (1987) 1621, (1993) - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 221; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Saddington (1980) 36 no. 58, (1985) 533 no. 53
Further bibliography: Drinkwater (1979) 98; Saddington (1982) 62; Maurin (1994) 79ff., 132ff.
Post(s): MT, PF
Date of post(s): MT before AD38, PF before AD38
Primary evidence: CIL 13.1042-1045 = AE 1888 170 = Maurin (1994) (ILA-Sant.) 124-135 no. 18 (Mediolanum Santorum, Aquitania)
Relevant text: CIL 13.1042: C. Iulio Cognometodubni f. Volt(inia) Victori [Agedomo]/patis nepoti p[r]aefecto fabrum tribuno militum cohor[t(is) - - -arum sacerd(oti)] / Romae et Aug[us]ti ad Confluentem C. Iulius Volt(inia) fi[lius]; CIL 13.1042-1045 (combined transcription): C. Iulio Congonnetodubni f. Volt(inia) Victori Ag[ed]omo/patis nepoti praefecto fabrum tribuno militum cohor[t(is) - - -]arum sac[erd(oti)] / Romae et Augusti ad Confluentem C. Iulius Volt(inia) filius
Reason for exclusion: On the basis of other inscriptions from the area, his position as *sacerdos Romae et Augustae ad Confluentum*, and the fact that his son erected a statue to Claudius in AD49 (CIL 13.1037), Iulius Victor's junior officer career probably belongs to the Tiberian era (Maurin (1994) 127; on the structure of the family itself, cf. Saddington (1992) 62; Demougin (1992) 194; and esp. Maurin (1994) 132), although it is possible that he began his junior officer career in the Augustan period (cf. Saddington (1982) 62; Demougin (1992) 194). On his junior officer career, see Saddington ((1982) 62, 156) and Maurin ((1994) 134).

M. Iulius Cottius Regis Donni f. Victor
Catalogues: SUO: C306; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** PIR(2) 274
Other reference works: Saddington (1987) 270 no. 6
Post(s): CP
Date of post(s): CP in 9BC
Future career: Praefectus ciuitatium
Primary evidence: CIL 5.7231 = Pais 942 = ILS 94 (Segusio, Alpes Cottiae); cf. Ammianus 15.10.2-7; Strabo 4.6.6; Suetonius, *Tib*. 37.4; Pliny, *N.H*. 3.138; Vitruvius 8.3.17
Relevant text: CIL 5.7231: Imp(eratori) Caesari Augusto diui f. pontifici maxumo(!) tribunic(ia) potestate XV imp(eratori) XIII / M. Iulius Regis Donni f. Cottius praefectus ceiuitatium(!) quae subscriptae sunt Segouiorum Segusinorum / Belacorum Caturigum Medullorum Tebauiorum Adanatium Sauincatium Ecdiniorum Veaminiorum / Venisamorum Iemeriorum Vesubianiorum Quadiatium et ceiuitates(!) quae sub eo praefecto fuerunt
Reason for exclusion: Cottius was the king, and prefect, of the area known as the *Alpes Cottiae* (cf. PIR(2) 274; Pflaum (1950) 20, 215; Demougin (1992) 417 n.14). While his command of the area was formally recognised by Rome, he cannot be described as a junior officer. The triumphal arch he dedicated to Augustus, from which the above inscription is derived, does depict soldiers, but they form part of a triumphal procession, and we should not necessarily assume that they depict a formal command held by him (cf. Ferrero (1901) 25ff.).

148 P. Iunius P.f.
Catalogues: SUO: C77; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.134; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 27, 2
Post(s): NP
Date of post(s): NP in 69BC
Primary evidence: I. de Délos 4.1.1856 (Delos); cf. 4.1.1855; cf. Cicero, *Ver*. 1.135-151

149 D. Iunius Brutus Albinus
Catalogues: SUO: C88, C98; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.213, 239, 3.112-113; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 55a (Supp. 5)
Further bibliography: Gelzer (1968) 125; Welch (1998) 92
Post(s): NP, MP
Date of post(s): NP in 56BC, MP in 52BC
Future career: Praetor 45BC
Primary evidence: 56BC: Caesar, *B.G*. 3.11.5-16.4; cf. Dio 39.40-43; Orosius 6.8.7-16; 52BC: Caesar, *B.G*. 7.9.2, 87.1; cf. Caesar *B.C*. 1.36.5

150 T. Iunius D.f. Ani(ensi) Montanus
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** I148: (1976-1977) 499-500, (1987) 1621, (1993) 2153; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 266; **RE/PIR:** PIR(2) 780
Other reference works: Sasel (1974) 470 no. 2; Holder (1980) 244 no. E19; Saddington (1980) 32 no. 26, (1985) 531 no. 22, (1999) 309 no. 26; Devijver (1986) 124 no. 57
Further bibliography: Loreto (2000) 10-11, 26; Saddington (2003) 22
Post(s): MT, EP(PE), PF
Date of post(s): MT before AD15, EP(PE) before AD15, PF before AD15
Future career: Pro legato
Primary evidence: AE 1938, 173 = AE 1939, +261 = AE 1992, 687 = EDH HD022326 (Emona, Pannonia Superior)
Relevant text: T. Iunius D. f. / Ani(ensi) Montanus / tr(ibunus) mil(itum) VI praef(ectus) / equit(um) VI praef(ectus) / fabr(um) II pro leg(ato) II
Note: The cursus, the lack of unit identification, the indication of each post's duration, and the fact that two of the posts were held for longer than 3 years all date the inscription securely to the pre-Claudian period (Demougin (1992) 227; Devijver (1992c) 65). All officers who held the post of *pro legato* in the Augustan period appear to have held their posts in the Illyrico-Dalmatian and Alpine areas, and had a combined military and civilian responsibility (cf. Loreto (2000) 10). Given the history of the region in the early Principate, this dates Montanus to the Augustan period (Sasel (1974) 470 no. 2; Devijver (1992c) 66; cf. Saddington (1980) 32 no. 26, (1999) 309 no. 26; Demougin (1992) 228). His funerary monument, probably a cenotaph, displayed a *corona*, perhaps the *corona ciuica* or *aurea*, as well as a *parma*, probably the *parma equestris*, over crossed *hastae* (Devijver (1992c) 66). He appears, from his voting tribe and from the presence of other familiy members there, to have been a native of Alexandria Troas (on this, and the family, cf. Demougin (1992) 227; Devijver (1992c) 67ff.).

151 M. Iunius C.f. Gal(eria) Proculus
Catalogues: SUO: C311, C312; **DEV:** I150: (1976-1977) 500, (1987) 1622, (1993) 2153; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 261; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Devijver (1975) 66-67 no. 66; Holder (1980) 244 no. E20; Saddington (1980) 32 no. 24, (1985) 530 no. 17
Post(s): EP(PE), ?PF
Date of post(s): EP(PE) before AD15, ?PF before AD15
Primary evidence: CIL 10.6309 = CIL *11.00250(2b) (Tarracina, Regio 1, Italia)

152 M. Iunius Silanus
Catalogues: SUO: A253; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.353, 3.115; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 172
Post(s): MP|LEG
Date of post(s): MP|LEG in 43BC
Future career: ?Consul 25BC
Primary evidence: Dio 46.38.6-7; cf. 50.3, 51.1; Cicero, *ad Fam*. 10.30.1, 34.2; Zonarius 10.15
Relevant text: Μάρκῳ Σιλανῷ τῷ στρατιάρχῳ
Note: One of Lepidus' officers who was portrayed, by Lepidus at least, as disloyal in going over to Antonius (cf. Terentius Culleo), Silanus' rank is difficult to decipher. Identified by Suolahti as a military tribune, and by Broughton as a legate (Broughton (1951-1986) 2.353, 3.115), the term "στρατίαρχος" is probably best translated as "praefectus" here (c.f. LSJM, "στρατίαρχος"; cf. Dio 55.28.2 on the equestrian ranked commanders of Sardinia; cf. Thomasson (1972) 73-75; Saddington (1992) 269).

153 Iustuleius
Catalogues: SUO: C132; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 3.115; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 10.1340
Post(s): MP
Date of post(s): MP in 48BC
Primary evidence: Valerius Maximus 3.2.23

154 P. Iuuentius Rufus
Catalogues: SUO: A298, C247; **DEV:** I155: (1976-1977) 503, (1987) - , (1993) 2153-2154; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 223; **RE/PIR:** RE 12.1514; PIR(2) 885
Other reference works: Devijver (1975) 71-72 no. 74; Saddington (1987) 270 no. 7
Further bibliography: Pflaum (1960-1961) 127-128

Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD11
Future career: Procurator
Primary evidence: AE 1910, 207 = SEG 20.670 = SB 8.10173 = Bernand (1977) (I.Pan.) no. 51 (Wadi Semna, Aegyptus)
Relevant text: ἔτους μ′ Καίσαρος, Παῦνι α′· / ἀγαθῇ τύχηι· ἐπεὶ {ἐπὶ} Ποπλίου / Ἰουεντίου Ῥούφου χιλιάρ/χου τῆς τερτιανῆς λε/γεῶν(ος) καὶ ἐπάρχου Βερνίκη/ς καὶ ἀρχιμεταλλάρχου / τῆς ζμαράγδου καὶ βα/ζίου καὶ μαργαρίτου καὶ / πάντων τῶν μετάλλων / τῆς Αἰγύπτου, ἀνέθηκε / ἐν τῶι Ὀφιάτηι ἱερὸν / Πανὶ θεῶι μεγίστωι / καὶ αὐτῶι Ποπλίωι Ἰουεντίω̣[ι] / Ἀγαθόποδι ἀπελευθέρ[ωι αὐ]/τοῦ καὶ ἐπιτρόπωι καὶ προ/νοητοῦ καὶ εὐεργέτηι / πάντων τῶν μετάλλων / τῆς Αἰγύπτου // τὸ προσκύνημα Θολεμαί/ου κουράτορος σπίρης Φλώ/ρου κεντυρίας Βάσσου ὁ καὶ / ἐπιστήσας // τὸ [προσ]/κύν[ημ]/α Μ[έρσι] / καὶ [Σω]/τῆ[ρος] / ἀμφ[ο]/τέρ[ων] / ἀρχι[τε]/κτόν[ων] / οἱ καὶ [ἐπι]/στήσ[αν]/τες τὸ / ἔργον
Note: Iuuentius Rufus is one of two military tribunes, with L. Pinarius L.f. Gal(eria) Natta, who served in Legio III before the legion (based in Egypt) gained the cognomen "Cyrenaica" in around AD35 (Pflaum (1960-1961) 127-128). Iuuentius Rufus can be dated more precisely, to before AD11, on the basis of his subsequent procuratorships (Devijver (1975) 71; cf. Saddington (1987) 270). The post of *praefectus Bernicidis* was probably a civilian prefecture overseeing an important mining area, and although it may have involved the command of a small number of troops (Saddington (1987) 269), was predominately a civilian prefecture: Iuuentius subsequently became a procurator overseeing the Egyptian metallic mines in AD18 (Demougin (1992) 195). Iuuentius Rufus may not have been of Italian origin (Demougin (1992) 195). On M. Florus, see M. Florus (IGR 1.1250).

155 Q. Laberius Durus
Catalogues: SUO: A223; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.225; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 6
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT in 54BC
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.G.* 5.15.5; cf. Orosius 6.9.5

156 C. Lacontius M.f.
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - : (1976-1977) - , (1987) - , (1993) 2155; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Keppie (2000a) 252-253
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before 42BC
Primary evidence: AE 1986, 154 = EDH HD004022 (Sinuessa, Regio 1, Italia)

D. Laelius
Catalogues: SUO: C118, C133; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.270, 283, 3.116-117; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 6
Post(s): SEN|LEG
Date of post(s): SEN|LEG in 49BC, SEN|LEG in 48BC
Future career: [Previously ?Tribunus plebis 54BC]
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.C.* 3.5.3; cf. 3.7.1, 40.5, 100; Cicero, *ad Att.* 11.7.2, 14.1. 15.1-2; IGR 3.1018
Relevant text: Caesar, *B.C.* 3.5.3: Praeerat Aegyptiis nauibus Pompeius filius, Asiaticis D. Laelius et C. Triarius, Syriacis C. Cassius, Rhodiis C. Marcellus cum C. Coponio, Liburnicae atque Achaicae classi Scribonius Libo et M. Octauius. Toti tamen officio maritimo M. Bibulus praepositus cuncta administrabat; ad hunc summa imperii respiciebat; *B.C.* 3.7.1: erat Orici Lucretius Vespillo et Minucius Rufus cum Asiaticis nauibus XVIII, quibus iussu D. Laelii praeerant; *B.C.* 3.40.5: commeatus; IGR: ἔπαρχον
Reason for exclusion: As the man responsible for the appointment of Lucretius Vespillo and Minucius Rufus to Oricum (cf. Q. Lucretius Vespillo), as the commander (along with Valerius Triarius) of Pomepius' Adriatic squadron, and as a man of probable senatorial rank, Laelius should not be considered as a junior officer. His senior rank is also implied by the fact that, as Cicero reports (Cicero, *ad Att.* 11.7.2), he was grouped with Cato, Dolabella, and Cicero himself when Caesar was considering who to allow to return to Italy. His description in Caesar as a "commeatus" and in IGR 3.1018 as an "ἔπαρχος" perhaps suggests that he was not a legate; if he was not a

legate, then he was as senior as any man appointed as an officer in this period, and is comparable with Pompeius' freedman naval commanders (cf. Cn. (Pompeius) Menecrates).

L. Laetilius L.f. Ste(llatina) Rufus
Catalogues: SUO: A332; **DEV:** L2: (1976-1977) 521, (1987) - , (1993) 2154; **BRO:** -
; **DEM:** 368; **RE/PIR:** RE 12.1793
Other reference works: Devijver (1975) 72-73 no.76
Further bibliography: Dobson (1966) 68 n.4
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD38
Primary evidence: CIL 9.1614 (Beneuentum, Regio 2, Italia)
Relevant text: L. Laetilio L. f. Ste(llatina) Rufo / trib(uno) mil(itum) leg(ionis) XXII / don(ato) hasta pura / corona uallari / aedili quaes(tori) IIuir(o) / i(ure) d(icundo) praef(ecto) fabrum / Atteia Q. f. Prisca / uxor
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Gaian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

157 Cn. Lerius C.f. Flaccus
Catalogues: SUO: A295; **DEV:** L6: (1976-1977) 523, (1987) - , (1993) 2156; **BRO:** -
; **DEM:** 111; **RE/PIR:** RE 12.1768
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD9
Primary evidence: CIL 11.5218 = Sensi and Sensi (1986) 65 no. 19 (Fulginae, Regio 6, Italy)

[- - -] T.f. Libo
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** L46: (1976-1977) 545, (1987) - , (1993) 2163; **BRO:** -
; **DEM:** 163; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): EP(PE)
Date of post(s): EP(PE) before AD42
Primary evidence: AE 1954, 47 (Spoletium, Regio 6, Italia)
Relevant text: [- - -] T. f. Liboni praef(ecto) equit(um) / [- - - F]elix lib(ertus) [- - -] / [- - -] faciundum curauit HS L m(ilibus)
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Claudian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

C. Licin[ius .f. ?Clu(stumina)]
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** L7: (1976-1977) 524, (1987) - , (1993) 2156; **BRO:** -
; **DEM:** 61; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD42
Primary evidence: CIL 11.4187 (Interamna Nahars, Regio 6, Italia)
Relevant text: C. Licin[ius .f. Clu(stumina)]/ IIIIuir [i(ure) d(icundo) tr(ibunus)] / mil(itum) [- - -]
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Claudian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date, cf. [- - -] Aufidi[us - - -] (CIL 11.4183a).

158 P. Licinius Crassus
Catalogues: SUO: C84; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.199, 3.119; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 63
Further bibliography: Gelzer (1968) 126; Gruen (1974) 114; Greenhalgh (1981) 88; Meier (1996) 260; Welch (1998) 89, 91-93, 105 n.29
Post(s): EP
Date of post(s): EP in 58BC
Future career: Quaestor 55BC
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.G.* 1.52.7; cf. Caesar, *B.G.* 2.34, 3.7-9; Orosius 6.8.7; Dio 39.31.2

L. Licinius Lucullus
Catalogues: SUO: A164; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.35; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 104
Post(s): ?MT
Date of post(s): ?MT before 87BC
Future career: Consul 69BC
Primary evidence: Plutarch, *Luc.* 2.3ff.
Relevant text: ἐκ τούτου τῆς μὲν γῆς ἐπικρατῶν ὁ Σύλλας ἐν ταῖς Ἀθήναις, περικοπτόμενος δὲ τὴν ἀγορὰν ἐκ τῆς θαλάττης ὑπὸ τῶν πολεμίων ναυκρατούντων, ἐξέπεμψεν

ἐπ' Αἰγύπτου καὶ Λιβύης τὸν Λεύκολλον, ἄξοντα ναῦς ἐκεῖθεν
Reason for exclusion: Lucullus' military prowess while a quaestor under Sulla is described in detail by Plutarch (*Luc*. 2-3), but while his military service in the Social War may have impressed Sulla, there is no evidence that he served as a miltary tribune, although the parallels between his career and that of Q. Hortensius (cf. Q. Hortensius Hortalus) suggest that this is a possibility.

C. Licinius Macer
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - : (1976-1977) 525, (1987) 1626, (1993) - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Pflaum (1978) 230 no. 3
Post(s): ?MT
Date of post(s): ?MT circa AD185
Primary evidence: AE 1954, 102 = AE 1964, 146 bis = AE 1999, 1022 = AE 2001, 1322 = EDH HD017909 (Glanum, Gallia Narbonensis)
Relevant text: Votum susceptu(m) / Herculi Victori pro / salute et reditu G(ai!) Licini / Macri trib(uni) et centurio/num et militum Glanico/rum qui sub uexsillo fue/runt Cn(aeus) Pomp(eius) Cornutus / opt(io) / ex stipendi(i)s et hono/rario quod ei d(onum) const(ituerant) / l(ibens) m(erito)
Reason for exclusion: Dated by Rolland ((1953) 15-17; cf. Picard (1963) 111ff.) to the 40s or the 50s BC, this inscription has been convincingly redated to the Antonine period by Pflaum, Le Bohec, and Christol (Pflaum (1978) 230; Le Bohec (1999) 297ff.; Christol (2001) 162ff.).

159 P. Ligarius
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 3.125; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 3
Post(s): MT|MP
Date of post(s): MT|MP in 49BC, MT|MP in 48BC, MT|MP in 47BC, MT|MP in 46BC
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.Afr*. 64
Relevant text: In ea naue captus est P. Vestrius eques Romanus et P. Ligarius Afranianus quem Caesar in Hispania cum reliquis dimiserat, et postea se ad Pompeium contulerat, inde ex proelio effugerat in Africamque ad Varum uenerat; quem ob periurium perfidiamque Caesar iussit necari. P. Vestrio autem quod eius frater Romae pecuniam imperatam numerauerat, et quod ipse suam causam probauerat Caesari, se a Nasidi classe captum, cum ad necem duceretur, beneficio Vari esse seruatum, postea sibi facultatem nullam datam transeundi, ignouit.
Note: No title is preserved for P. Ligarius, who served under Pompeian commanders during the period 49-46BC. As he appears to have been of equestrian status, it is likely that he was a junior officer (cf. Broughton (1951-1986) 125).

160 L. Liuineius Regulus
Catalogues: SUO: C150; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.303, 3.125-126; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 3
Further bibliography: Tibiletti (1953) 78
Post(s): MP|MP(GC)
Date of post(s): MP|MP(GC) in 46BC
Future career: Tresuir monetalis 42BC
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.Afr*. 89.3

161 Sex. Lucilius
Catalogues: SUO: A230; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.252, 3.129; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 16
Further bibliography: Shackleton Bailey (1976) 121
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT in 51BC
Primary evidence: Cicero, *ad Att*. 5.20.4

162 C. Lucilius C.f. Benignus Ninnianus
Catalogues: SUO: A333; **DEV:** L31: (1976-1977) 538, (1987) 1630, (1993) 2160; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 12.1926; PIR(2) 380
Other reference works: Nicolet (1967) 35-36 no. 4
Further bibliography: Alföldy (1969a) 182; Wiseman (1971) 239 no. 236
Post(s): MT(AP)
Date of post(s): MT(AP) before AD15
Future career: ?Aedilis

Primary evidence: Supp.It. III (CIL IX 3155) = CIL 9.3155 = AE (1967) +6 (Corfinium, Regio 4, Italia)

163 P. Lucilius P.f. P.nep. P.pron. P.abnep. Gamala
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** L32: (1976-1977) 538-539, (1987) 1630, (1993) 2160-2161; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 97; **RE/PIR:** PIR(2) 385
Further bibliography: Meiggs (1973) 493ff.; Coarelli (2004) 95ff.
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD15
Primary evidence: AE 1959, 254 = AE 2004, +360 (Ostia, Regio 1, Italia)

Lucius Bassus
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.147, 3.129; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): LEG|NP
Date of post(s): LEG|NP in 67BC
Primary evidence: Dio 36.19.1
Relevant text: ἀγανακτήσας οὖν ἐπὶ τούτῳ ὁ Ὀκτάουιος οὐκέθ'ἡσύχασεν, ἀλλὰ πρότερον μὲν τῷ τοῦ Σισέννου στρατῷ (νοσήσας γὰρ ἐκεῖνος ἐτεθνήκει) χρώμενος ἐπεβοήθει πῃ τοῖς κακουμένοις, ἔπειτα δ' ἀνακομισθέντων αὐτῶν πρός τε τὸν Ἀριστίωνα ἐς Ἱεράπυδνα ἦλθε καὶ μετ'αὐτοῦ ἐπολέμει· οὗτος γὰρ ὡς τότε ἐκ τῆς Κυδωνίας ἀπεχώρησε Λούκιόν τέ τινα Βάσσον ἀνταναχθέντα οἱ ἐνίκησε καὶ τὰ Ἱεράπυδνα κατέλαβε.
Reason for exclusion: No title is preserved for Lucius Bassus, who was probably a legate, although it is possible he was a naval prefect (cf. Broughton (1951-1986) 2.147, 3.129). On his name, cf. Broughton ((1951-1986) 129).

164 M. Lucretius Decidianus Rufus
Catalogues: SUO: A334, C314; **DEV:** L36: (1976-1977) 540-541, (1987) 1631, (1993) 2161; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 164; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Nicolet (1967) 38-39 nos. 8-12; Saddington (1985) 531 no. 26
Further bibliography: Salomies (1992) 24; Pesando (2000) 163ff.; Verzár-Bass (2000) 210
Post(s): MT(AP), PF
Date of post(s): MT(AP) before AD15, PF before AD15
Primary evidence: CIL 10.788 = ILS 6363c; CIL 10.789; CIL 10.815 = AE 2000, 296; CIL 10.851 = ILS 6363d; AE 1898, 143 = ILS 6363a; cf. CIL 10.815, 952-954 (Pompeii, Regio 1, Italia)

Q. Lucretius Ofella
Catalogues: SUO: C70; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.72; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 25
Post(s): LEG|MP
Date of post(s): LEG|MP in 82BC
Future career: ?Praetor
Primary evidence: Livy, *Per*. 88; Plutarch, *Sull*. 29.8; Appian, *B.C*. 1.88, cf. 93-94; Velleius 2.27.6; cf. Dio 30-35 fr. 108.1; Auct. Vir. Ill. 68.4; Orosius 5.21ff.
Relevant text: Livy: C. Marius Praeneste obsessus a Lucretio Ofella, Syllanarum partium uiro; Velleius: Oppugnationi autem Praenestis ac Marii praefuerat Ofella Lucretius qui cum ante Marianarum fuisset partium praetor; Appian: ὁ δὲ Σύλλας τὸν Μάριον ἐς Πραινεστὸν κατακλείσας τὴν πόλιν ἀπετάφρευε καὶ ἀπετείχιζεν ἐκ μακροῦ διαστήματος καὶ Λουκρήτιον Ὀφέλλαν ἐπέστησε τῷ ἔργῳ; Plutarch: πολλῶν ἐκ τῆς τροπῆς ὠσαμένων ἐκεῖ καὶ τὸν ἐπὶ τῇ πολιορκίᾳ τεταγμένον Ὀφέλλαν Λουκρήτιον ἀναζευγνύναι κατὰ τάχος κελευόντων, ὡς ἀπολωλότος τοῦ Σύλλα καὶ τῆς Ῥώμης ἐχομένης ὑπὸ τῶν πολεμίων.
Reason for exclusion: Appointed by Sulla to manage the siege at Praeneste, Lucretius Ofella, given his status and senatorial rank (although the text of Velleius is slightly corrupt), was almost certainly a legate (cf. Broughton (1951-1986) 2.72).

165 Q. Lucretius Vespillo
Catalogues: SUO: C119, C134; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.270-271, 283, 3.130; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 12, 36
Post(s): MP(GC), NP
Date of post(s): MP(GC) in 49BC, NP in 49BC, NP in 48BC
Primary evidence: 49BC (as a garrison commander): Caesar, *B.C*. 1.18; cf. Cicero, *ad Att*. 8.4.3;

Orosius 6.15.4; 49-48BC (as naval prefect): Caesar, *B.C.* 3.7.1; cf. Orosius 6.15.4; Appian, *B.C.* 2.54
Relevant text: Caesar *B.C.* 1.18: a Q. Lucretio senatore et Attio Peligno prohiberi, qui id oppidum VII cohortium praesidio; Caesar *B.C.* 3.7.1: erat Orici Lucretius Vespillo et Minucius Rufus cum Asiaticus nauibus XVIII, quibus iussu D. Laelii praeerant
Note: Cf. Minucius Rufus (2)

C. Ludius C.f. [S]er(gia) Rufus
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** L38: (1976-1977) 541, (1987) - , (1993) 2161; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 371; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Buonocore (1991-1992) 286
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD42
Primary evidence: CIL 9.4887 = AE 2001, +908 (Trebula Mutuesca, Regio 4, Italia)
Relevant text: C(aius) Ludius C. f. [S]er(gia) Rufus / trib(unus) mil(itum) / arbitratu T. Opidieni T. f. Ser(gia) / et Hilari l.
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Claudian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

A. Lusius A.f. Teret(ina) Gallus
Catalogues: SUO: A335, C315; **DEV:** L39: (1976-1977) 542, (1987) 1631, (1993) 2162; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 302; **RE/PIR:** 12.1793; PIR 321; PIR(2) 434
Other reference works: Devijver (1975) 74 no. 79; Holder (1980) 244 no. E22; Saddington (1980) 33 no. 30
Post(s): MT, MP(GC)
Date of post(s): MT before AD38, MP(GC) before AD38
Primary evidence: CIL 10.4862 = ILS 2690 (Venafrum, Regio 4, Italia)
Reason for exclusion: On A. Lusius A.f. Ter(etina) Gallus, see M. Vergilius M.f. Ter(etina) Gallus Lusius (CIL 10.4862). Note that the cognomen "Cyrenaica" for Legio XXII is almost certainly a mistake, and the legion name should be either Legio XXII Deiotariana or Legio III Cyrenaica - both were based in Egypt at the time (cf. Demougin (1992) 258).

Machaeras
Catalogues: SUO: C185; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.395, 3.131; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Syme (1955) 136; Wiseman (1971) 281 no. 540
Post(s): SEN|MP
Date of post(s): SEN|MP in 38BC
Primary evidence: Josephus, *A.J.* 14.434-438, 448, 450, *B.J.* 1.317, 324, 334
Relevant text: Josephus, *A.J.* 14.434: Ἐν δὲ τῷ μεταξὺ Πακόρου πεσόντος ἐν μάχῃ καὶ τῶν Πάρθων πταισάντων πέμπει βοηθὸν ὁ Βεντίδιος Ἡρώδῃ Μαχαιρᾶν σὺν δυσὶ τάγμασι καὶ χιλίοις ἱππεῦσιν ἐπισπεύδοντος Ἀντωνίου
Reason for exclusion: No title is preserved for Machaeras, who was sent by Ventidius with two legions and one thousand cavalry to aid Herod in Judea. Despite the suggestion of Syme, he was probably a Roman citizen (Syme (1955) 138; contra, Wiseman (1971) 281; Broughton (1951-1986) 3.131). If so, he was probably a military prefect of some kind, although his command was rather large and he should probably not be considered as a junior officer. As with other officers posted to Judea (cf. Helix), Machaeras fell out with Herod (cf. Josephus, *A.J.* 14.434-438, 448, *B.J.* 1.317, 324, 334; on his name, cf. Wiseman (1971) 281).

166 L. Maenius
Catalogues: SUO: A261; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 9; **RE/PIR:** RE 1
Post(s): MT|CENT(PP)
Date of post(s): MT|CENT(PP) in 40BC
Primary evidence: CIL 1(2).701 = EE 6 p. 82 n.112 (Perusia, Regio 7, Italia)
Relevant text: L. Maenius / [c.2] L(egionis) XII // X / millia
Note: Known from a sling bullet at Perusia, it is unclear whether Maenius was a junior officer or a centurion: abbreviations for the missing letters such as "TM", "PP" or even "PR" ("pr(aefectus)") are all possible. Given that Caesius Scaeua was a*praefectus equitum* before 44BC (cf. M. Caesius Scaeua), Demougin's suggestion (Demougin (1992) 28) that he cannot have been a *primipilus* in Legio XII because Scaeua was its *primipilus* should probably be rejected. For a military tribune recorded on a sling bullet from Perusia, see M. Feridius.

167 N. Magius
Catalogues: SUO: C120; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.271; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 9
Other reference works: Welch (1995) 140 no. xii; Badian (1997) 7 no. xii
Further bibliography: Saddington (2003) 19
Post(s): PF
Date of post(s): PF in 49BC
Primary evidence: Cicero, *ad Att*. 9.7C.2; Caesar, *B.C*. 1.24.4-5

M. Magius M.f. Ga[l(eria)] Antiquus
Catalogues: SUO: C316; **DEV:** M9: (1976-1977) 554, (1987) 1637-1638, (1993) 2166; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 743; **RE/PIR:** RE 12.1556-1557
Other reference works: Dobson (1966) 69-70 n.43; Holder (1980) 244 no. E23
Post(s): IP(PCOH), PF
Date of post(s): IP(PCOH) before AD58, PF before AD58
Primary evidence: ILS 8968 = EE 8.114 = Garcia Merino (1977) 196 (Uxama, Hispania Tarraconensis)
Reason for exclusion: On M. Magius Antiquus, cf. [?Ma]mius Murrius Umber (ILS 8968).

M. Magius Maximus
Catalogues: SUO: C234, C235; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 203; **RE/PIR:** RE 28; PIR(2) 89
Post(s): SEN
Date of post(s): SEN in AD12
Future career: Praefectus Aegypti
Primary evidence: CIL 9.1125 = ILS 1335 (Aeclanum, Regio 2, Italia); Pliny, *N.H*. 36.69; cf. SB 5245 (12 May AD12); Wagner (1971) 21-29 nos. 1-12 (AD14-15, Karnak, Aegyptus)
Reason for exclusion: This individual held a senior officer position.

168 M. [M]aian[i(us)] M.[f. Se]r(gia) (?Gallus)
Catalogues: SUO: A173; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.35, 3.132; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Cichorius (1922) 154-155 no. 22; Criniti (1970) 121-122
Post(s): ?MT
Date of post(s): ?MT in 89BC
Primary evidence: Criniti (1970) 16-26 = CIL 6.37045 = CIL 1.709 = CIL 16, p.145 = ILLRP 515 = ILS 8888 = AE 1909, 30 = AE 1910, +126 = AE 1910, +153 = AE 1910, +162 = AE 1910, 207 = AE 1910, 218 = AE 1911, 126 = AE 1912, +10 = AE 1912, +117 = AE 1912, +287 = AE 1920, +130 = AE 1923, +103 = AE 2003, +831 = EDH HD019742 (Roma)
Note: See the discussion of *consilia* in ch. 1.

169 M. Malolei(us) M.[f.]
Catalogues: SUO: A174; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.35; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 14.918
Further bibliography: Cichorius (1922) 146 no. 8; Criniti (1970) 105-106
Post(s): ?MT
Date of post(s): ?MT in 89BC
Primary evidence: Criniti (1970) 16-26 = CIL 6.37045 = CIL 1.709 = CIL 16, p.145 = ILLRP 515 = ILS 8888 = AE 1909, 30 = AE 1910, +126 = AE 1910, +153 = AE 1910, +162 = AE 1910, 207 = AE 1910, 218 = AE 1911, 126 = AE 1912, +10 = AE 1912, +117 = AE 1912, +287 = AE 1920, +130 = AE 1923, +103 = AE 2003, +831 = EDH HD019742 (Roma)
Note: See the discussion of *consilia* in ch. 1.

170 L. Mammi[us - - -] Men(enia) (1)
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Camodeca (2003) 642ff.
Post(s): ?MT
Date of post(s): ?MT before AD15
Primary evidence: CIL 10.1449 = AE 2003, 328 (Herculaneum, Regio 1, Italia)
Note: On L. Mammi[us - - -] Men(enia) (1), see [L.? Ma]mmius Ti.f. [Men(enia)] (2).

171 [L.? Ma]mmius Ti.f. [Men(enia)] (2)
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Camodeca (2003) 642ff.

Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD15
Primary evidence: CIL 10.1476 = AE 2003, 327 (Herculaneum, Regio 1, Italia)
Relevant text: [L.? Ma]mmio Ti. f. / [Men(enia)] fratri / [patr]ueli / [tr(ibuno) mi]l(itum) ter / [- - -]
Note: This inscription, along with another commemorating Mammius Ti.f.'s uncle (cf. L. Mammi[us - - -] Men(enia) (1)), is dated by Camodeca to the Augustan period on the basis of palaeographic details and the history of the family, who are known in Herculaneum from the Claudian period (cf. Camodeca (2003) 643, 644ff.). While the reconstruction of the fourth line appears ambitious, the layout of the inscription, as well as the use of "ter", means that the reconstruction above is probably correct (cf. Camodeca (2003) 642 fig. 2). The use of "ter", as well as the absence of unit identification or a personal cognomen, also suggest a date in the early imperial period. This inscription, along with that of his uncle L. Mammius, were clearly set up at the same time, and were part of the same monument (Camodeca (2003) 649), erected by L. Mammius's son (Mammius Ti.f.'s cousin). The restoration of "t[r(ibuno mil(itum)]" in the inscription recording L. Mammius (cf. Camodeca (2003) 645-646)) is somewhat less certain than that of Mammius Ti.f., but it is still likely to be correct, as the two inscriptions are similar in form.

172 Mamurra
Catalogues: SUO: C85; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 3.113; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 14.966
Other reference works: Welch (1995) 137 no. vii; Badian (1997) 6 no. vii; Verzár Bass (2000) 205-206
Post(s): PF
Date of post(s): PF in 58BC, ?PF in 55BC
Primary evidence: 58BC: Pliny, *N.H.* 36.48; cf. Catullus 29, 57 (cf. 94, 105, 114, 115); 55BC: Catullus 29.3-4, 11-14

173 Cn. Manlius Cn.f. Pa[p(iria)]
Catalogues: SUO: A337, C317, C318; **DEV:** M20: (1976-1977) 558-559, (1987) 1640, (1993) 2169; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 165; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Dobson (1978) 179-180 no. 30; Holder (1980) 244 no. E24; Saddington (1987) 273 no. 48
Further bibliography: Castillo Garcia (1965) 121-123, (1975) 647-648; Curchin (1990) 139 no. 17
Post(s): MT(COHP/U), IP(PCOHORTIUM)|IP(PCOH)
Date of post(s): MT(COHP/U) before AD15, IP(PCOHORTIUM)|IP(PCOH) before AD15
Primary evidence: CIL 2(5).1168 = CIL 2.1477 = CILA 2.3.698 (Astigi, Baetica)
Relevant text: Cn. Manlius Cn. / fil. Pa[p(iria)] / trib(unus) cohortis praet(oriae) / prefect(us) cohortium / IIuir / praefectus iure dic(undo)
Note: While the position of *praefectus cohortium* may indicate two separate commands as *praefectus cohortis*, it probably denotes the position of prefect in charge of cohorts of Roman citizens, and this, along with his unusual career path and the lack of unit identifiers or cognomina, suggests that Manlius is from the early Augustan era (Castillo Garcia (1965) 122-123; Curchin (1990) 139). The position is known from only one other inscription, that of P. Cornelius Cicatricula (CIL 11.6344), who was*praefectus cohortium ciuium Romanorum quattuor*, and who belongs to the Augustan era (on this unusual position, see P. Cornelius P.f. Sab(atina) Cicatricula; cf. Demougin (1992) 153-154). His command of a praetorian cohort as a prefect demonstrates that he held his position before the formalising of the praetorian guard in the late Augustan period. He may have been from Astigi, although his voting tribe may indicate otherwise (cf. Castillo Garcia (1965) 121, (1975) 647-648).

174 M. Manlius C.f. Pollio
Catalogues: SUO: A338, C319; **DEV:** M23 - M24: (1976-1977) 560, (1987) 1640, (1993) 2169; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 166; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Nicolet (1967) 45 no. 24; Saddington (1985) 531 no. 27
Post(s): MT(AP), PF
Date of post(s): MT(AP) before AD15, PF before AD15
Primary evidence: CIL 11.3617 = ILS 6578 (Caere, Regio 7, Italia)

175 C. [Marcius] Censorinus
Catalogues: SUO: C65; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.49; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 43
Post(s): MP|EP
Date of post(s): MP|EP in 87BC
Primary evidence: Appian, *B.C.* 1.71

(?L. Marcius) Censorinus
Catalogues: SUO: C76; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.129; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 47
Post(s): LEG|SEN|NP
Date of post(s): LEG|SEN|NP in 70BC
Primary evidence: Memnon 53 (FGrH 3B.364f.)
Relevant text: Ἐν τούτῳ Κηνσωρῖνος ναύαρχος Ῥωμαίων, τριήρεις ἄγων πεντεκαίδεκα σῖτον ἀπὸ Βοσπόρου τῷ Ῥωμαίων κομιζούσας στρατοπέδῳ, πλησίον Σινώπης κατῆρε·
Reason for exclusion: Censorinus was responsible for a squadron which brought grain from the Bosporan Kingdom to the Roman camp at Sinope. He may have been a naval prefect (Broughton (1951-1986) 2.129), but was probably a legate or a senior officer (Suolahti (1955) 372).

176 C. Marcius (?Crispinus)
Catalogues: SUO: A251; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.310; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 32
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT in 45BC
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.Hisp.* 11.2

Q. Marcius Crispus
Catalogues: SUO: A248a; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.229, 3.138; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 52
Further bibliography: Syme (1955) 135; Sumner (1971) 269
Post(s): LEG
Date of post(s): LEG in 46BC
Future career: ?Consul (suffectus) 36BC
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.Afr.* 77.2
Relevant text: Marcium Crispum tribus cum cohortibus et sagittariis tormentisque compluribus praesidio Thabenam mittit
Reason for exclusion: Given archers and a number of cohorts to defend Thabena, Marcius Crispus was almost certainly a legate (Sumner (1971) 269). On his later career, cf. Syme ((1955) 135).

177 L. (Marcius) Figulus
Catalogues: SUO: C160; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.356, 3.137; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 64
Post(s): NP
Date of post(s): NP in 43BC
Future career: ?Consul (suffectus) 36BC
Primary evidence: Appian, *B.C.* 4.60; Cicero, *ad Fam.* 12.13.3

178 Marcius Libo
Catalogues: SUO: C78; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.156; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 69
Other reference works: Welch (1995) 134 no. iii; Badian (1997) 3-4 no. iii
Further bibliography: Verzár-Bass (2000) 208
Post(s): PF
Date of post(s): PF circa 75BC
Primary evidence: Varro, *R.R.* 1.2.7

179 L. Marcius Q.f. Gal(eria) Optatus
Catalogues: SUO: A339; **DEV:** M30: (1976-1977) 563, (1987) 1642, (1993) 2170; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 47; **RE/PIR:** RE 12.1465
Other reference works: Saddington (1987) 273 no. 41
Further bibliography: Le Roux (1981) 203-204; Fabre et al. (1984-2002) 1.149-150; Alföldy (1984b) 230 no. 19; Curchin (1990) 211 no. 762; Saddington (1996a) 158-159
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD15

Primary evidence: CIL 2.4616 = ILS 6948 = Fabre et al. (1984-2002) (IRC 1.101) 147-150 no. 101 (Iluro, Hispania Tarraconensis)

180 T. Marius C.f. Ste(llatina) Siculus
Catalogues: SUO: A340, C320, A265, C193; **DEV:** M35: (1976-1977) 565-566, (1987) 1643, (1993) 2171-2172; **BRO:** 2.405, 409; **DEM:** 25; **RE/PIR:** RE 30, PIR(2) 319
Other reference works: Saddington (1988a) 307 no. 20, (1999) 305 no. 5
Further bibliography: Nicolet (1969) 148
Post(s): MT, ?MP, NP(PC)
Date of post(s): MT circa 38BC, ?MP circa 38BC, NP(PC) circa 38BC
Primary evidence: CIL 11.6058 (Uruinum Mataurense, Regio 6, Italia); cf. Valerius Maximus 7.9.2 (= 6.8.6)

181 [- - -] Tro(mentina) Maximus
Catalogues: SUO: A279; **DEV:** M82: (1976-1977) 590, (1987) 1653, (1993) 2177; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 167; **RE/PIR:** RE 12.1596
Other reference works: Saddington (1985) 530 no. 5
Further bibliography: Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 80; Saddington (1996a) 167
Post(s): MT, PF
Date of post(s): MT after 27BC, PF after 27BC
Primary evidence: CIL 9.2648 = ILS 2228 (Aesernia, Regio 4, Italia)

C. Meffius C.f. Cla(udia) Saxo
Catalogues: SUO: A341; **DEV:** M38: (1976-1977) 567-568, (1987) 1644, (1993) 2161; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 374; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Dobson (1978) 183 no. 39; Holder (1980) 247 no. E50
Further bibliography: Saddington (1982) 152
Post(s): CENT(PP), IP(PCOH), PF
Date of post(s): CENT(PP) before AD38, IP(PCOH) before AD38, PF before AD38
Primary evidence: CIL 5.4373 = Inscr.It. 10.5.162 = ILS 2694 (Brixia, Regio 10, Italia)
Relevant text: C. Meffio C. f. / Cla(udia) Saxoni / primo pilo praef(ecto) / coh(ortis) praef(ecto) fabr(um) / pontific(i) quinquen(nali) / coh(ors) Carietum et / Veniaesum
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Gaian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

C. Memmius
Catalogues: SUO: A188, A191, A193; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.84; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 7
Post(s): -
Date of post(s): [79BC], [78BC], [77BC]
Future career: Quaestor 76BC
Primary evidence: Cicero, *Balb*. 5
Relevant text: [Cornelius Balbus] hunc in Hispania durissimo bello cum Q. Metello, cum C. Memmio et in classe et in exercitu fuisse; ut Pompeius in Hispaniam uenerit Memmiumque habere quaestorem coeperit, numquam a Memmio discessisse, Carthagine esse obsessum, acerrimis illis proeliis et maximis, Sucronensi et Turiensi, interfuisse, cum Pompeio ad extremum belli tempus fuisse.
Reason for exclusion: Despite the suggestion of Suolahti (Suolathi (1955) 313-314), there is no evidence that Memmius held the rank of military tribune, or any rank at all, under Caecilius Metellus.

L. Memmius C.f. Gal(eria)
Catalogues: SUO: C169; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.484; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 13
Post(s): CP
Date of post(s): CP after 42BC
Future career: ?Praetor
Primary evidence: CIL 6.1460 = CIL 14.2264 = ILS 887 (Roma)
Relevant text: L(ucius) Memmius C. f. Gal(eria) q(uaestor) tr(ibunus) pl(ebis) [pr(aetor)] / frumenti curator ex s(enatus) c(onsulto) / praefectus leg(ionis) XXVI et <XX>VII / Lucae ad agros diuidundos / pontifex Albanus / Memmia filia testamento suo fieri iussit
Reason for exclusion: If the apparent reference to Legio VII is amended, as it probably should be, to read "<XX>VII" (cf. AE 1986, 154 adnot.), then it is likely that Memmius' prefecture dates

from just after 42BC, when Legio XXVII was disbanded (Keppie (1983) 25ff., (1984) 200, (2000a) 252; cf. C. Laconius (AE 1986, 154 = EDH HD004022 (Sinuessa, Regio 1, Italia))). There is no evidence, however, that he was a military officer.

182 C. Meuulanus
Catalogues: SUO: A215; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.170; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 1
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT in 63BC
Primary evidence: Cicero, *Sest*. 9

183 Post. Mimisius C.f. Sardus
Catalogues: SUO: A343; **DEV:** M55: (1976-1977) 574-575, (1987) 1645-1655, (1993) - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 15.1725; PIR 422; PIR(2) 592
Further bibliography: McAlindon (1957) 192; Wiseman (1971) 241 no. 255; Gaggiotti and Sensi (1982) 262
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD15
Future career: Proconsul
Primary evidence: CIL 14.2598 = Inscr.It. 4.1.112 = ILS 947 (Tibur, Latium, Italia)

184 M. Mindius Marcellus
Catalogues: SUO: C194; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.405; **DEM:** 16; **RE/PIR:** RE 5
Other reference works: Saddington (1988a) 308 no. 21
Post(s): NP(PC)
Date of post(s): NP(PC) circa 36BC
Primary evidence: SEG 4.102 = BE 1976, 872 = SEG 40.905 = AE 1925, 93 = EDH HD025816 (Velitrae, Regio 1, Italia); cf. Appian, *B.C*. 5.102

185 M. Minicius T.f. [- - -]
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** M57: (1976-1977) 575, (1987) - , (1993) 2173; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 168; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Dobson (1966) 69 n.43; Nicolet (1967) 48-49 no. 33; Saddington (1985) 531 no. 28
Post(s): MT(AP), PF|EP(PE)
Date of post(s): MT(AP) before AD15, PF|EP(PE) before AD15
Primary evidence: AE 1960, 258 (Falerio, Regio 5, Italia)

186 L. [Minucius] Basilus
Catalogues: SUO: A184; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.86, 3.143, 185; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 37
Further bibliography: Criniti (1970) 167-169; Wiseman (1971) 241-242
Post(s): MP|MT, MT
Date of post(s): MP|MT in 88BC, MT in 86BC
Primary evidence: Plutarch, *Sull*. 9.5-6; Appian, *Mith*. 51; cf. Criniti (1970) 16-26 = CIL 6.37045 = CIL 1.709 = CIL 16, p.145 = ILLRP 515 = ILS 8888 = AE 1909, 30 = AE 1910, +126 = AE 1910, +153 = AE 1910, +162 = AE 1910, 207 = AE 1910, 218 = AE 1911, 126 = AE 1912, +10 = AE 1912, +117 = AE 1912, +287 = AE 1920, +130 = AE 1923, +103 = AE 2003, +831 = EDH HD019742 (Roma)
Relevant text: Plutarch: ἐκείνων δὲ ἀπελθόντων εὐθὺς ἐκπέμψας Λεύκιον Βάσιλλον καὶ Γάϊον Μόμμιον καταλαμβάνει τὴν πύλην δι’αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ τείχη τὰ περὶ τὸν λόφον τὸν Αἰσκυλῖνον· εἶτ’αὐτὸς ἀπάσῃ σπουδῇ συνῆπτε. τῶν δὲ περὶ τὸν Βάσιλλον εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἐμπεσόντων καὶ κρατούντων, ὁ πολὺς καὶ ἄνοπλος δῆμος ἀπὸ τῶν τεγῶν κεράμῳ καὶ λίθῳ βάλλοντες ἐπέσχον αὐτοὺς τοῦ πρόσω χωρεῖν καὶ συνέστειλαν εἰς τὸ τεῖχος; Appian: Ὁ δὲ Σύλλας τῆς ἐπιούσης τόν τε ταξίαρχον ἐστεφάνου καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀριστεῖα ἐδίδου
Note: Rewarded for valour during the battle of Orchomenos, Basilus' rank when taking the Esquiline Hill in 88BC is unclear: he may have been a military tribune, although Sulla may not have had any military tribunes under his command at the time, and no title is preserved - his position at the time, therefore, should be regarded as a military prefecture. He was probably not the L. Minucius recorded in the *consilium* of Pompeius Strabo (Criniti (1970) 167-169; Wiseman (1971) 241-242; cf. L. Minucius (CIL 6.37045 = ILLRP 515 = ILS 8888 = AE 2003, +831 = EDH HD019742 et al. (Roma)).

187 C. Minucius Reginus
Catalogues: SUO: C151; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.303; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 47
Further bibliography: Tibiletti (1953) 78
Post(s): MP(GC)
Date of post(s): MP(GC) in 46BC
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.Afr*. 68.4

188 Minucius Rufus (1)
Catalogues: SUO: C61; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.44; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 49
Post(s): NP
Date of post(s): NP in 88BC
Primary evidence: Appian, *Mith*. 17, cf. 19

189 Minucius Rufus (2)
Catalogues: SUO: C121, C135; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.271, 2.283; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 50, 9
Post(s): NP
Date of post(s): NP in 49BC, NP in 48BC
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.C*. 3.7.1; cf. Orosius 6.15.4; Appian, *B.C*. 2.54
Note: On Minucius Rufus (2), cf. Q. Lucretius Vespillo.

190 L. Munatius Flaccus
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.313; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 19
Post(s): ?MP(GC)
Date of post(s): ?MP(GC) in 45BC
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.Hisp*. 19.4; cf. Valerius Maximus 9.2.4; Dio 43.33.4-35.5; Frontinus, *Strat*. 3.14.1
Relevant text: Caesar, *B.Hisp*. 19.4: tabellae de muro sunt deiectae, in quibus scriptum est inuentum: 'L. Munatius Caesari, si mihi uitam tribues, quoniam ab Cn. Pompeio sum desertus, qualem me illi praestiti, tali uirtute et constantia futurum me in te esse praestabo'
Note: Munatius Flaccus surrendered to Caesar at Ategua in Spain. It is unclear whether or not he was in command of the town.

Munatius Rufus
Catalogues: SUO: A207; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 37
Post(s): -
Date of post(s): [67BC]
Primary evidence: Plutarch, *Cato Min*. 9.1-2; cf. Valerius Maximus 4.3.2
Relevant text: Ἀποδειχθεὶς δὲ χιλίαρχος, εἰς Μακεδονίαν ἐπέμπετο πρὸς Ῥούβριον τὸν στρατηγόν. ἔνθα δὴ λέγεται, τῆς γυναικὸς ἀχθομένης καὶ δακρυούσης, ἕνα τῶν φίλων τοῦ Κάτωνος Μουνάτιον εἰπεῖν· „ὦ Ἀτιλία θάρσει· τοῦτον ἐγώ σοι φυλάξω·“ „πάνυ μὲν οὖν,“ φάναι τὸν Κάτωνα, καὶ προελθόντων μιᾶς ἡμέρας ὁδόν, εὐθὺς εἰπεῖν μετὰ τὸ δεῖπνον· „ἄγ’ ὅπως ὦ Μουνάτιε τῇ Ἀτιλίᾳ τὴν ὑπόσχεσιν ἐμπεδώσεις, μήθ’ ἡμέρας ἐμοῦ μήτε νυκτὸς ἀφιστάμενος.“
Reason for exclusion: A companion of the younger Cato during his military tribunate (although he is not explicitly named, cf. M. Porcius Cato (1)), and subsequent trip to Cyprus, no rank is preserved for Munatius Rufus, who wrote about his time with Cato (Valerius Maximus 4.3.2). He is likely to have been a *contubernalis*.

191 M. Munatuleius M.f. Ani(ensi) Marcellus
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** M75: (1976-1977) 586, (1987) - , (1993) 2176; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 169; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Nicolet (1967) 47-48 no. 31
Post(s): MT(AP)
Date of post(s): MT(AP) before AD15
Primary evidence: CIL 14.3438 (Ficulea, Regio 1, Italia)

[Ma]mius Murrius Umber
Catalogues: SUO: A336; **DEV:** M75 bis: (1976-1977) 586, (1987) 1650-1651, (1993) 2176; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 12.1558, PIR(2) 749
Further bibliography: Syme (1939) 361 n.2; De Laet (1941) 65 no. 253; Wiseman (1971) 243

no. 265; Szramkiewicz (1976) 415-416; Le Roux (1982) 462; Garcia Merino (1987) 97 no. 3; Devijver (1998) 218 no. 12; Spiedel (1998) 165, (2000) 328ff.
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD58
Future career: Praetor
Primary evidence: ILS 8968 = EE 8.114 (Segontia *uel* Uxama, Hispania Tarraconensis)
Relevant text: M. Magio M. f. Ga[l(eria)] / Antiquo praef(ecto) / cohor(tis) Cil(icum) praef(ecto) fab(rum)/ [?Ma]mius Murrius Umber / [t]rib(unus) mil(itum) leg(ionis) IIII Scythicae / IIIuir cap(italis) q(uaestor) pro pr(aetore) / [l]eg(atus) pro pr(aetore) aed(ilis) plebis / cerialis pr(aetor)
Reason for exclusion: This inscription from Uxama in Spain records two junior officers, one of whom went on to hold the praetorship. The date of the inscription is uncertain: while it is generally dated to the Augustan period (Suolahti (1955) 375; Wiseman (1971) 243 no. 265; Szramkiewicz (1976) 415-416; Devijver (1982) 178), there is no specific piece of evidence which confirms this, and it is better to place the inscription in the first century AD, probably during the Julio-Claudian period (cf. Garcia Merino (1977) 199, (1987) 97; Demougin (1992) 633). As it is likely, from the fact that Murrius Umber dedicated the inscription to Magius Antiquus, that the two men served together, this is likely to have happened before AD58, as *cohors I Cilicum* and *legio IIII Scythica* were probably both in Moesia from the Augustan period until this time, when legio IIII Scythica was sent to the East (Cohors I Cilicum: Spaul (2000) 398; Legio IIII Scythica: Devijver (1982) 178; Speidel (1998) 165, (2000) 328ff.; cf. Garcia Merino (1987) 97 no. 3; Devijver (1998) 206). Of course, they might have served together only while Antiquus was *praefectus fabrum* (where he may have served under Murrius Umber, cf. Devijver (1998) 206), or possibly not at all, but this is less likely than the above hypothesis, especially given the lack of municipal honours on the inscription. One of Syme's "dim characters with fantastic names" (Syme (1939) 361 n.2), Murrius Umber is known only from this inscription. Probably originally from Italy (Le Roux (1982) 462; Devijver (1998) 218), Murrius Umber had a successful senatorial career, but it is unclear whether he was from a senatorial family (cf. Devijver (1998) 218). Magius Antiquus was probably from Uxama or a nearby city, as other members of the *gens* are known from the area (Demougin (1992) 633). Murrius Umber's praenomen is traditionally given as [Ma]mius, and, although disputed by Garcia Merino ((1977) 199, (1987) 97), this is preferred here (cf. Devijver (1987) 1650-1651).

C. Musanus C.f.
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** M76: (1976-1977) 587-596, (1987) 1651, (1993) 2176; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 378; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Dobson (1978) 180 no. 31; Saddington (1996b) 251 no. 40
Further bibliography: Dobson (1982) 333ff.
Post(s): CENT(PP), MT, IP(PCAST)
Date of post(s): CENT(PP) before AD42, MT before AD42, IP(PCAST) before AD42
Primary evidence: AE 1954, 163 (Lucus Feroniae, Regio 7, Italia)
Relevant text: C. Musano C. f. / primo pilo bis / tr(ibuno) mil(itum) praefecto / stratopedarc(h)i / IIuir(o) quinquen(nali) / ex d(ecreto) d(ecurionum) p(ublice)
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Claudian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

192 L. Nasidienus Agrippa
Catalogues: SUO: A345; **DEV:** N7: (1976-1977) 595, (1987) - , (1993) 2180; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 170; **RE/PIR:** RE 12.1743; PIR(2) 30
Further bibliography: La Baume (1973) 337
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD15
Primary evidence: CIL 13.8270 (Colonia Agrippinensium, Germania Inferior)

193 L. Nasidius
Catalogues: SUO: C122, C144; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.271, 2.292; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 3
Other reference works: Saddington (1988a) 308 no. 30
Post(s): NP
Date of post(s): NP in 49BC, NP in 47BC
Primary evidence: 49BC: Caesar, *B.C.* 2.3-4, 7; cf. Schol. Bern. on Lucan 3.524; 47BC: Caesar, *B.Afr.* 64, 98; cf. Dio 42.56.3

Q. Nasidius
Catalogues: SUO: C186, C203; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.394, 423, 3.147; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 4
Further bibliography: Crawford (1975) 1.494-496
Post(s): LEG|NP
Date of post(s): LEG|NP in 38BC, NP|LEG in 31BC
Primary evidence: (38BC) RRC 483; Appian, *B.C.* 5.139; (31BC) Dio 50.13.5
Relevant text: Appian: Νασίδιος...ὅσοι τε ἄλλοι τῶν ἀξιολόγων ἔτι τῷ Πομπηίῳ παρῆσαν φίλοι; Dio: καὶ Πάτρας εἶλε Κύιντον Νασίδιον ναυμαχίᾳ νικήσας
Reason for exclusion: Given that no title is preserved, it is not possible to determine whether Q. Nasidius was a prefect or a legate - given the high status of many other naval commanders, he is more likely to have been a legate.

194 [- - -] Niger
Catalogues: SUO: A347, C324; **DEV:** Inc. 162: (1976-1977) 959, (1987) 1812, (1993) 2310; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 195; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Saddington (1999) 308 no. 18
Post(s): ?MT, ?EP(PE)
Date of post(s): ?MT before AD14, ?EP(PE) before AD14
Primary evidence: CIL 9.3158 = ILS 2682 (Corfinium, Regio 4, Italia)
Relevant text: [- - -] / Nigri annos XXXVIIII u[n]i / nupta uiro summa cum / concordia ad ultumum! / diem peruenit tres ex [e]o / superstites reliquid! liberos / unum maximis municipi(i) honorib(us) / iudiciis Aug(usti) Caesaris usum / alterum castre(n)sibus eiusdem / Caesaris August(i) summis [eq]u[es] / tris ordinis honoribus et iam / superiori destinatum ordini / filiam sanctissimam probissimo / uiro coniunctam et ex ea duos / [nepotes - - - dedit [- - -] / quas[- - -] / rib[- - -]
Note: The editors of ILS (ILS 2682 adnot.) suggest that "castrensibus ... summis equestris ordinis honoribus" represents the positions of *tribunus cohortis* and *praefectus equitum*, although a military tribunate and an equestrian-ranked prefecture would be more likely (cf. Devijver (1976-1977) 959). There is not enough evidence to be certain quite what these honours were, although, as Demougin argues ((1988) 283), while there was no equestrian cursus at this time, there were nevertheless posts clearly identified as equestrian, and promotion to a junior officer position would seem to fit the inscription, especially in the light of the son's promotion to the senatorial *ordo* (cf. Tacitus, *Hist.* 2.75). The rewards to Niger and his family were presumably for loyalty to Augustus (Syme (1939) 360 n.2; Demougin (1992) 174).

Niger (?Camerensi)
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** N31: (1976-1977) 607-608, (1987) 1663, (1993) 2185; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 222; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Devijver (1975) 123 no. 14; Saddington (1980) 28 no. v
Post(s): IP(PCOH)
Date of post(s): IP(PCOH) in AD15
Primary evidence: IGR 1.1236 = OGIS 2.660 = SB 8580 = I.Koptos 41 (Wadi Hammamat, Aegyptus); Ostracon Tait, 1.245 (Apollinis Hydreuma, Aegyptus)
Reason for exclusion: On Niger, cf. M. Florus (IGR 1.1250). On his cognomen, cf. Demougin (1992) 194-195.

Nonius
Catalogues: SUO: A260; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 3
Post(s): CENT
Date of post(s): CENT in 41BC
Primary evidence: Appian, *B.C.* 5.16
Relevant text: Νώνιος δὲ λοχαγὸς ἐπέπλησσεν αὐτοῖς σὺν παρρησίᾳ, τό τε πρέπον τοῖς ἀρχομένοις ἐς τὸν ἄρχοντα προφέρων καὶ τὴν Καίσαρος ἀσθένειαν, οὐχ ὑπεροψίαν.
Reason for exclusion: A centurion under Octavian, there is no reason to assume that Nonius was a military tribune.

L. Nonius Asprenas
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.313, 3.147; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 14
Further bibliography: Badian (1971) 138ff.; Sumner (1971) 260
Post(s): SEN|EP

Date of post(s): SEN|EP in 45BC
Future career: Consul (suffectus) 36BC
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.Hisp*. 10.2; cf. CIL 12.1748 = CIL 1.790 = ILS 884 = ILLRP 432 (Valentia, Gallia Narbonensis)
Relevant text: Arguetius ex Italia cum equitatu uenit. Is signa Saguntinorum rettulit quinque, quae ab oppidanis cepit. Suo loco praeteritum est quod equites ex Italia cum Asprenate ad Caesarem uenissent.
Reason for exclusion: Given his rank (he was probably a propraetor, cf. Badian (1971) 138ff.), it is hard to see Nonius Asprenas as a junior officer in 45BC. His cavalry command therefore probably involved the command of more than one unit. He may have been the son of the L. Nonius T.f. Vel(ina) from the *consilium* of Pompeius Strabo (cf. Criniti (1970) 153-155).

195 P. Numicius Pica Caesianus
Catalogues: SUO: C327; **DEV:** N15: (1976-1977) 599, (1987) 1659, (1993) 2181; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 5; PIR 165; PIR(2) 203
Other reference works: Holder (1980) 242 no. E2; Saddington (1980) 31 no. 19
Further bibliography: De Laet (1941) 67-68 no. 268; Wiseman (1971) 246 no. 283; Demougin (1982) 87 n.102, 97 n.3; Saddington (1982) 58
Post(s): EP(PE)
Date of post(s): EP(PE) before AD15
Future career: Tribunus plebis
Primary evidence: CIL 6.31742-3 = CIL 6.3835 = ILS 911 (Roma); cf. Varro, *R.R*. 3.2.2; Horace, *Ep*. 1.6

196 Octacilius Crassus
Catalogues: SUO: C137; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.284; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 9
Post(s): MP(GC)
Date of post(s): MP(GC) in 48BC
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.C*. 3.28-9

197 C. Octauius C.f. C.n. C.pr[on.]
Catalogues: SUO: A200, A201; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.482; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 15
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before 73BC
Future career: Proconsul 60BC
Primary evidence: CIL 6.41023 = CIL 6.1311 = CIL 1, p.199 = CIL 5.*753.2 = Inscr.It. 13.3.75 = ILS 47 = AE 1949, 4 = EDH HD027489 (Roma)
Relevant text: [C. Iulius C. f. C. n.] Caesar / [pater diui Iul]i / [tr(ibunus) mil(itum) Xuir agr(is) dand(is) adtr(ibuendis) iu]dic(andis) q(uaestor) pr(aetor) / [inter ciues et peregrinos pro]co(n)s(ul) in Asia // C. Octauius C. f. C. n. C. pr[on.] / pater Augusti / tr(ibunus) mil(itum) bis q(uaestor) aed(ilis) pl(ebis) cum / C. Toranio iudex quaestionum / pr(aetor) proco(n)s(ul) imperator appellatus / ex prouincia Macedonia

M. Octauius
Catalogues: SUO: C204; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.422; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 34
Other reference works: Saddington (1988a) 308 no. 27
Post(s): LEG|NP
Date of post(s): LEG|NP in 31BC
Primary evidence: Plutarch, *Ant*. 65.1-2
Relevant text: Ἀντώνιος μὲν τὸ δεξιὸν κέρας ἔχων καὶ Ποπλικόλας, Κοίλιος δὲ τὸ εὐώνυμον, ἐν μέσῳ δὲ Μᾶρκος Ὀκτάβιος καὶ Μᾶρκος Ἰνστήιος.
Reason for exclusion: A naval commander at the centre of Antonius' forces at Actium, Octauius was probably too senior to be considered as a junior officer and, like M. Insteius, was probably a legate (cf. M. Insteius; Broughton (1951-1986) 2.420, 422).

P. Octauius
Catalogues: SUO: C232; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 100; **RE/PIR:** RE 37; PIR(2) 20
Further bibliography: Brunt (1975) 142; Thomasson (1984) 342 no. 6
Post(s): SEN
Date of post(s): SEN in 2BC

Future career: Praefectus Aegypti
Primary evidence: BGU 4.1200 (2-1BC); IGR 1.1117 (February 19 AD3, Sicbioaei Insula, Aegyptus)
Reason for exclusion: This individual held a senior officer position.

198 (Octauius?) Balbus
Catalogues: SUO: C71; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.72, 3.151; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 43
Post(s): EP
Date of post(s): EP in 82BC
Primary evidence: Plutarch, *Sull*. 29.3

199 C. Octauius Graecinus
Catalogues: SUO: A186; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 55
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT circa 80BC
Future career: Legatus 76BC
Primary evidence: CIL 14.3629 = Inscr.It. 4.1.161; cf. CIL 14.3629a = Inscr.It. 4.1.162; CIL 14.3664 = CIL 1.1492 = ILS 5546 = Inscr.It. 4.1.19 = ILLRP 680 = AE 2000, +19 (Tibur, Regio 1, Italia); cf. Frontinus, *Strat*. 2.5.31

200 A. Octauius A.f. Ligus
Catalogues: SUO: A291; **DEV:** O9: (1976-1977) 612, (1987) 1667, (1993) 2187-2188; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 89; **RE/PIR:** RE 68, 12.1600, 1612; PIR(2) 47
Further bibliography: Roldán Hervás (1974b) 320-321; Szramkiewicz (1976) 422; Paci (1978) 281ff.; Le Roux (1982) 305; Torelli (1982) 295; Menella (1983) 215ff.
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before 5BC
Primary evidence: CIL 11.3312; cf. CIL 11.3304 = ILS 135; CIL 11.3305 = ILS 142 (Forum Clodii, Regio 7, Italia)

L. Octauius L.f. Cam(ilia) Rufus
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** O10: (1976-1977) 613, (1987) 1668, (1993) 2188; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 171; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Forni (1982a) 52; Duthoy (1984-1986) 146 no. 264
Post(s): MT, PF
Date of post(s): MT before AD42, PF before AD42
Primary evidence: CIL 11.6167 = ILS 5673 = AE 1997, +498 (Suasa, Regio 6, Italia)
Relevant text: L. Octauio L. f. Cam(ilia) / Rufo trib(uno) mil(itum) leg(ionis) IIII / Scythicae praef(ecto) fabr(um) / bis duomuiro quinq(uennali) ex / s(enatus) c(onsulto) et d(ecreto) d(ecurionum) auguri ex d(ecreto) d(ecurionum) / creato / qui lauationem gratuitam / municipib(us) incoleis / hospitib(us) et aduentorib(us) / uxsorib(us) serueis ancilleis/que eoru(um) in perpetuom / dedit d(ecreto) d(ecurionum) publ(ice) patrono
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Claudian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

201 Q. Octauius L.f. C.n. L.pron. Ser(gia) Sagitta
Catalogues: SUO: A352, C328, C329; **DEV:** O11: (1976-1977) 613-614, (1987) 1668, (1993) 2188-2189; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 281; **RE/PIR:** PIR 39; PIR(2) 58
Other reference works: Pflaum (1960-1961) 13 no. 1; Nicolet (1967) 48 no. 32; Holder (1980) 244 no. E25; Saddington (1980) 30 no. 15, (1985) 530 no. 8, (1999) 307 no. 14
Further bibliography: Heuberger (1942) 291-292; Wells (1972) 75ff.; Laffi (1977) 370ff.; Saddington (1996a) 161; Verzár-Bass (2000) 217-218; Schaub (2001) 391-400
Post(s): PF, EP(PE), MT(AP)
Date of post(s): PF before 15BC, EP(PE) before 15BC, MT(AP) before 15BC
Future career: Procurator
Primary evidence: AE 1977, 241 = AE 1912, 219 = AE 1902, 189 = ILS 9007 = NS 1902 (De Nino, A.) 124 = EDH HD005859; CIL 9.3311 = ILS 6532 (Superaequum Paeligniorum, Regio 4, Italia)

Ofellius
Catalogues: SUO: A262; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.404; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 1

Post(s): -
Date of post(s): [39BC]
Primary evidence: Josephus, *A.J.* 14.345
Relevant text: μάλιστα μέντοι πρὸς ταῦτα αὐτὸν Ὀφέλλιος ἐνῆγεν
Reason for exclusion: An adviser under Herod in 39BC, there is no evidence that Ofellius was a junior officer. He should not, as Broughton notes, be identified with the Ofillius of Appian (cf. Ofillius; Broughton (1951-1986) 2.404; Demougin (1992) 31; contra, Suolahti (1955) 403).

202 Ofillius
Catalogues: SUO: A264; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.404; **DEM:** 15; **RE/PIR:** RE Ofellius 2
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT in 36BC
Primary evidence: Appian, *B.C.* 5.128; cf. Dio 49.13
Relevant text: ἔτι δὲ αὐτοῦ τοιάδε προστιθέντος ἕτερα, ὑπεφώνησε χιλίαρχος Ὀφίλλιος στεφάνους μὲν καὶ πορφύραν εἶναι παισὶν ἀθύρματα, στρατοῦ δὲ γέρα χωρία καὶ χρήματα: καὶ τοῦ πλήθους ἐπιβοήσαντος, ὅτι ὀρθῶς λέγοι, ὁ μὲν Καῖσαρ ἀπέστη τοῦ βήματος δυσχεραίνων. οἱ δὲ ἀμφὶ τὸν χιλίαρχον ἦσαν ἐπαινοῦντές τε καὶ τοῖς οὐ συνισταμένοις αὐτῷ λοιδορούμενοι. ὁ δ᾽ ἔφη καὶ μόνος ἀρκέσειν ἐπὶ οὕτω δικαίοις.
Note: A military tribune in Octavian's army, Ofillius is notable for his objection to Octavian's proposals to reward his officers with crowns and purple robes, and for his subsequent disapperance. He is not to be confused with the Ofellius of 39BC (contra, Suolahti (1955) 403; cf. Broughton (1951-1986) 2.404; Demougin (1992) 31). Given the presence of other equestrian-ranked Ofillii in inscriptions from the town, he was possibly from Terventum (Demougin (1992) 31; cf. CIL 9.2599).

Sex. O[lius L.f.] A[e]m. Secu[ndus]
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 172; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Kent (1966) 69ff.
Post(s): PF
Date of post(s): PF before AD42
Primary evidence: Kent (1966) 69-70 no. 152 (Corinth 8.3.152) (Corinthus, Achaia)
Relevant text: Sex. O[lio L. f.] A[e]m(ilia) / Secu[ndo p]raef(ecto) / fabr(um) theocol(o) Iouis / [Ca]p[it]ol(ini) aedilic(ibus) et / ag[ono]t[heti]c(is) orna/mentis d(ecreto) [d(ecurionum) o]rnato / Sex. Olius Sex. f. Aem(ilia) Procu/[lus et] Cornelia M. [f(ilia)] / [- - - Secundi uxor] pos[t] / [obitum]
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Claudian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

203 M. Opimius
Catalogues: SUO: C136; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.283; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 9, cf. 2
Post(s): EP(PE)
Date of post(s): EP(PE) in 48BC
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.C.* 3.38.4

M. Oppius
Catalogues: SUO: A353; **DEV:** O19: (1976-1977) 617-618, (1987) 1669, (1993) 2191; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 173; **RE/PIR:** 12.1465
Other reference works: Dobson (1978) 180 no. 32
Post(s): CENT(PP), ?MT, IP(PCAST)
Date of post(s): CENT(PP) before AD38, ?MT before AD38, IP(PCAST) before AD38
Primary evidence: CIL 9.798 (Luceria, Regio 2, Italia)
Relevant text: M. Oppius [- - -] / centur(io) leg(ionis) VI p(rimus) [p(ilus)] / trib(unus) leg(ionis) II pr[aef(ectus)] / castror[um - - -]
Reason for exclusion: Oppius is dated by Ritterling and Dobson to the Augustan era (Ritterling (RE 12.1465); Dobson (1978) 10). Demougin suggests that he may have been Augustan, as he was of Italian origin, and this career path is more normal for those of Italian origin in the Augustan period (Demougin (1992) 159); the lack of legion *cognomina* also suggests an early date, as does the parallel with the probably Triumviral L. Firmius (cf. L. Firmius L.f. (CIL 10.5713)). This argument is, however, not strong, and if it were correct, this would be a very early use of the phrase "tribunus legionis" (although probably not without parallel: cf. L. Nasidienus Agrippa (CIL 13.8270)). Another possible justification for the Augustan date is that it would be usual for a

centurion, if he were promoted to another legion, to be promoted to one nearby. If so, then the fact that Legio II (Augusta) and Legio VI (Victrix) were both in Spain until AD9 might suggest an Augustan date (Ritterling (RE 12.1465); Devijver (1976-1977) 618). However, there is no evidence that Oppius was a member of either legion, and this argument could be made for other pairs of legions II and VI at other times.

P. Opsidius P.f. Rufus
Catalogues: SUO: A354, C330; **DEV:** O23: (1976-1977) 620, (1987) - , (1993) 2192; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 746; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Dobson (1966) 69 n.43
Post(s): MT, PF
Date of post(s): MT before AD69, PF before AD69
Primary evidence: CIL 5.2791 (Patauium, Regio 10, Italia)
Relevant text: Fortunae sacrum / P. Opsidius P. f. Rufus IIIIuir / tr(ibunus) mil(itum) leg(ionis) IIII Scythic(ae) / praef(ectus) fabr(um)
Reason for exclusion: Julio-Claudian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

204 M. Orfius
Catalogues: SUO: A224; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 3.153; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 1
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT in 54BC
Primary evidence: Cicero, *ad Q.F.* 2.14.2

P. Ostorius Scapula
Catalogues: SUO: C230, C236; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 119; **RE/PIR:** RE 5; PIR(2) 165
Further bibliography: Brunt (1975) 142 no. 7; Thomasson (1984) 342 no. 8
Post(s): SEN
Date of post(s): SEN after AD3
Future career: Praefectus Aegypti
Primary evidence: AE 1938, 136 = SB 8003 (Madinatmadi, Aegyptus); cf. P.Mich. 1440
Relevant text: [῾Υπὲ]ρ Καίσαρος αὐ[το]/κράτορος Θε[ο]ῦ Δὶος Σεβαστο[ῦ / ἐπὶ] Σκάπλου / [ἡγε]μόνος
Reason for exclusion: P. Ostorius Scapula was *praefectus Aegypti* from AD3 to AD11, but there is no evidence that he was a junior officer. He was probably not the same individual as the praetorian prefect Ostorius Scapula (Brunt (1975) 142 no. 7; Thomasson (1984) 342 no. 8; Demougin (1992) 125-126), whose praenomen was Quintus.

Q. Ostorius Scapula
Catalogues: SUO: C230, C236; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 94; **RE/PIR:** RE 5; PIR(2) 166
Further bibliography: Syme (1974) 3ff.
Post(s): SEN
Date of post(s): SEN in 2BC
Future career: Praefectus praetorii
Primary evidence: Dio 55.10.10
Reason for exclusion: This individual held a senior officer position.

L. Ouinius L.f. Teret(ina) Rufus
Catalogues: SUO: A355, C331; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 265; **RE/PIR:** RE 12.1730
Other reference works: Dobson (1978) 174 no. 15; Saddington (1985) 531 no. 18
Post(s): CENT(PP), MT(COHP/U), PF
Date of post(s): CENT(PP) after AD15, MT(COHP/U) after AD15, PF after AD15
Primary evidence: CIL 10.4872 = ILS 2021 (Venafrum, Regio 10, Italia).
Relevant text: L. Ouinius L. f. Ter(etina) Rufus / prim(us) ordo cohortium praet(oriarum) / diui Augusti prim(us) pil(us) leg(ionis) XIIII Gem(inae) / trib(unus) mil(itum) cohort(is) XI urb(anae) trib(unus) mil(itum) / coh(ortis) [.]III praet(oriae) praef(ectus) fabr(um) IIuir / L. Ouinio M. f. Ter(etina) patri / M. Ouinio L. f. Ter(etina) Vopisco fratri / Allidiae L. f. Rufae matri / Pulliae Primae uxori
Reason for exclusion: This inscription, which records a number of members of Ouinius' family, is one of few early examples of a detailed centurionate career. Promoted from the position of centurion in the praetorian cohorts, he was probably a*primipilus* at the turn of the

Augustan/Tiberian periods (Dobson (1978) 11; Demougin (1992) 226; contra Ritterling (RE 12.1730) who dates his service in Legio XIIII Gemina to the Augustan period). He was then promoted to a tribunate in the urban cohorts, followed by one in charge of Cohors [.]III Praetoria, which suggests a Tiberian date for his career as a junior officer, before becoming *praefectus fabrum*. He became *duouir* in Venafrum following his retirement, which Demougin dates to c.AD30 (Demougin (1992) 227).

Pacatianus
Catalogues: SUO: C332; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** PIR 2; PIR(2) 7
Post(s): -
Date of post(s): [before 15BC]
Primary evidence: Malalas 9.13 (Thurn)
Relevant text: Φρυγίαν δὲ Πακατιανὴν ὑπὸ τὴν τετραρχίαν τοῦ αὐτοῦ οὖσαν ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίους ἐποίησε, πέμψας μετὰ βοηθείας Πακατιανὸν στρατηγὸν αὐτοῦ
Reason for exclusion: As PIR2 notes (PIR(2) 7), the Pacatianus named in Malalas is almost certainly a fictional character.

205 Pacideius (1)
Catalogues: SUO: C152; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.303; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 1
Post(s): MP|EP
Date of post(s): MP|EP in 46BC
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.Afr*. 13.1, 78.4
Relevant text: *B.Afr*. 13.1: hostes interim, quorum dux Labienus et duo Pacidei; *B.Afr*. 78 Pacideius suos equites exporrigere coepit in longitudinem
Note: One of two brothers serving with Pompeian forces in Africa as *praefecti*, one of the Pacideii, here designated as "Pacideius (1)", was also responsible for a number of unsuccessful cavalry manoeuvres at Tegea (cf. Pacideius (2)).

206 Pacideius (2)
Catalogues: SUO: C153; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.303; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 1
Post(s): MP
Date of post(s): MP in 46BC
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.Afr*. 13.1
Note: One of two brothers serving with Pompeian forces in Africa, cf. Pacideius (1).

207 Q. (Paconius) Lepta
Catalogues: SUO: C104, C109; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.246; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 1
Other reference works: Welch (1995) 138-139 no. x; Badian (1997) 6 no. x
Post(s): PF
Date of post(s): PF in 51BC, PF in 50BC
Primary evidence: 51BC: Cicero, *ad Fam*. 3.7.4; cf. *ad Att*. 5.17.2, 6.1.22, 6.8.2, *ad Fam*. 16.4.4; 50BC: Cicero, *ad Fam*. 5.20.4; cf. *ad Att*. 6.8.2

208 Sex. Palpellius P.f. Vel(ina) Hister
Catalogues: SUO: A356; **DEV:** P9 bis: (1976-1977) - , (1987) 1673-1674, (1993) 2196; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 12.1743; PIR(2) 73
Further bibliography: Syme (1939) 363 n.2; Wiseman (1971) 100; Chastagnol (1980) 171-172; Alföldy (1982) 330
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT in AD11
Future career: Consul AD43
Primary evidence: CIL 5.35 = ILS 946 = Inscr.It. 10.1.66 (Pola, Regio 10, Italia); cf. CIL 6.2015; Tacitus, *Ann*. 12.29; Pliny, *N.H*. 10.35

209 Sex. Papinius Q.f. Allenius
Catalogues: SUO: A357; **DEV:** P11: (1976-1977) 628-629, (1987) 1674, (1993) 2196; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 236; **RE/PIR:** PIR(2) 102
Further bibliography: McAlindon (1957) 192; Demougin (1982) 97 n.8
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD15

Future career: Consul AD36
Primary evidence: CIL 5.2823 = ILS 945 (Patauium, Regio 10, Italia); cf. Pliny, *N.H*. 15.47; CIL 1(2) p.91; Tacitus, *Ann*. 6.49.

210 C. Papirius C.f. Clu(stumina) Carbo
Catalogues: SUO: A271; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 3.154; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 36
Further bibliography: Wiseman (1971) 58, 151
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before 20BC
Future career: Propraetor
Primary evidence: CIL 6.1317 = ILS 909 (Roma)

211 C. Papirius C. f. Vel(ina) Masso
Catalogues: SUO: A272; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 3.155; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 60
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before 31BC
Future career: Aedilis plebis
Primary evidence: CIL 6.1480 = ILS 907; CIL 6.1481 (Roma)

212 Passienus Rufus
Catalogues: SUO: A294; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 7; PIR(2) 150
Further bibliography: Merlin (1944) 258; Syme (1986) 160
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT in AD3
Primary evidence: CIL 8.26580 = ILS 8966 = Merlin (1944) (ILTun.) 258 no. 1422 (Thugga, Africa proconsularis)

213 [- - -] Patruus
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** P121 - P121 bis: (1976-1977) 687, (1987) 1697, (1993) 2214; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 26; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Speidel (1977) 514ff., (1980) 211ff.; Birley (1978) 263
Post(s): ?MT, ?EP(PE)
Date of post(s): ?MT before 28BC, ?EP(PE) before 28BC
Primary evidence: AE 1983, 182 (Fundi, Regio 1, Italia); cf. CIL 9.733 = ILS 2499 = AE 1980, 537 (Larinum, Regio 2, Italia)

214 [S]ex. Pedius Sex.f. Ar[n(ensi)] Lusianus Hirrutus
Catalogues: SUO: C333, C334; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 227; **RE/PIR:** RE 19.1973; PIR(2) P217
Other reference works: Pflaum (1960-1961) no. 14; Dobson (1978) 175 no. 18
Further bibliography: Wells (1972) 75-78; Demougin (1981) 100; Torelli (1982) 186; Wrobel (2009) 78
Post(s): CENT(PP), MP(GC), IP(PLA)
Date of post(s): CENT(PP) before AD15, MP(GC) before AD15, IP(PLA) before AD15
Primary evidence: CIL 9.3044 = ILS 2689 = AE 1986, 221 (Interpromium, Regio 4, Italia)

Pedo
Catalogues: SUO: C245; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 124; **RE/PIR:** PIR(2) 219
Further bibliography: Brunt (1975) 142 no. 8; Thomasson (1984) 342-343 no. 10
Post(s): SEN
Date of post(s): SEN circa AD10
Future career: Praefectus Aegypti
Primary evidence: PSI 1149 l.5
Reason for exclusion: This individual held a senior officer position.

L. Peducaeus
Catalogues: SUO: C82; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.178; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 2
Post(s): CP
Date of post(s): CP in 62BC
Primary evidence: Cicero, *Flacc*. 68

Relevant text: Apameae manifesto comprehensum ante pedes praetoris in foro expensum est auri pondo c paulo minus per Sex. Caesium, equitem Romanum, castissimum hominem atque integerrimum, Laodiceae xx pondo paulo amplius per hunc L. Peducaeum, iudicem nostrum, Adramytii <c> per Cn. Domitium legatum, Pergami non multum.
Reason for exclusion: One of those responsible for accounting for the Jewish gold which Flaccus was accused of stealing. While Flaccus may well have been a prefect of some kind, there is no evidence that he was a junior officer. Cf. Sex. Caesius.

215 M. Petreius
Catalogues: SUO: A212, C81; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.482; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 3
Post(s): MT, MP
Date of post(s): MT before 63BC, MP before 63BC
Future career: Praetor before 63BC
Primary evidence: Sallust, *Cat*. 59.6
Relevant text: homo militaris, quod amplius annos triginta tribunus aut praefectus aut legatus aut praetor cum magna gloria in exercitu fuerat
Note: Petreius, a key ally of and commander under Pompeius, began his military career as a junior officer.

216 Petronius
Catalogues: SUO: A225, A226; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.225, 2.230; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 84
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): ?MT in 54BC, MT in 53BC
Primary evidence: Plutarch, *Crass*. 30.5, 31.5; cf. Polyaenus 7.41

[- - - ?Pet]ronius Ti.f. Ti.n. [- - -]
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** P20: (1976-1977) 633, (1987) - , (1993) 2198; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 180; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD42
Primary evidence: CIL 11.6347 = CIL 11.*826d (Pisaurum, Regio 6, Italia)
Relevant text: [- - - ?Pet]ronius Ti. f. Ti. n. / [- - -] tr(ibunus) mil(itum) IIuir aug(ur) / [- - -]
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Claudian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

C. Petronius
Catalogues: SUO: C216; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 62; **RE/PIR:** RE 21; PIR(2) 267-268
Further bibliography: Brunt (1975) 142; Thomasson (1984) 341-342 no. 3
Post(s): SEN
Date of post(s): SEN in 24BC
Future career: Praefectus Aegypti
Primary evidence: Pliny, *N.H*. 6.181; Dio 54.5.4; Strabo 17.788
Reason for exclusion: This individual held a senior officer position.

217 L. Petronius
Catalogues: SUO: A181, C66; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 88
Post(s): PF|MP|MT
Date of post(s): PF|MP|MT in 87BC
Primary evidence: Valerius Maximus 4.7.5

218 Cn. Petronius Cn.f. Pom(ptina) Asellio
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** P21: (1976-1977) 633, (1987) 1677, (1993) 2198; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 126; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Saddington (1980) 31 no. 17, (1985) 530 no. 14; Holder (1980) 244 no. E26
Further bibliography: Saddington (1982) 58; Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 94 n.195; Devijver (1991) 252ff.
Post(s): MT, EP(PE), PF
Date of post(s): MT after AD4, EP(PE) after AD4, PF after AD4
Primary evidence: CIL 13.6816 (Mogontiacum, Germania Superior)

[. P]inarius Sex.f. Clu(stumina)
Catalogues: SUO: A358; **DEV:** P32: (1976-1977) 641, (1987) 1680, (1993) 2199; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 62; **RE/PIR:** RE 20.1406
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD42
Primary evidence: CIL 11.4746 (Vicus Martis Tudertium, Regio 6, Italia)
Relevant text: [. P]inario Sex. f. Clu(stumina) / [?II]IIuir(o) i(ure) d(icundo) / [. p]raef(ecto) sacr(orum) tr(ibuno) mil(itum)
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Claudian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

219 Q. Pinarius L.f. Aem(ilia)
Catalogues: SUO: A258; **DEV:** P33: (1976-1977) 641-642, (1987) 1680-1681, (1993) 2199-2200; **BRO:** 2.482; **DEM:** 27; **RE/PIR:** RE 6
Other reference works: Devijver (1986) 125 no. 64
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before 14BC
Primary evidence: AE 1992, 1581 = IK-59 12 = ILS 8862 (Ephesus, Asia)

L. Pinarius L.f. Gal(eria) Natta
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** P35: (1976-1977) 642, (1987) - , (1993) 2200; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 306; **RE/PIR:** 309
Other reference works: Devijver (1975) 81-82 no. 91; Saddington, (1987) 270 no. 12
Further bibliography: Lesquier (1918) 427
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD31
Primary evidence: CIL 10.1129 = ILS 2698 (Abellinum, Regio 1, Italia); Tacitus, *Ann*. 6.34; cf. Seneca, *Mor*. 122.11
Relevant text: L. Pinario L. f. Gal(eria) / Nattae / aed(ili) IIuir(o) q(uinquennali) tr(ibuno) mil(itum) leg(ionis) III / praefecto Bernicidis(!) / M. Biuellius C. f. Gal(eria); Tacitus, *Ann*. 4.34: accusabant Satrius Secundus et Pinarius Natta, Seiani clientes
Reason for exclusion: L. Pinarius Natta is often identified with one of the prosecutors of Cremutius Cordus in AD25 (cf. Devijver (1975) 81 no. 91), although, as Demougin points out, it is more likely that they were related (Demougin (1992) 261); even so, he probably would not have held a prominent post in Egypt after Sejanus' fall. Moreover, he will have held his military tribunate before AD35, when Legio III (stationed in Egypt) gained the cognomen "Cyrenaica" (Pflaum (1960-1961) 127-128), and it probably dates to the early Tiberian period; if he is the Pinarius Natta of Tacitus, it may also belong to the late Augustan period. On his roles as military tribune and *praefectus Berenicidis*, see P. Iuuentius Rufus (cf. Lesquier (1918) 427). On the basis of his voting tribe, Pinarius Natta was probably a native of Abellinum (Demougin (1992) 261).

[?T. P]inarius T.f. Clu(stumina) Natta
Catalogues: SUO: A359; **DEV:** P34: (1976-1977) 642, (1987) 1681, (1993) 2200; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 63; **RE/PIR:** RE 19; PIR(2) 410
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD42
Primary evidence: CIL 11.4189 = ILS 6627 (Interamna Nahars, Regio 6, Italia)
Relevant text: [?T. Pi]narius T. f. Clu(stumina) Natta / [p]ontif(ex) IIIIuir pr(aefectus) sacr(orum) tr(ibunus) mil(itum) / [T. P]inarius T. f. Clu(stumina) IIIIuir / pr(aefectus) sacr(orum) pater
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Claudian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date, cf. [- - -] Aufidi[us - - -] (CIL 11.4183a).

L. Pinarius L.f. Pup(inia) Ruscus
Catalogues: SUO: A360; **DEV:** P35 bis: (1976-1977) - , (1987) 1681, (1993) 2200; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** PIR(2) 411
Other reference works: Saddington (1987) 270 no. 12
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD42
Future career: Quaestor
Primary evidence: CIL 6.1489 (Roma)
Relevant text: L. Pinarius L. f. Pup(inia) Ruscus tr(ibunus) mil(itum) q(uaestor) / Pinaria L. f.

Metili(a) / Besia C. f. Sabina annorum XV decessit
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Claudian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

220 [L.] Pinarius Scarpus
Catalogues: SUO: C170; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.368; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 24
Further bibliography: Tibiletti (1953) 79
Post(s): IP
Date of post(s): IP in 42BC
Future career: Legatus 31BC
Primary evidence: Appian, *B.C.* 4.107

221 Cn. Plancius
Catalogues: SUO: A216; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.177; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 4
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT in 62BC
Future career: Aedile 54BC
Primary evidence: Cicero, *Planc.* 28; cf. 27

M. Plautius Hypsaeus
Catalogues: SUO: C69; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.484; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 22
Post(s): SEN|NP|LEG
Date of post(s): SEN|NP|LEG circa 84BC
Future career: Legatus before 80BC
Primary evidence: Valerius Maximus 4.6.3

[- - -] Plautus Scaeua Vibianus
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** P43 bis: (1976-1977) 646, (1987) - , (1993) 2202; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 316; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD38
Primary evidence: AE 2000, 1002 (Nouaesium, Germania inferior)
Relevant text: [- - -] Plauti Scaeua[e] Vibiani tribuni / militum [l]egionis V
Reason for exclusion: Plautus Scaeua Vibianus served as a military tribune in Legio V (Alaudae) on the Rhine. Given that the legion was based there under Augustus or Tiberius, his military tribunate must be dated to this period (von Petrikovitis and Müller (1961) 467-468; Devijver (1976-1977) 646; Demougin (1992) 267-268).

222 Cn. Pollienus Cn.f.
Catalogues: SUO: A285; **DEV:** P49: (1976-1977) 650, (1987) - , (1993) 2023-2024; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 50; **RE/PIR:** RE 12.1709
Further bibliography: Wilson (1990) 38; Bivona (1994) 126-127
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before 21BC
Primary evidence: Bivona (1994) 125-126 no. 13 = CIL 10.7349; Bivona (1994) 126-127 no. 14 = CIL 10.7350 (Thermae Himeraeae, Sicilia)

[- - - ?Po]llio
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** P126: (1976-1977) 690, (1987) 1699, (1993) 2215; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 199; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Nicolet (1967) 46 no. 28
Post(s): ?MT(AP)
Date of post(s): ?MT(AP) before AD15
Primary evidence: CIL 11.6352 (Pisaurum, Regio 6, Italia)
Relevant text: [- - - Po]llio / [?trib(unus) ?mil(itum) ?a ?p]opulo / [- - -]r duouir / [au]gur / [- - -]
Reason for exclusion: Given the highly fragmentary nature of the inscription, it is not possible to be confident even that this individual served as a military tribune, let alone that this post was followed by that of *praefectus fabrum*, as is suggested by Demougin (Nicolet (1967) 46; cf. Devijver (1976-1977) 690; Demougin (1992) 176).

C. Pompeius C.f. Sabatina
Catalogues: SUO: A234a; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Suolahti (1958) 153 no. 9
Further bibliography: Forni (1982a) 163; Ben Zeev (1998) 156-157
Post(s): -
Date of post(s): [49BC]
Primary evidence: Josephus, *A.J.* 14.228-230, 236-240
Reason for exclusion: See the discussion of *consilia* in ch. 1.

223 L. Pompeius M.f. Pol(lia)
Catalogues: SUO: A362; **DEV:** P52: (1976-1977) 651-652, (1987) - , (1993) 2204; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 174; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Nicolet (1967) 35 no. 3
Post(s): MT(AP)
Date of post(s): MT(AP) before AD15
Primary evidence: CIL 5.7566 (Hasta, Regio 9, Italia)

Sex. Pompeius
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** 33
Other reference works: Saddington (1988a) 305 no. 1
Post(s): SEN|NP, SEN|MP(GC)
Date of post(s): SEN|NP in 42BC, SEN|MP(GC) in 42BC
Primary evidence: Velleius 2.73.1-2; BMCRR 2.560ff. = RRC 520
Relevant text: Velleius: Quem senatus paene totus adhuc e Pompeianis constans partibus post Antonii a Mutina fugam eodem illo tempore, quo Bruto Cassioque transmarinas prouincias decreuerat, reuocatum ex Hispania, ubi aduersus eum clarissimum bellum Pollio Asinius praetorius gesserat, in paterna bona restituerat et orae maritimae praefecerat; RRC 520: praefectus classis et orae maritimae ex s(enatus) c(onsulto)
Reason for exclusion: Despite his being designated by the senate as *praefectus classis et orae maritimae*, and classed as such by Saddington ((1988a) 305), Sextus Pompeius cannot be viewed as a junior officer.

T. Pompeius T.f. Trom(entina) Albinus
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** P54: (1976-1977) 652, (1987) 1683, (1993) 2204; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 562; **RE/PIR:** RE 12.1612
Further bibliography: Pflaum (1978) 204; Rémy and Ferber (1991) 270; Keppie (2000a) 30; Morillo Cerdan and Garcia Marcos (2000) 592
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT after AD54
Future career: Subprocurator
Primary evidence: CIL 12.2327 = ILS 6995 = AE 1991, 1199 = AE 2002, +929 (Cularo, Gallia Narbonensis); AE 1935, 5 = AE 2002, +929 (Emerita, Lusitania)
Relevant text: CIL 12.2327: [T. Pompeio T. f. Trom(entina)] / [Albino] / [tribuno mil(itum) leg(ionis) VI] / [Victric(is) subproc(uratori)] / [prouinc(iae)] Lusitaniae / [IIu(iro) i(ure) d(icundo) col(oniae) Iu]l(iae) Aug(ustae) Flor(entiae) [V(iennae)] / [Pompeia T. f]il. Sextina; AE 1935, 5: T. Pompeius T. f. Trom(entina) / Albinus domo Vienna / IIuir tr(ibunus) mil(itum) leg(ionis) VI Victr(icis) / adiutor T. Decidi Domitiani / procuratoris / Caesaris Augusti / h(ic) s(itus) e(st) s(it) t(ibi) t(erra) l(euis)
Reason for exclusion: These two inscriptions record a junior officer who served as a military tribune in *Legio VI Victrix*, and then as the deputy of T. Decidius Domitianus, procurator of Lusitania. They have been dated to the Augustan period by some (Roldán Hervás (1974b) 320-321; Devijver (1976-1977) 652), but as Legio VI does not seem to have taken the name Victrix until the Neronian period, and the duovirate in Vienne probably postdates AD40 (Legio VI Victrix: Ritterling, RE 12.1601; Pflaum (1978) 204; Keppie (2000a) 30; Vienne: Demougin (1992) 467-468), a later date is preferred here (cf. Pflaum (1960-1961) 1050; Demougin (1988) 742, 839, (1992) 467-469; Rémy and Ferber (1991) 270; Morillo Cerdan and Garcia Marcos (2000) 592; Rémy et al. (2002) 279). There is no evidence that T. Decidius Domitianus, the procurator under whom Pompeius Albinus served, was a junior officer.

[Cn. Pompeius] Apollophanes
Catalogues: SUO: C187, C195; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.394, 2.405; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE Apollophanes 10
Other reference works: Saddington (1988) 306 no. 7
Post(s): SEN|NP
Date of post(s): SEN|NP in 38BC, SEN|NP in 36BC
Primary evidence: 38BC: Suetonius, *Aug*. 16; cf. Appian, *B.C*. 5.84; Dio 48.47, 48.6; 36BC: Appian, *B.C*. 5.104-107; Dio 49.2-7, 10
Relevant text: Suetonius: Democharе et Apollophane praefectis Pompei; Appian, *B.C*. 5.105: Ἀγρίππας μὲν οὖν ἀπὸ Στρογγύλης εἰς Ἱερὰν διέπλει καὶ τῶν Πομπηίου φρουρῶν αὐτὸν οὐχ ὑποστάντων εἶλε τὴν Ἱερὰν καὶ τῆς ἐπιούσης ἔμελλεν ἐπιχειρήσειν ἐς Μύλας Δημοχάρει τῷ Πομπηίου, τεσσαράκοντα ναῦς ἔχοντι: ὁ δὲ Πομπήιος, τὸ βίαιον ὑφορώμενος τοῦ Ἀγρίππα, ἔπεμπε τῷ Δημοχάρει ναῦς ἄλλας πέντε καὶ τεσσαράκοντα ἀπὸ Μεσσήνης. ἐξελεύθερον ἄγοντα Ἀπολλοφάνη, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐφείπετο ἄλλαις ἑβδομήκοντα.
Reason for exclusion: Explicitly described as "praefecti" by Suetonius, Apollophanes and Democharеs were in independent command of a large number of warships. Therefore, despite the description by Suetonius (confirmed by no other author), it is likely that they should be regarded as senior officers, like other Pompeian freedmen serving as naval commanders under Sextus Pompeius (such as Cn. [Pompeius] Menecrates).

[Cn. Pompeius] Democharеs
Catalogues: SUO: C188, C196; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.394, 405; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE Democharеs 7
Other reference works: Saddington (1988a) 306 no. 8
Post(s): SEN|NP
Date of post(s): SEN|NP in 38BC, SEN|NP in 36BC
Primary evidence: 38BC: Suetonius, *Aug*. 16; cf. Appian, *B.C*. 5.84-86; Dio 48.46.4-5; Orosius 6.18.21; Zonaras 10.23; 36BC: Appian, *B.C*. 5.105-106
Reason for exclusion: On Pompeius Democharеs, cf. [Cn.] Pompeius Apollophanes.

224 T. Pompei(us) T.f. Cor(nelia) (?Longinus)
Catalogues: SUO: A175; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.35, 3.161; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Cichorius (1922) 150-151 no. 17; Criniti (1970) 115-116
Post(s): ?MT
Date of post(s): ?MT in 89BC
Primary evidence: Criniti (1970) 16-26 = CIL 6.37045 = CIL 1.709 = CIL 16, p.145 = ILLRP 515 = ILS 8888 = AE 1909, 30 = AE 1910, +126 = AE 1910, +153 = AE 1910, +162 = AE 1910, 207 = AE 1910, 218 = AE 1911, 126 = AE 1912, +10 = AE 1912, +117 = AE 1912, +287 = AE 1920, +130 = AE 1923, +103 = AE 2003, +831 = EDH HD019742 (Roma)
Note: See the discussion of *consilia* in ch. 1.

[?Cn.] Pompeius Macer
Catalogues: SUO: C337; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 106; **RE/PIR:** PIR 472; PIR(2) 625
Other reference works: Pflaum (1960-1961) 11-13 no. B(2)
Post(s): CP
Date of post(s): CP before AD15
Future career: Procurator
Primary evidence: McCabe et al. (1987) no. 256 = Hiller von Gaertringen (1906) (I.Priene) 150 no. 247 = SEG 35.906 (Priene, Asia); Strabo 13.2.3; cf. Ovid, *ex Pont*. 2.10.21-22; RRC 2687; Suetonius, *Iul*. 56.9; Tacitus, *Ann*. 6.18.3-4.
Reason for exclusion: This individual held a civilian position.

Cn. Pompeius Magnus
Catalogues: SUO: C123, C138; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.271, 2.283; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE *17
Post(s): SEN|LEG|NP
Date of post(s): SEN|LEG|NP in 49BC, SEN|LEG|NP in 48BC
Primary evidence: 49BC: Caesar, *B.C*. 3.4.4, 5.3; cf. 111.3, Plutarch, *Ant*. 25, *Pomp*. 62.2; Appian, *B.C*. 2.71; 48BC: Caesar, *B.C*. 3.40; cf. Dio 42.12.1-4
Reason for exclusion: This individual held a senior officer position.

Cn. [Pompeius] Menecrates
Catalogues: SUO: C178, C183, C189; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.384, 2.389, 2.394; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE Menecrates 15
Other reference works: Saddington (1988a) 306 no. 6
Post(s): SEN|NP
Date of post(s): SEN|NP in 40BC, SEN|NP in 39BC, SEN|NP in 38BC
Primary evidence: 40-39BC: Velleius 2.73.3, 77.3; Plutarch, *Ant*. 32.1; Appian, *B.C*. 5.70, 5.83; cf. Florus 2.18.2; Pliny, *N.H*. 35.200; Dio 48.17-19; 38BC: Appian, *B.C*. 5.78-80, 5.81-89; Dio 48.45, 48.48; Orosius 6.18.21; Zonarius 10.23
Relevant text: Velleius 2.73.3: Is [Sextus Pompeius] tum, ut praediximus, occupata Sicilia seruitia fugitiuosque in numerum exercitus sui recipiens magnum modum legionum effecerat perque Menam [Menodorum] et Menecraten paternos libertos, praefectos classium, latrociniis ac praedationibus infestato mari ad se exercitumque tuendum rapto utebatur, cum eum non depuderet uindicatum armis ac ductu patris sui mare infestare piraticis sceleribus.
Reason for exclusion: The title of *praefectus classis* is given to both Menodorus and Menecrates by Velleius, and to Menodorus by Porphyrio (cf. Demougin (1992) 32-33). However, given the seniority of their roles as naval commanders, it is hard to view them as junior officers, even if they were not legates (cf. D. Laelius). The same should probably be said of those of Pompeius' freedmen employed as naval commanders for whom no title survives (cf. [Cn. Pompeius] Apollophanes, [Cn. Pompeius] Democharis).

Cn. Pompeius Menodorus
Catalogues: SUO: C179, C184, C190, C191, C197, C200; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.384, 389, 394, 398, 404, 410; **DEM:** 17; **RE/PIR:** RE Menodorus 1
Other reference works: Saddington (1988a) 306 no. 2
Post(s): SEN|NP
Date of post(s): SEN|NP in 40BC, SEN|NP in 39BC, SEN|NP in 38BC, SEN|NP in 37BC, SEN|NP in 36BC, SEN|NP in 35BC
Primary evidence: 40-39BC: Velleius 2.73.3, 77.3; Plutarch, *Ant*. 32.1; Appian, *B.C*. 5.70, 5.83; cf. Florus 2.18.2; Pliny, *N.H*. 35.200; Dio 48.17-19; 38-36BC: Appian, *B.C*. 5.78-80, 5.81-89; Dio 48.45, 48.48; Orosius 6.18.21; Zonarius 10.23; 35BC: Dio 49.37.6; Porphyrio, *ad Hor. Ep*. 4.1
Reason for exclusion: On Pompeius Menodorus, who was granted full citizenship by Octavian (Appian, *B.C*. 5.80), cf. Cn. [Pompeius] Menecrates. On his cognomen, given by Plutarch and Dio as "Menas", cf. Münzer, RE 15.896-897 s.v. 'Menodorus 1'.

225 Cn. Pompeius C.f. Teret(ina) Proculus
Catalogues: SUO: A296, C246; **DEV:** P66: (1976-1977) 657, (1987) 1685, (1993) 2206; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 112; **RE/PIR:** RE 12.1768
Other reference works: Saddington (1985) 530 no. 13
Further bibliography: Dobson (1966) 69 n.43; Mello (1980-1981) 409-410 no. 1; Demougin (1988) 243-245
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD9
Future career: Seuir centuriarum equitum
Primary evidence: CIL 6.3530 = ILS 1314 (Roma)
Relevant text: C. Pompeius C. f. Ter(etina) / Proculus / trib(unus) mil(itum) leg(ionis) XVIII / praefectus fabrum / seuir centur(iarum) equit(um) / hic sepultus est
Note: Pompeius Proculus' military service must have taken place before AD9, when Legiones XVII-XIX were destroyed under P. Quinctillius Varus in Germany (Velleius 2.118ff; Dio 56.18-22; Tacitus, *Ann*. 1.60-62; cf. Ritterling, RE 12.1767-1768). His career is probably given in chronological order, and shows that he served as a *tribunus militum*, then as a *praefectus fabrum* (Dobson (1966) 69 n.43; Saddington (1985) 530 no. 13; Demougin (1992) 115-116), before holding the position of *seuir centuriarum equitum* in Rome, a position associated by Ross-Taylor and Mello with the *ludi seuirales* which began in AD5 (Ross-Taylor (1924) 161-162; Mello (1980-1981) 403-404, 409), but by others with voting centuries (cf. Demougin (1988) 243ff.). Although the majority of *seuiri equitum Romanorum*, as the position came to be called, were senatorial (Ross-Taylor (1924) 162), Pompeius Proculus' cursus suggests that he was of equestrian origin (Mello (1980-1981) 409, Demougin (1992) 115) and, on the basis of his tribe, was probably from Italy, but not from Rome (Demougin (1992) 116; cf. Devijver (1976-1977) 657).

T. Pompeius Proculus
Catalogues: SUO: C249; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 127; **RE/PIR:** RE 109; PIR(2) 642
Other reference works: Pflaum (1960-1961) 1044; Sasel (1974) 470 no. 6
Further bibliography: Meloni (1958) 183 no. 2
Post(s): SEN
Date of post(s): SEN in AD13
Future career: Pro legato
Primary evidence: EE 8.742 = ILS 105 (AD13-14, Fordungianus, Sardinia)
Reason for exclusion: This individual held a senior officer position.

226 Cn. Pompeius Theophanes
Catalogues: SUO: C139; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.284; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE Theophanes 1
Other reference works: Welch (1995) 140-142 no.xii; Badian (1997) 7-8 no. xiii
Post(s): PF
Date of post(s): PF in 48BC
Primary evidence: Plutarch, *Cic*. 38.4; cf. Caesar, *B.C*. 3.18.3; SIG 3.755

227 Pompeius Trogus
Catalogues: SUO: C79; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.647; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 51
Post(s): EP
Date of post(s): EP circa 66BC
Primary evidence: Justin 43.5.11-12

C. Pompilius Ceria[lis]
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** P71: (1976-1977) 659, (1987) - , (1993) 2206-2207; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 244; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): MT|CENT(PP)
Date of post(s): MT|CENT(PP) after AD14
Primary evidence: CIL 11.7066 = ILS 6598 (Volaterrae, Regio 7, Italia)
Relevant text: C. Pompilius Ceria[lis IIIIuir] / i(ure) d(icundo) quinq(uennalis) praef(ectus) Drusi [Caesaris p(rimus) p(ilus) *aut* Caes(aris) tr(ibunus) mil(itum)] / leg(ionis) XXI Rapacis [- - -] / Laelia M. f. Broc[hilla(?)] / C. Pompilius C. f. Sab(atina) Procu[lus] / pontifex in perpetuo[m?] / [.] Pompilius [- - -] / [e]quo pub(lico) uix(it) [ann(os) - - -]
Reason for exclusion: Since he served as a municipal prefect in place of Drusus, Pompilius' military career probably dates to the period after AD14 (cf. Demougin (1992) 213). He was either a primipilus or a military tribune in Legio XXI Rapax, then serving at Vetera in Germany (Devijver (1976-1977) 659; Demougin (1992) 213), although, as Demougin points out, a military tribunate is more likely given his municipal prefecture (Demougin (1992) 213). He was almost certainly from Volaterrae, where other Pompilii are known (cf. Demougin (1992) 213).

228 Pomponianus
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** P128: (1976-1977) 691, (1987) - , (1993) - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): EP(PE)
Date of post(s): EP(PE) before AD19
Primary evidence: CIL 13.8097 = ILS 2501 = AE 1890, 26 (Bonna, Germania inferior)
Note: On Pomponianus, see T. Pomponius T.f. Pol(lia) Petra (CIL 11.969).

229 M. Pomponius
Catalogues: SUO: C75; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.120, 3.167; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 1, *20
Post(s): EP(PE)
Date of post(s): EP(PE) in 72BC
Primary evidence: Appian, *Mith*. 79; Plutarch, *Luc*. 15.2

T. Pomponius Atticus
Catalogues: SUO: C211; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 18; **RE/PIR:** RE 102
Further bibliography: Welch (1996) 450ff.
Post(s): ?PF|?MP
Date of post(s): ?PF|?MP before 32BC
Primary evidence: Cornelius Nepos, *Att*. 6; cf. 1, 12, 19; Tacitus, *Ann*. 2.43.9; Suetonius, *Tib*. 7.3

Relevant text: Cornelius Nepos, *Att*. 6: Multorum consulum praetorumque praefecturas delatas sic accepit, ut neminem in prouinciam sit secutus, honore fuerit contentus, rei familiaris despexerit fructum
Reason for exclusion: While Pomponius may have held the rank of a junior officer, Nepos' description suggests strongly that he never actively served in such a post. Though Pomponius would therefore be an example of an 'honorary prefect', as suggested by Cicero's correspondence with Atticus, Nepos' quote nevertheless further illustrates the profits that were to be made from holding a prefecture. There is no indication, however, despite Badian's suggestion ((1997) 16 n.16), that this prefecture was necessarily that of a *praefectus fabrum*, or that his 'honorary' post was a military prefecture.

Sex. Pomponius C.f. Clu(stumina) Balbus
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** P73: (1976-1977) 661, (1987) 1688, (1993) 2207; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 64; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD42
Primary evidence: CIL 11.4190 = ILS 6628 = AE 1997, +484 (Interamna Nahars, Regio 6, Italia)
Relevant text: Sex. Pomponius C. f. Clu(stumina) / Balbus IIIIuir i(ure) d(icundo) / quaestor a decurionibus / tr(ibunus) mil(itum)
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Claudian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date, cf. [- - -] Aufidi[us - - -] (CIL 11.4183a).

230 T. Pomponius T.f. Pol(lia) Petra
Catalogues: SUO: A363, C338; **DEV:** P79: (1976-1977) 663-664, (1987) 1688, (1993) 2208; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 247; **RE/PIR:** RE 63; RE 12.1687
Other reference works: Holder (1980) 244 no. E28; Saddington (1980) 34 no. 40, (1985) 531 no. 31
Further bibliography: Saddington (1996a) 167
Post(s): PF, MT, EP(PE), ?IP
Date of post(s): PF before AD19, MT before AD19, EP(PE) before AD19, ?IP before AD19
Primary evidence: CIL 11.969 (Regium Lepidum, Regio 8, Italia); cf. CIL 13.8097 = ILS 2501 = AE 1890, 26 (Bonna, Germania inferior)
Relevant text: CIL 11.969: [- - -]xi[- - -] / T. Pomponio T. f. Pol(lia) / Petrae / aedil(i) IIuiro praef(ecto) fabr(um) IIII / trib(uno) milit(um) leg(ionis) X Gemin(ae) / praef(ecto) equitum praef(ecto) / Germanici Caesaris IIuiro / quinq(uennali) q(ui) d(onum) d(edit) / patrono; CIL 13.8097: Niger Aetonis f. / Nemes ala Pomponi/ani anno(rum) L / aera(rium) XXV / h(ic) s(itus) e(st)
Note: As Pomponius was probably an officer under Germanicus in the early Tiberian era (Dobson (1966) 70; Saddington (1980) 34, (1985) 531; Demougin (1992) 215), his early military career can be confidently dated to the mid- to late-Augustan period. Pomponius Petra may well have given his name to the *ala Petreiana* (Birley (1978) 268), although the civil war commander M. Petreius is a possible alternative (Saddington (1982) 148; cf. M. Petreius, above). If he gave his name to the *ala Petreiana*, it is unlikely that he was also the commander of Niger, who served in an *ala Pomponiani*, an *ala* that was also based in Germany, of which Niger's inscription is the only attestation (cf. Spaul (1994) 179). Given the name of the *ala Pomponiana*, it is likely that he did not give his name to it, and that another equestrian prefect, probably a Pomponianus, gave his name to the unit (cf. Pomponianus). His positions appear to be in chronological order, which means that he left his municipal career to pursue a military career, and then returned to municipal life. It is, however, possible that the text "praefecto Germanici Caesaris IIuiro" refers not to a position as a military officer under Germanicus, followed by a duovirate, but to the holding of a municipal office as *praefectus pro duouiro* in place of Germanicus. If he was, in fact, duovir twice, then it is unusual that this is not represented by "IIuiro II" or "bis" or "iterum" (e.g. CIL 10.830 = ILS 6361b, concerning M. Holconius Rufus). It is more likely that he was *praefectus pro duouiro*, and possibly *praefectus pro quinquennali* (cf. Sex. Pedius Sex.f. Ar[n(ensi)] Lusianus Hirrutus (CIL 9.3044); C. Caristanius C.f. Ser(gia) Fronto Caesianus Iulius (AE 1914, 260)), which would explain the order of his cursus, as such a position would indicate a close link with a member of the imperial house, and would therefore have received particular emphasis.

C. Pompullius P.f. Hor(atia)
Catalogues: SUO: A364, C339; **DEV:** P83: (1976-1977) 666, (1987) 1689, (1993) 2209; **BRO:** -

; **DEM:** 384; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Dobson (1978) 181 no. 33
Post(s): CENT(PP), MT, EP(PE)
Date of post(s): CENT(PP) before AD42, MT before AD42, EP(PE) before AD42
Primary evidence: CIL 9.996 (Ager Compsinus, Regio 2, Italia)
Relevant text: C. Pompullius P. f. Hor. / prim(us) pil(us) trib(unus) mil(itum) praef(ectus) eq(uitum) / Careia P. f. Gemella uxor / arbitratu / Gemellae uxoris et Philodami l(iberti)
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Claudian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

231 T. Pompullius L.f. Lappa
Catalogues: SUO: A365, C340; **DEV:** P84: (1976-1977) 666-667, (1987) - , (1993) 2209; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 175; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Nicolet (1967) 37 no. 6; Saddington (1985) 531 no. 29
Further bibliography: Buonocore (1989) 99
Post(s): MT(AP), PF
Date of post(s): MT(AP) before AD15, PF before AD15
Primary evidence: CIL 9.3307 = ILS 5599 (Superaequum, Regio 4, Italia)

T. Pontinius [- - -]
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** P85: (1976-1977) 667, (1987) 1689, (1993) - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 385; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Dobson (1978) 181 no. 34; Holder (1980) 247 no. E53
Post(s): CENT(PP), EP(PE), MT(COHP/U)
Date of post(s): CENT(PP) before AD42, EP(PE) before AD42, MT(COHP/U) before AD42
Primary evidence: CIL 11.4368 (Ameria, Regio 6, Italia)
Relevant text: [D(is)] M(anibus) / T. Pontinius [- - -] / primopil(us!) leg(ionis) V Maced(onicae) [- - - praef(ectus)] / eq(uitum) trib(unus) c(o)hor(tis) V p[raet(oriae?) - - -]
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Claudian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

232 C. Pontius C.f. Paelignus
Catalogues: SUO: A366; **DEV:** P88: (1976-1977) 668, (1987) 1690, (1993) 2209; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 12.1687; PIR(2) 813
Further bibliography: De Laet (1941) 270; McAlindon (1957) 192; Wiseman (1971) 220 no. 336; Le Roux (1982) 312; Alföldy (1985) 400
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT circa AD15
Future career: Praetor
Primary evidence: CIL 5.4348 = ILS 942 = AE 1995, 604 (Brixia, Regio 10, Italia)
Relevant text: C. Pontio C. [f. Fab(ia)] / Paeligno trib(uno) m[il(itum)] / leg(ionis) X Gem(inae) q(uaestori) cur[atori] / locorum public[or(um)] / iterum aed(ili) cur(uli) [pr(aetori)] / legato pro pr(aetore) iter[um] / ex s(enatus) c(onsulto) et ex auctorit[ate] / Ti. Caesaris d[- - -]
Note: As with a number of other junior officers in this period, it is uncertain whether Pontius Paelignius was of senatorial rank before he held a junior officer position. Le Roux and Demougin argue that he was (Le Roux (1982) 312; Demougin (1982) 97), whereas others argue that he was a *homo nouus* (De Laet (1941) 270; McAlindon (1957) 192; Alföldy (1985) 400). His senatorial career dates from the early Tiberian period (Wiseman (1971) 220) and thus his junior officer career presumably dates from the late Augustan or early Tiberian period.

233 L. Pontius L.f. Strabo
Catalogues: SUO: A367, C341; **DEV:** P90: (1976-1977) 670, (1987) 1691, (1993) 2210; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 176; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Pflaum (1960-1961) 1042; Holder (1980) 245 no. E29; Saddington (1988a) 311 no. 53
Post(s): MT, EP(PE), NP(PC)
Date of post(s): MT before AD15, EP(PE) before AD15, NP(PC) before AD15
Primary evidence: CIL 11.6964 = ILS 2674 (Luna, Regio 7, Italia)

234 C. Popillius (1)
Catalogues: SUO: C62; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.44; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 2, *12
Post(s): NP

Date of post(s): NP in 88BC
Primary evidence: Appian, *Mith*. 17, cf. 19

235 C. Popillius (2)
Catalogues: SUO: A202; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.125, 3.168; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE *15, 15
Further bibliography: Syme (1963) 168
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT in 71BC
Future career: ?Tribunus plebis 68BC
Primary evidence: Plutarch, *Caes*. 5.1

236 C. Popillius Laenas
Catalogues: SUO: A256; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.350, 3.168; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 16, *22
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT in 43BC
Primary evidence: Plutarch, *Cic*. 48.1-2; cf. Livy, *Per*. 120; Valerius Maximus 5.3.4; Appian *B.C*. 4.19-20; Seneca, *Suas*. 6.20, *Contr*. 7.2.8; Dio 47.11.1-2

237 M. Porcius Cato (1)
Catalogues: SUO: A208; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.147; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE *20
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT in 67BC
Future career: Praetor 54BC
Primary evidence: Plutarch, *Cato Min*. 9-11; Pliny, *N.H*. 7.113; cf. Valerius Maximus 4.3.2

238 M. Porcius Cato (2)
Catalogues: SUO: C171; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.368; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 22
Post(s): IP
Date of post(s): IP in 42BC
Primary evidence: Appian, *B.C*. 4.135; cf. Velleius 2.71.2; Plutarch, *Brut*. 49.5, *Cato Min*. 73-74; Zonarius 10.20

L. Po[stu]mius Q.f. Ser(gia) Fabul[lus?]
Catalogues: SUO: A368; **DEV:** P103: (1976-1977) 679, (1987) 1693, (1993) 2211; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 12.1626
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT after AD71
Primary evidence: CIL 2.3329 (Tugia, Hispania citerior)
Relevant text: L. Po[stu]mius Q. f. Serg(ia) Fabul[lus? flamen] / Augus[tor]um prouinci(ae) His[paniae cit(erioris) trib(unus) mil(itum)] / leg(ionis) VII [IIu]ir colonia[e Salariae et] / Manlia [L.] f. Silana fla[minica] / eiusdem prouinc(iae) [d(ederunt) d(edicauerunt)]
Reason for exclusion: Postumius' flaminate dates him to the Flavian era (Alföldy (1973) 86; Devijver (1976-1977) 678; Curchin (1990) 223).

C. Proculeius L.f.
Catalogues: SUO: C205; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** PIR(2) 985
Post(s): CP
Date of post(s): CP before 28BC
Primary evidence: Grant (1946) 66 = BMCR 2 no. 232 = BMC Peloponnese no. 65; cf. Dio 51.4; Pliny, *N.H*. 7.148; Plutarch, *Ant*. 77
Relevant text: C. Proculei(us) L. f.
Reason for exclusion: The man responsible for the capture of Cleopatra in whom, Plutarch reports, Antonius advised her to put the most trust (Dio 51.10; Plutarch, *Ant*. 77ff.), Proculeius probably minted this coin while some form of civilian equestrian governor in the southern Balkans in the period after Actium (Grant (1946) 67, Syme (1939) 236, 266 n.3). As Grant suggests, it is unlikely that it indicates that Proculeius was a naval commander under Antonius (Grant (1946) 66-67; contra, Tarn, CAH 10.52). Tacitus reports that he was considered by Augustus as a potential wife for his daughter, along with other persons of a quiet life and without political entanglements (Tacitus, *Ann*. 4.40).

Ptolemaeus
Catalogues: SUO: C342; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** PIR 763; PIR(2) 1024
Further bibliography: Thomas (1982) 11ff., 185 no. 1
Post(s): CP
Date of post(s): CP in 20BC
Future career: Epistrategos
Primary evidence: IGR 1.1302 = SB 8428 = Bernand and Bernand (1969) (I.Philae) no. 135 = SEG 48.1981 (Philae, Aegyptus)
Reason for exclusion: This individual held a civilian position.

L. Publius P.f.
Catalogues: SUO: A235; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): -
Date of post(s): [49BC]
Primary evidence: Josephus, *A.J.* 14.236
Reason for exclusion: On L. Publius P.f., cf. M. Publius M.f.

M. Publius M.f.
Catalogues: SUO: A236; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): -
Date of post(s): [49BC]
Primary evidence: Josephus, *A.J.* 14.236
Relevant text: Μᾶρκος Πόπλιος Σπουρίου υἱὸς καὶ Μᾶρκος Μάρκου καὶ Ποπλίου υἱὸς Λουκίος λέγουσιν. Λέντλῳ τἀνθυπάτῳ προσελθόντες ἐδιδάξαμεν αὐτὸν περὶ ὧν Δοσίθεος Κλεοπατρίδου Ἀλεξανδρεὺς λόγους ἐποιήσατο
Reason for exclusion: One of the three petitioners to Lentulus Crus in Josephus, *A.J.* 14.236 (cf. L. Publius L.f.; M. Publius Sp.f.), there is no evidence that he, or any of the petitioners, were junior officers (for a discussion of their identities, cf. Ben Zeev (1998) 184).

M. Publius Sp.f.
Catalogues: SUO: A237; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): -
Date of post(s): [49BC]
Primary evidence: Josephus, *A.J.* 14.236
Reason for exclusion: On M. Publius Sp.f., cf. M. Publius M.f.

C. Purtisius C.f. Stel(latina) Atinas
Catalogues: SUO: C343, C344; **DEV:** P116: (1976-1977) 685-686, (1987) 1696, (1993) 2213; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 479; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Dobson (1978) 184 no. 42; Holder (1980) 247 no. E54; Saddington (1980) 34 no. 43, (1985) 532 no.33
Further bibliography: Alföldy (1969b) 113; Susini (1972) 351ff.; Maxfield (1981) 162, Plate 7b; Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 83-84, Figs. 25-27
Post(s): CENT(PP), PF, EP(PE)
Date of post(s): CENT(PP) before AD38, PF before AD38, EP(PE) before AD38
Primary evidence: CIL 11.624 = Cenerini (1992) (Supp.It. 10) 46 no. 624 (Forum Liui, Regio 8, Italia)
Relevant text: Dis Manibus / C. Purtisius C. f. Stel(latina) Atinas IIII/uir quin(quennalis) pr(aefectus) equi(tum) pr(aefectus) fab(rum) pri(mus) pil(us) leg(ionis) / [- - -]
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Gaian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

239 L. Purtisius Atinas
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** P117: (1976-1977) 686, (1987) 1696, (1993) 2213; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 215; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Rendic-Miocevic (1964) 340ff.; Wilkes (1969) 252-253; Le Glay (1972) 214; Susini (1972) 354-356; Spaul (2000) 34-37
Post(s): MT(COHA)
Date of post(s): MT(COHA) circa AD15
Primary evidence: Sasel and Sasel (1978) (ILJug. 2) 75-76 no. 636 = AE 1964, 227 (Epidaurum, Dalmatia)

240 [- - - Qu]adratus Maesianus Celsus
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** Inc. 178 bis, Inc. 202: (1976-1977) 972, (1987) 1815, (1993) - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** PIR(2) 8
Other reference works: Sasel (1974) 470 no. 5
Further bibliography: Loreto (2000) 10-11; Alföldy (2002) 129
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD15
Future career: Quaestor
Primary evidence: CIL 10.4749 = AE 2002, 362 (Suessa Aurunca, Regio 1, Italia)
Relevant text: [Imp(erator) Caesar diui f. Au]gust(us) pontif(ex) max(imus) pater patriae / [- - -]us trib(unus) milit(um) pontif(ex) IIuir ter / [- - - Qu]adratus Maesianus Celsus Xuir / [stlitib(us) iudic(andis) - - -] tribun(us) milit(um) pro legat(o) quaest(or) urb(anus) / [- - -]us augur Xuir stlit(ibus) iudic(andis) deder(unt)
Note: This inscription naming two military tribunes (cf. also [- - -]us (CIL 10.4749)) is datable to the period between 2BC and AD14 on the basis of the use of *pater patriae* (Alföldy (2002) 129). Both individuals served in unnamed units, and although they may not have served together (as the inscription is an honorific municipal inscription), Maesianus probably served as *pro legato* in one of the Illyrico-Dalmatian and Alpine regions (cf. T. Iunius D.f. Ani(ensi) Montanus (AE 1938, 173 = AE 1939, +261 = AE 1992, 687 = EDH HD022326)).

P. Quinctius P.f. Pom(ptina)
Catalogues: SUO: A273; **DEV:** Q1: (1976-1977) 697, (1987) 1705, (1993) 2219; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 28; **RE/PIR:** RE 6
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD42
Primary evidence: CIL 6.3533 (Roma)
Relevant text: P. Quinctius P. f. Pom(ptina) / tr(ibunus) mil(itum) leg(ionis) XVI / ex testamento arbitratu P. Quincti P. l. Zenonis
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Claudian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

M. Quinctius Q.f. Hor(atia) Chilo
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** Q1 bis: (1976-1977) - , (1987) - , (1993) 2219; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): CENT(PP), MT
Date of post(s): CENT(PP) before AD42, MT before AD42
Primary evidence: AE 1990, 332 = EDH HD016650 (Corchiano, Regio 7, Italia)
Relevant text: M. Quinctius Q. f. Hor(atia) / Chilo Sen(tino) / tr(ibunus) mil(itum) primus pili(!)
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Claudian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

T. Quin(c)tius Scapula
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 3.180; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 54
Post(s): SEN
Date of post(s): SEN before 46BC
Primary evidence: Dio 43.29.3; cf. Caesar, *B.Hisp*. 33; Cicero, *ad Att*. 12.37.2, 38a.2, 41.3
Relevant text: χρονίζοντος οὖν αὐτοῦ, πυθόμενοι οἱ στρατιῶται οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰβηρίᾳ τόν τε Σκιπίωνα ἀπολωλότα καὶ τὸν Δίδιον ἐπιπλέοντά σφισι, καὶ φοβηθέντες μὴ διαφθαρῶσι πρὶν τὸν Πομπήιον ἐλθεῖν, οὐκ ἔμειναν αὐτόν, ἀλλὰ Τίτον τε Κυίντιον Σκαπούλαν καὶ Κύιντον Ἀπώνιον ἄνδρας ἱππέας προστησάμενοι τόν τε Τρεβώνιον ἐξέβαλον καὶ τὸ ἔθνος τὸ Βαιτικὸν πᾶν συναπέστησαν
Reason for exclusion: On T. Quin(c)tius Scapula, cf. Q. Aponius.

[C. Quincti]us Trogus
Catalogues: SUO: C215; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** PIR 42; PIR(2) 48
Post(s): -
Date of post(s): [before 31BC]
Primary evidence: CIL 10.1726 = ILS 4972 (Puteoli, Regio 1, Italia)
Relevant text: [C. Quincti]o Trogi lib(erto) sui / kalatori pontif(ici) / C. Quinctio C. f. Recepto f(ecit) / Quinctiae Urbanae / C. Quinctio Aucto / P. Numisio Marioni
Reason for exclusion: No evidence that this individual held a junior officer position

241 C. Rabeiri(us) C.f. Gal(eria)
Catalogues: SUO: A176; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.35, 3.180; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 5
Further bibliography: Cichorius (1922) 151-152 no. 18; Criniti (1970) 116-117; Wiseman (1971) 255 no. 353
Post(s): ?MT
Date of post(s): ?MT in 89BC
Future career: Quaestor after 89BC
Primary evidence: Criniti (1970) 16-26 = CIL 6.37045 = CIL 1.709 = CIL 16, p.145 = ILLRP 515 = ILS 8888 = AE 1909, 30 = AE 1910, +126 = AE 1910, +153 = AE 1910, +162 = AE 1910, 207 = AE 1910, 218 = AE 1911, 126 = AE 1912, +10 = AE 1912, +117 = AE 1912, +287 = AE 1920, +130 = AE 1923, +103 = AE 2003, +831 = EDH HD019742 (Roma)
Note: See the discussion of *consilia* in ch. 1.

C. Rasinius C.f. Ser(gia) Tettianus
Catalogues: SUO: C345, C346; **DEV:** R4: (1976-1977) 703, (1987) 1707, (1993) 2221; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 751; **RE/PIR:** RE 4.329
Further bibliography: Dobson (1966) 75 n.52; Duthoy (1984-1986) 149 no. 321; Forni (1987) 31; Spaul (2000) 276-278
Post(s): PF, IP(PCOH)
Date of post(s): PF after AD15, IP(PCOH) after AD15
Primary evidence: CIL 11.5387 = Forni (1987) (ERAssisi) 31 no. 23 (Asisium, Regio 6, Italia)
Relevant text: C. Rasinio C. f. Ser(gia) / Tettiano / praef(ecto) fabrum IIII / praef(ecto) coh(ortis) Raetor(um) / patrono municipi(i)
Reason for exclusion: As the *cohors Raetorum* was probably founded in the Tiberian period (Spaul (2000) 277), it is unlikely that Rasinius was a junior officer in the Augustan era. The identity, and nature, of the *cohors* is a matter of some conjecture, but it was probably stationed in Cappadocia in the first half of the first century AD (Spaul (2000) 276-278; cf. Cichorius, RE 4.328-329; Devijver (1976-1977) 703).

Cn. Ricinius Cn.f. Pup(inia) Persa
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** R7: (1976-1977) 704, (1987) - , (1993) 2221; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 178; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD42
Primary evidence: CIL 14.2108 (Lanuuium, Regio 1, Italia)
Relevant text: Cn. Ricinio Cn. f. Pup(inia) Persae scr(ibae) / tr(ibunus) mil(itum) auonculo / Pomponiae L. f. Rufae matri / Thoriae A. f. auiae / L. Albius L. f. Fab(ia) Rufus scr(iba) aed(ilis) / Quintiae L. f. Rufae uxsori
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Claudian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

C. Romanius P.f. Rom(ilia)
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** R9 - R10: (1976-1977) 705, (1987) - , (1993) 2222; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 179; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD42
Primary evidence: CIL 6.3534 (Roma)
Relevant text: P. Romanius C. f. Rom(ilia) / C. Romanius P. f. Rom(ilia) / tr(ibunus) mil(itum) II / Manlia P. f.
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Claudian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

242 Roscius (1)
Catalogues: SUO: C173; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.368; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 2
Post(s): ?IP(PCAST)
Date of post(s): ?IP(PCAST) in 42BC
Primary evidence: Appian, *B.C.* 4.56

Roscius (2)
Catalogues: SUO: C93; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 3.182; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 1
Post(s): -
Date of post(s): [53BC]

Primary evidence: Plutarch, *Crass*. 31.2, cf. 32.4, 6
Relevant text: ὁ δὲ Κράσσος ἀπεκρίνατο μέν, ὡς εἰ καὶ τὸν ἐλάχιστον εἶχε τοῦ ζῆν λόγον, οὐκ ἂν εἰς χεῖρας αὐτοῖς ἦλθεν· ὅμως δὲ δύο Ῥωσκίους ἀδελφοὺς ἔπεμψε πευσομένους ἐπὶ τίσι καὶ πόσοι συνίασιν.
Reason for exclusion: Suolahti suggests that the Roscii, two brothers (here Roscius (2) and Roscius (3)) sent as envoys after Carrhae who were captured by the Parthians, were possibly military tribunes on account of the fact that they had Greek literature with them at the time of their capture (Suolahti (1955) 404). Given the salacious nature of the material (the Milesiaca of Aristeides; cf. Plutarch, *Crass*. 32.3) they were carrying (the sort of literature, perhaps, one might expect in the baggage of a soldier on a campaign), as well as the lack of any military rank, it should not be assumed that they were junior officers.

Roscius (3)
Catalogues: SUO: C93; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 3.182; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 1
Post(s): -
Date of post(s): [53BC]
Primary evidence: Plutarch, *Crass*. 31.2, cf. 32.4, 6
Reason for exclusion: Cf. Roscius (2).

243 C. Rosius C.f. Arn(ensi) Sabinus
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** R10 bis: (1976-1977) -, (1987) 1708, (1993) 2223; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 10; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Eck (1979a) 108-111
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before 31BC
Primary evidence: CIL 1.3341a = Eck (1979a) 108, no. 16 = AE 1981, 363 = EDH HD003307 (Blera, Regio 7, Italia)

M. Rubrius
Catalogues: SUO: C154; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.303, 3.182; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 13
Post(s): CP|LEG
Date of post(s): CP|LEG in 46BC
Primary evidence: Plutarch, *Cato Min*. 62.2, cf, 63.3
Relevant text: ταῦθ'ὁ Κάτων ἀκούσας, τοῖς μὲν τριακοσίοις ἐκέλευσε προσέχειν Μᾶρκον Ῥούβριον, ἀτρέμα τὰς ἀπογραφὰς τῶν ἐλευθερούντων δεχόμενον καὶ μὴ προσβιαζόμενον
Reason for exclusion: Responsible for the administration of Cato's 'senate' at Utica, there is no suggestion that Rubrius was a military officer, and it is most likely that he held a civilian prefecture. He may, however, have been a legate (cf. Broughton (1951-1986) 2.303).

P. Rubrius M.f. Mae(cia) Barbarus
Catalogues: SUO: C219; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 71; **RE/PIR:** RE 16; PIR(2) 125
Further bibliography: Brunt (1975) 142; Thomasson (1984) 342 no. 4
Post(s): SEN
Date of post(s): SEN in 13BC
Future career: Praefectus Aegypti
Primary evidence: CIL 10.5169 = ILS 87 (Casinum, Regio 1, Italia); cf. CIL 3.6588 = OGIS 656 (Alexandria, Aegyptus); OGIS 657 = IGR 1.1294 = I.Philae 140 (Philae, Aegyptus)
Reason for exclusion: This individual held a senior officer position.

Rufio {?Rufinus}
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 3.183; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 3
Post(s): SEN
Date of post(s): SEN in 47BC
Primary evidence: Suetonius, *Iul*. 76.3
Reason for exclusion: This individual held a senior officer position.

Rufus
Catalogues: SUO: C227; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** PIR(2) 190
Other reference works: Saddington (1980) 29 no. 5
Post(s): -

Date of post(s): [4BC]
Primary evidence: Josephus, *B.J.* 2.52; cf. *A.J.* 17.294, *B.J.* 2.74
Reason for exclusion: On Rufus, see Volumnius (Josephus, *B.J.* 1.535, *A.J.* 16.332).

Ruso
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** R30: (1976-1977) 716, (1987) - , (1993) - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 1.1259
Further bibliography: Birley (1978) 263; Spaul (1994) 20
Post(s): EP(PE)
Date of post(s): EP(PE) before AD42
Primary evidence: CIL 13.7031 = ILS 2500 (Mogontiacum, Germania superior)
Relevant text: Adbogius Coi/nagi f. na(tione) Petr/ucorius eq(ues) ala(e) / Rusonis an(norum) XXIIX sti(pendiorum) X / hic situs est / ex testamen/to libertus / fecit
Reason for exclusion: As Adbogius served in an *ala Rusonis*, it is likely that his unit was commanded at some point by a man with the cognomen Ruso (an otherwise unknown cognomen, cf. Spaul (1994) 20). As the unit is otherwise unkown - it may have become the ala Picentiana (cf. L. Rustius Picen[s] (CIL 3.10094 = ILS 2679)) - Ruso almost certainly belongs to the early imperial period (Devijver (1976-1977) 716; Birley (1978) 263; Spaul (1994) 20); he cannot, however, be dated more precisely.

L. Rustius Picen[s]
Catalogues: SUO: A371, C348; **DEV:** R17: (1976-1977) 709-710, (1987) - , (1993) 2223; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 386; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Holder (1980) 245 no. E31
Further bibliography: Alföldy (1962) 260, (1969b) 16 n.70; Birley (1978) 268; Saddington (1982) 145; Spaul (1994) 185
Post(s): MT, EP(PE)
Date of post(s): MT before AD42, EP(PE) before AD42
Primary evidence: CIL 3.10094 = ILS 2679 (Lesina, Dalmatia)
Relevant text: L. Rustius Picen[s] / tr(ibunus) mil(itum) uoui[t] / praef(ectus) eq(uitum) fec[it]
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Claudian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

Rutilius
Catalogues: SUO: C156; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.313; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 5
Further bibliography: Keppie (1983) 52
Post(s): CP
Date of post(s): CP in 45BC
Primary evidence: Cicero, *ad Fam.* 13.8
Reason for exclusion: This individual held a civilian position.

Q. Rutilius P.f. Gal(eria) Flaccus Cornelianus
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: González (1988) 134
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD69
Primary evidence: CIL 2(5).1116 = CILA 2(3).619 = HEp. 4.770 = AE 1989, 413 = AE 1998, +725 (Urso, Baetica)
Relevant text: Q. Rutilio P. f. Gal(eria) / Flacco Corne/liano tribuno / militum leg(ionis) / VIII Aug(ustae)
Reason for exclusion: Julio-Claudian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

244 [- - -] Sabidin[ius - - -]
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** S89: (1976-1977) 766, (1987) - , (1993) 2245; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 181; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Nicolet (1967) 47 no. 30
Post(s): MT(AP)
Date of post(s): MT(AP) before AD15
Primary evidence: CIL 14.3836 = Inscr.It. 4.1.439 (Tibur, Regio 1, Italia)

[- - - Sa]bidius C.f. Pap(iria)
Catalogues: SUO: C349; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:**
Other reference works: Dobson (1978) 166-167 no. 3
Post(s): CENT(PP)
Date of post(s): CENT(PP) before AD15
Primary evidence: CIL 9.4122 = ILS 2644 (Aequiculi, Regio 4, Italia)
Reason for exclusion: This individual held a centurionate position.

Sabinus (1)
Catalogues: SUO: C228; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 91; **RE/PIR:** RE 4; PIR(2) 33
Other reference works: Pflaum (1960-1961) 1080
Post(s): CP
Date of post(s): CP in 4BC
Future career: Procurator
Primary evidence: Josephus, *B.J.* 2.16; cf. *A.J.* 17.221
Reason for exclusion: This individual held a civilian position.

245 [- - -] Sabinus (2)
Catalogues: SUO: C198, C212; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 3
Post(s): ?EP
Date of post(s): ?EP after 36BC
Primary evidence: Appian, *B.C.* 5.132 (36BC); CIL 1.1295 = CIL 9.4503 = ILS 2488 = ILLRP 500 (Amiternum, Regio 4, Italia)
Relevant text: Appian, *B.C.* 5.132: λῃστευομένης δὲ κατὰ συστάσεις τῆς τε Ῥώμης αὐτῆς καὶ τῆς Ἰταλίας περιφανῶς καὶ τῶν γιγνομένων ἁρπαγῇ μετὰ τόλμης ἢ λῃστείᾳ λανθανούσῃ μᾶλλον ἐοικότων, Σαβῖνος ὑπὸ Καίσαρος αἱρεθεὶς εἰς διόρθωσιν πολὺν μὲν εἰργάσατο φθόρον τῶν ἁλισκομένων, ἐνιαυτῷ δ᾽ ὅμως εἰς εἰρήνην ἀφύλακτον ἅπαντα περιήγαγε. καὶ ἐξ ἐκείνου φασὶ παραμεῖναι τὸ τῆς στρατιᾶς τῶν νυκτοφυλάκων ἔθος τε καὶ εἶδος; CIL 9.4503: [- - -] et Sabino praef(ecto) [- - -] / [- - - au]xiliariei Hispan[ei - - -]
Note: This text from Appian is linked by Mommsen ((1887-1888) 2.1075, 1) with the inscription from Amiternum. If so, then Sabinus presumably performed his duties with the title of *praefectus*, or had held a prefecture before taking up the command of a force designed to control banditry (cf. Demougin (1992) 41). Appian's text might suggest that the system he employed was adopted by the *uigiles* (not discused in Sablayrolles (1996) 6-7), and given that the command of the Rome units was in the hands of a *praefectus*, it would not be suprising if Appian's Sabinus had held that title, although he would have been, like the Praetorian Prefect, superior to a junior officer. However, as pointed out in RE 1(A) 1595, Sabinus 3, this link is only a possibility. If we reject the link between these two Sabini, then the inscription becomes far harder to date. We might, on the evidence of the letter-forms, date the inscription to the Triumviral period or early Principate. Moreover, the use of the phrase*auxiliariei Hispanei* might suggest that the inscription refers to a group of Spanish auxiliary forces (presumably cavalry) levied in the period before the widespread use of permanent cavalry alae (cf. Spaul (1994) 19ff., 145), although, as Speidel points out ((1980) 212-213), Spanish cavalry were formed into permanent units during the Triumviral period (i.e. at a comparatively early stage). However, the inscription, which sits below a frieze containing religious imagery, is highly fragmentary, and it would be unwise to place too much weight on any such conclusion, especially given what may have been a large gap between the word 'praefecto' and the phrase 'auxiliariei Hispanei' and the irregular spelling and the curious placement of "et" at the start of line 1 of the inscription (cf. image at http://www1.ku-eichstaett.de/epigr/uah-bilder.php?bild=PH0002080).

M. Sacratiuir
Catalogues: SUO: A243; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 1A.1674
Post(s): -
Date of post(s): [48BC]
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.C.* 3.71
Reason for exclusion: On M. Sacratiuir, cf. C. Felginas

P. Saluius Aper
Catalogues: SUO: C231; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 95; **RE/PIR:** RE 11; PIR(2) 128
Post(s): SEN

Date of post(s): SEN in 2BC
Future career: Praefectus praetorii
Primary evidence: Dio 55.10.10
Reason for exclusion: This individual held a senior officer position.

246 T. Satanus T.f. Sabinus
Catalogues: SUO: C210, C213; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 30; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Demougin (1991) 237-239; Badian (1997) 2; AE 2003, +582, adnot.; Marengo (2003) 219-226
Post(s): PF
Date of post(s): PF circa 31BC
Primary evidence: CIL 9.5191 = CIL 1(2) 1911 = ILLRP 529 = AE 1991, 609 = AE 2000, 468 = AE 2003, +582; cf. CIL 9.5195 = CIL 1(2) 1912 = AE 2000, 478 (Asculum, Regio 5, Italia)

247 Satrius N.f. Teret(ina) Rufus
Catalogues: SUO: A372; **DEV:** S10: (1976-1977) 721, (1987) - , (1993) 2229; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 182; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Nicolet (1967) 49-50 no. 34
Post(s): MT(AP)
Date of post(s): MT(AP) before AD15
Primary evidence: AE 1908, 218 = ILS 9389 = EDH HD02081 (Teanum Sidicinum, Regio 1, Italia)

248 M. Scaptius (1)
Catalogues: SUO: C99; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.239; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 1
Further bibliography: Tibiletti (1953) 77
Post(s): EP
Date of post(s): EP in 51BC
Primary evidence: Cicero, *ad Att*. 6.1.6, 5.21.20, 6.2.8; cf. 6.3.5

M. Scaptius (2)
Catalogues: SUO: A232, C110; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.252, 254; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 2
Post(s): CP
Date of post(s): CP in 50BC
Primary evidence: Cicero, *ad Att*. 6.3.5
Relevant text: *ad Att*. 6.1.4: ego tamen quas per te Bruto promiseram praefecturas, M. Scaptio, L. Gauio, qui in regno rem Bruti procurabant, detuli; *ad Att*. 6.3.5: a me tribunatum accepit postea scripsit ad me se uti nolle eo tribunatu
Reason for exclusion: One of two Scaptii, both agents of Brutus. M. Scaptius (2), along with L. Gauius (a third of Brutus' agents), held nominal civilian prefectures under Cicero. He was offered a military tribunate by Cicero, but then refused it. M. Scaptius (1), although a cavalry commander under Ap. Claudius in 51BC, did not hold a prefecture under Cicero in 50BC.

L. Seius [- - -] Strabo
Catalogues: SUO: C250; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 207; **RE/PIR:** RE 15; PIR(2) 246
Post(s): SEN
Date of post(s): SEN in AD12
Future career: Praefectus praetorii
Primary evidence: CIL 11.2707 = AE 1983, 397 (Volsinii, Regio 7, Italia); Tacitus, *Ann*. 1.7.2, 1.24.2, 4.1.7; Dio 57.19.5-6; Pliny, *N.H*. 36.197; Velleius 2.127.3; cf. CIL 11.7285 = ILS 8996 = AE 1904, 37 = AE 1983, 398 = AE 1998, 86 (Volsinii, Regio 7, Italia).
Reason for exclusion: This individual held a senior officer position.

249 C. Sentius C.f. Aemilia
Catalogues: SUO: A239; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.264, 3.191; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 4, f. 9
Other reference works: Suolahti (1958) 153 no. 7
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT in 49BC
Primary evidence: Josephus, *A.J*. 14.236-240
Relevant text: Josephus, *A.J*. 14.228-230: Λεύκιος δὲ Λέντλος ὕπατος εἶπεν: πολίτας

Ῥωμαίων Ἰουδαίους ἱερὰ Ἰουδαϊκὰ ἔχοντας καὶ ποιοῦντας ἐν Ἐφέσῳ πρὸ τοῦ βήματος δεισιδαιμονίας ἕνεκα στρατείας ἀπέλυσα πρὸ δώδεκα καλανδῶν Ὀκτωβρίων Λευκίῳ Λέντλῳ Γαΐῳ Μαρκέλλῳ ὑπάτοις. παρῆσαν Τίτος Ἄμπιος Τίτου υἱὸς Βάλβος Ὁρατία πρεσβευτής, Τίτος Τόνγιος Τίτου υἱὸς Κροστομίνα, Κόιντος Καίσιος Κοΐντου, Τίτος Πομπήιος Τίτου Λογγῖνος, Γάιος Σερουίλιος Γαΐου υἱὸς Τηρητίνα Βράκκος χιλίαρχος, Πόπλιος Κλούσιος Ποπλίου Ἐτωρία [Γάλλος], Γάιος Σέντιος Γαΐου υἱὸς, [Γάιος Πομπήιος Γαΐου υἱὸς?] Σαβατίνα, Τίτος Ἄμπιος Τίτου υἱὸς Βάλβος πρεσβευτὴς καὶ ἀντιστράτηγος Ἐφεσίων ἄρχουσι βουλῇ δήμῳ χαίρειν. Ἰουδαίους τοὺς ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ Λεύκιος Λέντλος ὁ ὕπατος ἐμοῦ ἐντυχόντος ἀπέλυσεν τῆς στρατείας. αἰτησάμενος δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα καὶ παρὰ Φαννίου τοῦ ἀντιστρατήγου καὶ παρὰ Λευκίου Ἀντωνίου τοῦ ἀντιταμίου ἐπέτυχον ὑμᾶς τε βούλομαι φροντίσαι, ἵνα μή τις αὐτοῖς διενοχλῇ; Josephus, *A.J.* 14.236-240: Μᾶρκος Πόπλιος Σπουρίου υἱὸς καὶ Μᾶρκος Μάρκου καὶ Ποπλίου υἱὸς Λουκίος λέγουσιν. Λέντλῳ τἀνθυπάτῳ προσελθόντες ἐδιδάξαμεν αὐτὸν περὶ ὧν Δοσίθεος Κλεοπατρίδου Ἀλεξανδρεὺς λόγους ἐποιήσατο, ὅπως πολίτας Ῥωμαίων Ἰουδαίους ἱερὰ Ἰουδαϊκὰ ποιεῖν εἰωθότας, ἂν αὐτῷ φανῇ, δεισιδαιμονίας ἕνεκα ἀπολύσῃ: καὶ ἀπέλυσε πρὸ δώδεκα καλανδῶν Κουιντιλίων Λευκίῳ Λέντλῳ Γαΐῳ Μαρκέλλῳ ὑπάτοις. παρῆσαν Τίτος Ἄμπιος Τίτου υἱὸς Βάλβος Ὁρατία πρεσβευτής, Τίτος Τόνγιος Κροστομίνα, Κόιντος Καίσιος Κοΐντου, Τίτος Πήιος Τίτου υἱὸς Κορνηλία Λογγῖνος, Γάιος Σερουίλιος Γαΐου Τηρητείνα Βρόκχος χιλίαρχος, Πόπλιος Κλούσιος Ποπλίου υἱὸς Ἐτωρία Γάλλος, Γάιος Τεύτιος Γαΐου Αἰμιλία χιλίαρχος, Σέξστος Ἀτίλιος Σέξστου υἱὸς Αἰμιλία Σέσρανος, Γάιος Πομπήιος Γαΐου υἱὸς Σαβατίνα, Τίτος Ἄμπιος Τίτου Μένανδρος, Πόπλιος Σερουίλιος Ποπλίου υἱὸς Στράβων, Λεύκιος Πάκκιος Λευκίου Κολλίνα Καπίτων, Αὖλος Φούριος Αὔλου υἱὸς Τέρτιος, Ἄππιος Μηνᾶς. ἐπὶ τούτων ὁ Λέντλος δόγμα ἐξέθετο: πολίτας Ῥωμαίων Ἰουδαίους, οἵτινες ἱερὰ Ἰουδαϊκὰ ποιεῖν εἰώθασιν, ἐν Ἐφέσῳ πρὸ τοῦ βήματος δεισιδαιμονίας ἕνεκα ἀπέλυσα

Note: A member of the consilium of Cornelius Lentulus, C. Sentius' identity is controversial. He is considered by Forni and Ben Zeev to be the same man as C. Teutius in *A.J.* 14.237 (Forni (1982a) 163; Ben Zeev (1998) 156; cf. Syme (1964b) 161; contra, Suolahti (1958) 153; cf. C. Teutius {?Tettius} C.f. Aem(ilia)). If, as is likely, this is the case, then C. Sentius is explicitly named as a military tribune by Josephus in both lists (for a discussion of the evidence, cf. ch. 1). He was possibly the father of C. Sentius C.f. C.n. Saturninus (Broughton (1951-1986) 3.191) For the other military tribune explicitly named by Josephus, cf. C. Seruilius C.f. Teretina Brocchus.

C. Sentius C.f. C.n. Saturninus
Catalogues: SUO: A288; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 2A.1511ff.; 294; PIR(2) 394
Post(s): CP
Date of post(s): CP circa 7BC
Future career: Consul AD4
Primary evidence: Josephus, *A.J.* 16.368-369, *B.J.* 1.541
Reason for exclusion: On C. Sentius C.f. C.n. Saturninus, see L. Sentius C.f. C.n. Saturninus.

Cn. Sentius C.f. C.n. Saturninus
Catalogues: SUO: A289; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 2A.1511ff; PIR 295; PIR(2) 395
Post(s): CP
Date of post(s): CP circa 7BC
Future career: Consul AD4
Primary evidence: Josephus, *A.J.* 16.368-369, *B.J.* 1.541
Reason for exclusion: On Cn. Sentius C.f. C.n. Saturninus, see L. Sentius C.f. C.n. Saturninus.

L. Sentius C.f. C.n. Saturninus
Catalogues: SUO: A290; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 2A.1511ff.; PIR 297; PIR(2) 397
Post(s): CP
Date of post(s): CP circa 7BC
Future career: Legatus
Primary evidence: Josephus, *A.J.* 16.368-369, *B.J.* 1.541; CIL 6.9979 = ILS 7427 (Roma)
Relevant text: Josephus, *A.J.* 16.368-369: καὶ πρῶτον μὲν Σατορνῖνος ἀνὴρ ὑπατικὸς καὶ τῶν ἐπ᾽ἀξιώματος ἀπεφήνατο γνώμην ἀηδεστάτῃ περιστάσει χρώμενος: ἔφη γὰρ καταδικάζειν μὲν τῶν Ἡρώδου παίδων, κτείνειν δ᾽οὐκ οἴεσθαι δικαιοῦν αὐτὸς παῖδας ἔχων καὶ τοῦ

πάθους μείζονος ὄντος, εἰ καὶ πάντα δι᾽αὐτοὺς δεδυστύχηκεν. μετ᾽ἐκεῖνον οἱ Σατορνίνου παῖδες, εἵποντο γὰρ αὐτῷ πρεσβευταὶ τρεῖς ὄντες, τὴν αὐτὴν γνώμην ἀπεφήναντο, Οὐολόμνιος δὲ ἄντικρυς ἔφη κολάζειν θανάτῳ τοὺς οὕτως ἀσεβήσαντας εἰς τὸν πατέρα. τὰ δ᾽αὐτὰ καὶ τῶν ἐξῆς οἱ πλείους, ὥστε καὶ μηκέτι ἄλλο τι δοκεῖν ἢ καταδεδικάσθαι τὴν ἐπὶ θανάτῳ τοὺς νεανίσκους; Josephus *B.J.* 1.541: καὶ πρῶτος Σατορνῖνος ἀπεφήνατο κατακρίνειν μὲν τῶν νεανίσκων, ἀλλ᾽οὐ θάνατον· οὐ γὰρ εἶναι θεμιτὸν αὐτῷ τριῶν παρεστώτων τέκνων ἑτέρου τέκνοις ἀπώλειαν ἐπιψηφίσασθαι; CIL 6.9979: Philoxenus / L. Senti Saturnini / uestificus
Reason for exclusion: L. Sentius C.f. C.n. Saturninus was one of the three sons of C. Sentius Saturninus, the consul of 19BC (PIR(2) 397) who travelled with their father to Syria in around 7BC (Syme (1986) 85). Josephus records that they were present at the debate concerning the fate of Herod's sons, but they were present as legates ('πρεσβευταὶ'), not as junior officers (Josephus, *A.J.* 16.368-369, *B.J.* 1.541). On the Sentii Saturnini see Groag, PIR(2), and Syme (Groag, RE 2A.1511ff; PIR(2) 395; Syme (1964b) 155ff. esp. 159).

250 L. Septimius
Catalogues: SUO: A209, A244; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.147, 278, 3.191; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 9
Further bibliography: Gabba (1976) 34, 191
Post(s): CENT(PP), MT
Date of post(s): CENT(PP) in 67BC, MT in 48BC
Primary evidence: Caesar *B.C.* 3.104; Plutarch, *Pomp.* 78.1-79.1; Appian *B.C.* 2.84; Dio 38.1, 42.3-4; cf. Florus 2.13.52; Zonarius 10.9; Lucan 8.596ff.; Schol. Bern. 279U

251 L. Septumius L.f. Arn(ensi)
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; (1976) - , (1987) - , (1993) 2235; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 64-65 Fig. 2; Kockel (1993) 101-102 (C1); Keppie (1997) 5
Post(s): ?MT
Date of post(s): MT circa 50BC
Primary evidence: ILLRP 697 (Roma)
Relevant text: [L. Septumius - - -] mag(ister) Capitolinus quinq(uennalis) L. Septumius L. f. Arn(ensi) eques Hirtuleia L. f.
Note: Septumius is known from a funerary relief generally dated to the middle of the first century BC (Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 64-65; cf. Devijver (1993) 2235; Keppie (1997) 5). The accompanying inscription names him only as an eques, but the relief depicts him in the dress of a junior officer, probably as a military tribune (Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 64-65; cf. Keppie (1997) 5).

C. Serenus Pa[- - -]
Catalogues: SUO: A373; **DEV:** - : (1976-1977) 736, (1987) - , (1993) - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): -
Date of post(s): N/A
Primary evidence: CIL 3.6097 (Patrai, Achaia)
Relevant text: C. Serenus Pa[- - -] / ciu(is) Romanus / et trib(unus) militum / leg(ionis) XII / in Ac(h)aia / sibi et suis / p(onendum) c(urauit)
Reason for exclusion: As the editors of CIL suggest, and as Devijver (Devijver (1976-1977) 736) argues strongly, CIL 3.6097 is probably a fake.

252 L. Sergius L.f. Lepidus
Catalogues: SUO: A274; **DEV:** S40: (1976-1977) 636-637, (1987) 1720, (1993) 2235; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 31; **RE/PIR:** RE 12.1821
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before 29BC
Primary evidence: CIL 5.50 = CIL *5.582.12 = CIL *5.582.13 = CIL *5.582.14 = ILS 2229 = Inscr.It. 10.1.72 (Pola, Regio 10, Italia)

253 Seruilius
Catalogues: SUO: C80; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.160; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 5, cf. 67
Post(s): NP

Date of post(s): NP in 65BC
Primary evidence: Plutarch, *Pomp*. 34.5; cf. Dio 37.3.2-3

254 C. Seruilius C.f. Teretina Brocchus
Catalogues: SUO: A238; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.264; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 39
Other reference works: Suolahti (1958) 153 no. 5
Further bibliography: Ben Zeev (1998) 155
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT in 49BC
Primary evidence: Josephus, *A.J*. 14.228-230, 236-240
Note: See the discussion of *consilia* in ch. 1.

255 [Q. Seruilius] Caepio
Catalogues: SUO: A198; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.119; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 40-42
Further bibliography: Badian (1964) 42
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT in 72BC
Future career: ?Quaestor 67BC
Primary evidence: Plutarch, *Cato Min*. 8.1

256 P. Seruilius Rullus
Catalogues: SUO: C180; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.385; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 80, 81
Post(s): EP|SEN
Date of post(s): EP|SEN in 40BC
Primary evidence: Appian, *B.C*. 5.58; Dio 48.28.1

P. Seruilius P.f. Strabo
Catalogues: SUO: Suolahti (1958) 153 no. 11; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Suolahti (1958) 153 no. 11
Post(s): -
Date of post(s): [49BC]
Primary evidence: Josephus, *A.J*. 14.236-240
Reason for exclusion: See the discussion of *consilia* in ch. 1.

257 P. Sestius
Catalogues: SUO: A213; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 6
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before 63BC
Future career: Praetor before 50BC
Primary evidence: Cicero, *Sest*. 7

258 L. Sextilius Rufus
Catalogues: SUO: C161; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.356, 3.183, 198; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 24 cf. 23
Post(s): NP, MP(GC)
Date of post(s): NP in 43BC, MP(GC) in 43BC
Primary evidence: As a naval prefect: Cicero, *ad Fam*. 12.13.4; as commander of Tarsus: Dio 47.31.1

259 T. Silius
Catalogues: SUO: A217; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.212; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 1
Post(s): MT|MP
Date of post(s): MT|MP in 56BC
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.G*. 3.7.2-4, cf. 8.2-4, 9.3, 10.2, 16.4; Dio 39.40.1; Orosius 6.8.67
Relevant text: Is [P. Crassus], quod in his locis inopia frumenti erat, praefectos tribunosque militum complures in finitimas ciuitates frumenti causa dimisit; quo in numero est T. Terrasidius missus in Esuuios, M. Trebius Gallus in Coriosolites, Q. Velanius cum T. Silio in Venetos.
Note: In 56BC P. Crassus sent a number of individuals, including T. Terrasidius, M. Trebius Gallus, Q. Velanius and T. Silius, to obtain corn from various Gallic peoples. They were arrested and held as hostages. In naming them, Caesar describes them as "praefectos tribunosque militum", but does not give an exact rank to each. In other passages, they are collectively referred to as

"legati" (in the sense of delegates, not as promagistrates: Caesar, *B.G.* 3.9.3, 16.4; cf. Dio 39.40.1) and as "equites Romani" (Caesar, *B.G.* 3.10.2). It should be assumed that each was either a military tribune or a prefect, but it is not possible to tell who was which. Cf. T. Terrasidius, M. Trebius Gallus, Q. Velanius.

C. Silius C.f. Fab(ia) Auiola
Catalogues: SUO: A374, C350; **DEV:** S51 - S52: (1976-1977) 742, (1987) 1722, (1993) 2237-2238; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 257; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Saddington (1985) 532 no. 37
Further bibliography: Dobson (1966) 66; Gregori (1990) 230ff.; Demougin (1992) 221
Post(s): PF, MT, ?EP(PE)
Date of post(s): PF circa AD27, MT circa AD27, ?EP(PE) circa AD27
Primary evidence: CIL 5.4919 = Inscr.It. 10.5.1144 = ILS 6100 = AE 1941, +72; CIL 5.4920 = Inscr.It. 10.5.1145 = AE 1941, +72 = AE 1942-1943, 34; CIL 5.4921 = Inscr.It. 10.5.1146 = ILS 6099, 6099a; CIL 5.4922 = Inscr.It. 10.5.1147 = ILS 6099; cf. CIL 5.4292 (Trumplini, Regio 10, Italia)

[- - -] Sont[i]us [- - -] Ter(etina) Cimber
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Parma (1990) 114
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD100
Primary evidence: AE 1990 223f = EDH HD016335 (Allifae, Regio 4, Italia)
Relevant text: [- - -] Sont[i]us [- - -] / Ter(etina) Cimbe[r] / trib(unus) mili[tum] / [- - -]
Reason for exclusion: A military tribune in an unknown legion, Sontius Cimber is impossible to date precisely. Given the letter-forms, he may belong to the first century AD, but Parma's suggestion that he should be dated to the Triumviral or early imperial periods on the basis of the *cognomen* Cimber is unconvincing (Parma (1990) 114).

260 T. Sornius T.f. Vel(ina)
Catalogues: SUO: C229; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 93; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Saddington (1985) 530 no. 10
Post(s): PF
Date of post(s): PF before 2BC
Primary evidence: CIL 10.960 (Pompeii, Regio 1, Italia)

C. Sosius
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.420; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 2
Other reference works: Saddington (1988a) 308 no. 26
Post(s): SEN|LEG|NP
Date of post(s): SEN|LEG|NP in 31BC
Primary evidence: Velleius 2.85
Reason for exclusion: On C. Sosius, cf. L. Arruntius, M. Insteius, M. Octauius.

261 L. Staberius
Catalogues: SUO: C140; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.284; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 2
Post(s): MP(GC)
Date of post(s): MP(GC) in 48BC
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.C.* 3.12

Staius Esdragassi f.
Catalogues: SUO: A375, C351; **DEV:** - : (1976-1977) 747, (1987) - , (1993) - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** PIR 586
Other reference works: Saddington (1980) 30 no. 14
Further bibliography: Timpe (1970) 32 n.62, 55; Wells (1972) 74; Laffi (1978) Pl. 1; Saddington (1982) 57-58; Birley (1986) 250; Spaul (2000) 272
Post(s): -
Date of post(s): [after 15BC]
Primary evidence: CIL 5.4910 = Inscr.It. 10.5.1133 = ILS 847 = AE 1979, 297 (Trumplini, Regio 10, Italia)

Reason for exclusion: This individual was not a Roman citizen, and therefore should not be considered to be a junior officer.

[L.?] Staius L.f. R[u]tilus
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** S74: (1976-1977) 755, (1987) - , (1993) 2240; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 184; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Parma (1990) 115
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD42
Primary evidence: AE 1990, 223g = CIL 9.2359 = EDH HD016314 (Allifae, Regio 1, Italia)
Relevant text: [L.?] Statio L. f. R[u]tilo tr(ibuno) mil(itum) / prae[f(ecto) eq(uitum)] IIuir(o) iter(um) quinq(uennali) / aed(ili) [Aug]ustales h(onoris) c(ausa) [fecerunt]
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Claudian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

262 M. Sufenas M.f. P[roculus]
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** S84 bis: (1976-1977) 763, (1987) 1728-1729, (1993) 2243; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 129; **RE/PIR:** RE Supp. 14 no. 2
Other reference works: Saddington (1980) 31 no. 16
Further bibliography: Gasperini (1971) 5ff.; Demougin (1978a) 620ff.; Reynolds (1979) 459; Laronde (1988) 1022; Luni (1991) 130-132
Post(s): IP(PCOH)
Date of post(s): IP(PCOH) before AD15
Primary evidence: AE 1978, 830 = EDH HD004639 (Cyrenae, Cyrenaica)

L. Tarius Rufus
Catalogues: SUO: C206; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.423; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 3; PIR(2) 19
Other reference works: Saddington (1990) 29
Further bibliography: De Laet (1941) no. 371
Post(s): LEG|NP
Date of post(s): LEG|NP in 31BC
Future career: Consul (suffectus) 16BC
Primary evidence: Dio 50.14.1-2
Relevant text: ὁ γὰρ Σόσσιος Λουκίου Ταρρίου ναυσὶν ὀλίγαις ἐφορμοῦντός σφισιν ἐλπίσας ἄξιόν τι λόγου πράξειν
Reason for exclusion: The commander of a small fleet under Agrippa that was attacked by Sosius, Tarius Rufus may have been a naval prefect, but he was probably a legate (cf. Broughton (1951-1986) 2.423).

263 C. Tarquitius Priscus
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.95, 3.203; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 8
Further bibliography: Konrad (1994) 56
Post(s): EP|SEN|LEG
Date of post(s): EP|SEN|LEG in 76BC
Primary evidence: Frontinus, *Strat*. 2.5.31
Relevant text: Tarquitium Priscum cum duobus milibus equitum ire iubet
Note: Given that he served under Sertorius, it is perhaps unsurprising that no title is given to Tarquitius Priscus. Given the significance of this command (2000 cavalry), his may have been a senior officer position, and possibly a legateship (Broughton (1951-1986) 3.202 cf. C. Octauius Graecinus), though I think it more likely that he should be considered a junior officer.

264 M. Teiedi(us) M.f. Pol(lia)
Catalogues: SUO: A177; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.35; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE Va.128
Further bibliography: Cichorius (1922) 153 no. 20; Criniti (1970) 119-120
Post(s): ?MT
Date of post(s): ?MT in 89BC
Primary evidence: Criniti (1970) 16-26 = CIL 6.37045 = CIL 1.709 = CIL 16, p.145 = ILLRP 515 = ILS 8888 = AE 1909, 30 = AE 1910, +126 = AE 1910, +153 = AE 1910, +162 = AE 1910, 207 = AE 1910, 218 = AE 1911, 126 = AE 1912, +10 = AE 1912, +117 = AE 1912, +287 = AE 1920, +130 = AE 1923, +103 = AE 2003, +831 = EDH HD019742 (Roma)
Note: See the discussion of *consilia* in ch. 1.

265 [?Q.] Terentius Culleo
Catalogues: SUO: C162; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.356; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 44
Post(s): MP(GC)
Date of post(s): MP(GC) in 43BC
Future career: [?Tribunus plebis 58BC]
Primary evidence: Cicero, *ad Fam*. 10.34.2; Appian, *B.C*. 3.83

266 T. Terrasidius
Catalogues: SUO: A218; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.212; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE Va.820
Post(s): MT|MP
Date of post(s): MT|MP in 56BC
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.G*. 3.7.2-4, cf. 8.2-4, 9.3, 10.2, 16.4; Dio 39.40.1; Orosius 6.8.67
Note: On T. Terrasidius, cf. T. Silius

T. Tettius T.f. Vel(ina)
Catalogues: SUO: C145; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.292; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 5
Post(s): -
Date of post(s): [47BC]
Primary evidence: CIL 8.979 = CIL 8.24099 = CIL 1.780 = ILS 5319 = ILPBardo 519 = ILTun 836 = ILLRP 394 = AE 1895, 69 = AE 1895, 97 = AE 1895, +106 = AE 1898, +46 = EDH HD005696 (Curubis, Africa Proconsularis)
Relevant text: P. Attius P. f. Vaarus(!) leg(atus) pro pr(aetore) / C. Considius C. f. Longus leg(atus) pro pr(aetore) / murum turres posteicuus / fossam faciundum coer(auerunt) / T. Tettius T. f. Vel(ina) praefectus
Reason for exclusion: Responsible for overseeing construction work at Curubis - a Caesarian colony - there is no evidence that Tettius was a military officer.

P. Tettius P.f. Rufus Tontianus
Catalogues: SUO: A376; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** PIR(2) 141
Further bibliography: Wiseman (1971) 265
Post(s): -
Date of post(s): [before AD15]
Future career: Praetor
Primary evidence: CIL 10.5059, 5060 (Atina, Latium, Italia); cf. CIL 6.9319 (Roma)
Relevant text: CIL 10.5059: P. Tettio P. f. Rufo / Tontiano / q(uaestori) tr(ibuno) pl(ebis) pr(aetori) legio XX; CIL 10.5060: P. Tettio P. [f.] Rufo Tontiano / q(uaestori) tr(ibuno) pl(ebis) pr(aetori) Atinates urbani / patrono d(ecreto) d(ecurionum)
Reason for exclusion: No evidence that this individual held a junior officer position

C. Teutius {?Tettius} C.f. Aem(ilia)
Catalogues: SUO: A239; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.264, 3.205; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 1
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT in 49BC
Primary evidence: Josephus, *A.J*. 14.236-240
Reason for exclusion: On C. Teutius {Tettius} C.f. Aemilia, cf. C. Sentius C.(f.) Aemilia.

267 [?L.] Tillius C.f. Cor(nelia)
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 2; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT circa 45BC
Primary evidence: D'Ambrosio and De Caro (1983) Pompeii 17OS (Pompeii, Regio 1, Italia)
Note: On. [?L.] Tillius C.f. Cor(nelia) cf. C. Tillius C.f. Cor(nelia) Rufus.

268 C. Tillius C.f. Cor(nelia) Rufus
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 1; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Castrén (1983) 93, 226
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT circa 45BC
Primary evidence: D'Ambrosio and De Caro (1983) Pompeii 17OS (Pompeii, Regio 1, Italia)
Relevant text: [?L. Tilius] C. f. Cor(nelia) / [tr(ibunus) mil(itum) l]eg(ionis) X equest(ris) / duouir

i(ure) d(icundo) // C. Tilio C. f. Cor(nelia) / Rufo patri duomuir(o) / i(ure) d(icundo) bis aedili i(ure) d(icundo) Arpini / auguri Verulis // C. Tilio L. f. Cor(nelia) auo // Fadiae C. f. / matri // C. Tilio C. f. C[or(nelia)] / Rufo fratri tr(ibuno) mil(itum) / leg(ionis) X auguri Verulis
Note: This inscription from Pompeii records a family in which two brothers were military tribunes. The father had been a local magistrate, first at Arpinum, then at Verulae, and then (apparently) at Pompeii. Of the two brothers, one (Gaius) had held a magistracy at Verulae, the other (Lucius?) was duouir at Pompeii, and both were military tribunes in legio X. Given that they both probably served in Legio X (Equestris), it is likely that their service dates to the 40s BC, possibly under Antonius (cf. Castrén (1974) 6, (1983) 93, 226; Demougin (1992) 23).

269 [L.] Ti[t]inius L.f. Aem(ilia) Sulpicianus
Catalogues: SUO: A377; **DEV:** T26: (1976-1977) 787, (1987) - , (1993) 2254; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 41; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Sasel (1974) 470; Saddington (1996a) 165-166
Post(s): MT, MT(PL)
Date of post(s): MT before 25BC, MT(PL) before 25BC
Primary evidence: CIL 3.605 = ILS 2678 (Dyrrachium, Macedonia)

270 Titius (1)
Catalogues: SUO: A249; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.299-300, 3.206; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 13
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT in 46BC
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.Afr*. 28

271 Titius (2)
Catalogues: SUO: A250; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.299-300, 3.206; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 13
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT in 46BC
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.Afr*. 28

272 L. Titius
Catalogues: SUO: A245; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.279; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 13
Other reference works: Saddington (1999) 305 no. 1
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT in 48BC
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.Alex*. 57.1

273 M'. Titius M'.f. Fab(ia)
Catalogues: SUO: A275; **DEV:** T27: (1976-1977) 788, (1987) 1740, (1993) 2254; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 32; **RE/PIR:** RE 12.1662, 1645
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before 29BC
Primary evidence: CIL 5.2163 (Altinum, Regio 10, Italia)

C. Trebatius Testa
Catalogues: SUO: A227; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 7
Further bibliography: Deniaux (2000) 229 n.13
Post(s): -
Date of post(s): [54BC]
Primary evidence: Cicero, *ad Fam*. 7.5.1-3; cf. 6.1, 7.1, 8.2, 9.1, 10.1, 11.2, 13.1, 14.2, 15.1, 16.1, 17.1, 18.1, 19-22, *ad Q.F*. 2.12.3, 13.3
Relevant text: 7.5.2-3: Mitto igitur ad te Trebatium atque ita mitto ut initio mea sponte, post autem inuitatu tuo mittendum duxerim. hunc, mi Caesar, sic uelim omni tua comitate complectare, ut omnia, quae per me possis adduci ut in meos conferre uelis, in unum hunc conferas. de quo tibi homine haec spondeo non illo uetere uerbo meo, quod cum ad te de Milone scripsissem, iure lusisti, sed more Romano, quo modo homines non inepti loquuntur, probiorem hominem, meliorem uirum, pudentiorem esse neminem; accedit etiam, quod familiam ducit in iure ciuili singulari memoria, summa scientia. huic ego neque tribunatum neque praefecturam neque ullius benefici certum nomen peto, beneuolentiam tuam et liberalitatem peto neque impedio quo minus, si tibi ita placuerit, etiam hisce eum ornes gloriolae insignibus

Reason for exclusion: Despite being recommended to Caesar by Cicero - with the hint that Trebatius might want a prefecture or a military tribunate (Cicero, *ad Fam*. 7.5.1-3, cf. 8.2, 9.1) - Trebatius did not hold an officer position, although he spent a great deal of time with Caesar in Gaul. His legal experience, as Welch notes ((1998) 101), was useful to Caesar.

274 M. Trebius Gallus
Catalogues: SUO: A219; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.212; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 2
Post(s): MT|MP
Date of post(s): MT|MP in 56BC
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.G*. 3.7.2-4, cf. 8.2-4, 9.3, 10.2, 16.4; Dio 39.40.1; Orosius 6.8.67
Note: On M. Trebius Gallus, cf. T. Silius.

M. Trebius Ribianus Silonianus
Catalogues: SUO: A378; **DEV:** - : (1976-1977) 792, (1987) - , (1993) - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): -
Date of post(s): [before AD15]
Primary evidence: CIL 8.1226 (Vaga, Africa)
Relevant text: D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum) / M. Trebius Ribi/anus Silonianus / tribunus populi / uixit ann(is) LVII / h(ic) s(itus) e(st)
Reason for exclusion: No evidence that this individual held a junior officer position

275 C. Trebonius
Catalogues: SUO: C95; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.232; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 7
Post(s): IP
Date of post(s): IP in 53BC
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.G*. 6.40.4; cf. 6.33; Cicero, *ad Q.F*. 3.1.9
Relevant text: inter se cohortati duce Gaio Trebonio, equite Romano, qui eis erat praepositus
Note: Presumably a relative of the legate C. Trebonius who was given command of three legions in order to destroy the countryside around the territory of the Aduatuci (Caesar, *B.G*. 6.33), the equestrian Trebonius was (at the same time) given command of veteran troops leading a foraging party, who were then ambushed.

[- - - ?Tre]boniu[s - - -] Valens
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** T39: (1976-1977) 792, (1987) - , (1993) 2256; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 185; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Nicolet (1967) 44 no. 22
Post(s): ?MT(AP)
Date of post(s): ?MT(AP) before AD15
Primary evidence: CIL 11.3216 (Nepet, Regio 7, Italia)
Relevant text: [- - - ?Tre]boniu[s - - -] / [- - -] Valens [- - -] / [- - - tr(ibunus) mil(itum)] a populo [- - -] / [- - - IIIIuir] i(ure) d(icundo) [- - -]
Reason for exclusion: Given the highly fragmentary state of this inscription, it is doubtful whether Trebonius Valens was a *tribunus militum a populo* (cf. Nicolet (1967) 44; Demougin (1992) 167).

276 Cn. Tremellius Scrofa
Catalogues: SUO: A206; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.133; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 5
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT in 69BC
Future career: Praetor before 57BC or in ?52BC
Primary evidence: Cicero, *Verr*. 1.30

277 M. Tullius M.f.
Catalogues: SUO: A379; **DEV:** T41: (1976-1977) 793, (1987) 1741, (1993) 2256-2257; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 92; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Nicolet (1967) 39-40 nos. 12-13
Further bibliography: Castrén (1975) 231; Mouritsen (1988) 103, 120; Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 91
Post(s): MT(AP)

Date of post(s): MT(AP) before AD3
Primary evidence: CIL 10.820 = ILS 5398; CIL 10.822 cf. 821 (Pompeii, Regio 1, Italia)

278 M. Tullius Cicero
Catalogues: SUO: C125, C141, C163, C174; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.271, 284, 356, 368; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 30
Post(s): EP
Date of post(s): EP in 49BC, EP in 48BC, EP in 43BC, EP in 42BC
Future career: Consul suffectus 30BC
Primary evidence: 49-48BC: Cicero, *de Off*. 2.45; 43-42BC: Cicero, *ad Fam*. 12.14.8; *ad Brut*. 1.4a, 4, 6.1; Plutarch, *Cic*. 45.3; cf. Appian, *B.C*. 4.20; Cicero, *Phil*. 10.13, 11.26, *ad Brut*. 2.4.6, 5.2, 6; Plutarch, *Brut*. 26.2

C. Turranius
Catalogues: SUO: C225, C352; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 451; **RE/PIR:** RE 5; PIR 297, PIR(2) 410
Further bibliography: Thomasson (1984) 342 no. 5
Post(s): SEN
Date of post(s): SEN before AD48
Future career: Praefectus praetorii, Praefectus annonae
Primary evidence: IGR 1.1295 = Bernand and Bernand (1969) (I.Philae) no. 142 = CIG 4923 (Philae, Aegyptus); IGR 1.1109 = SB 1.982 (Mahemdieh, Aegyptus); Tacitus, *Ann*. 1.7.2, 11.31.1; Seneca, *De breuitate uitae* 20.3;
Reason for exclusion: This individual held a senior officer position.

M. Turtellius C. f. Rufus
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** T45: (1976-1977) 795, (1987) - , (1993) 2257; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 187; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD42
Primary evidence: CIL 11.1341 (Luna, Regio 7, Italia)
Relevant text: M. Turtellio C. f. Rufo / duouiro III tr(ibuno) mil(itum) II / coloni et incolae
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Claudian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

Tuticanus Gallus
Catalogues: SUO: A246; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE Sup. 65
Post(s): -
Date of post(s): [48BC]
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.C*. 3.71
Reason for exclusion: On Tuticanus Gallus, cf. C. Felginas.

279 [?L. Va]leri[us] L.f. Cor(nelia)
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Menella (1991) 421
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before 31BC
Primary evidence: AE 1991, 708 (Parma, Regio 8, Italia)

280 P. Valerius
Catalogues: SUO: C74; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 76
Post(s): MP(GC)
Date of post(s): MP(GC) in 74BC
Primary evidence: Frontinus, *Strat*. 2.11.1

281 L. Valerius Flaccus
Catalogues: SUO: A192, A194, A195; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.87, 91, 94; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE *69, 179
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT in 78BC, MT in 77BC, MT in 76BC
Future career: Praetor 63BC

Primary evidence: Cicero, *Flacc*. 6, 100-101, cf. 63; Schol. Bob. 7-8; cf. Nicolas of Kues, Macdonald (1989) 445
Relevant text: Cicero, *Flacc*. 6: fuit P. Seruilio imperatore in Cilicia tribunus militum; ea res siletur; *Flacc*. 101: Flacci et perpetua uita defendet. et, si prodesse L. Flacco, iudices, debet, quod se tribunum militum, quod quaestorem, quod legatum imperatoribus clarissimis, exercitibus ornatissimis, prouinciis grauissimis dignum suis maioribus praestitit; *Flacc*. 63: neque uero te, Massilia, praetereo quae L. Flaccum <?tribunum> militum quaestoremque cognosti; Schol. Bob. 7-8: ex hoc aetatis gradu se ad exercitum C. Flacci patrui contulit. tribunus militaris cum P. Seruilio, grauissimo et sanctissimo ciue, profectus.
Note: A military tribune under his uncle P. Seruilius, Flaccus had a considerable military career (cf. Cicero, *Flacc*. 6, 63, 101, Nicolas of Kues, Macdonald (1989) 445). However, it should be noted that his proposed military tribunate in 82BC (cf. Broughton (1951-1986) 2.87) rests entirely upon an emendation of Cicero (Cicero, *Flacc*. 63), which, as Badian notes, is highly uncertain (Badian (1989) 87ff.). Although we should not assume that the unemended passage shows that he served in the ranks - "militum" is here be being used generically - we should not assign a rank to him in this period, and he should be considered as a *contubernalis* of his uncle.

C. Valerius C.f. Pap(iria) Marianus
Catalogues: SUO: C353; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Dietz (2000) 133
Post(s): PF
Date of post(s): PF after AD165
Primary evidence: CIL 5.5036 = CIL 14, *228 = ILS 5016 (Tridentum, Regio 10, Italia)

282 M. Valerius M.f. M'.[n.] Messalla (Niger)
Catalogues: SUO: A196, A197; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.482; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE *76
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before 73BC
Future career: Censor 55BC
Primary evidence: CIL 6.3826 = CIL 6.31618 = Inscr.It. 13.3.77 = ILS 46 = AE 2000, +132 (Roma)
Relevant text: M. Valerius M. f. M(ani) [n.] / Messalla pontife[x] / tr(ibunus) mil(itum) II q(uaestor) pr(aetor) urb(anus) co(n)[s(ul)] Vuir a(gris) d(andis) a(dgisnandis) i(udicandis) interr[ex] / III censor // [M. Valerius M. f.] M. n. / [Messalla Coru]inus

C. Valerius Triarius
Catalogues: SUO: C125; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.271; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 363
Post(s): SEN|NP
Date of post(s): SEN|NP in 49BC
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.C*. 3.5; cf. 3.92
Relevant text: Praeerat Aegyptiis nauibus Pompeius filius, Asiaticis D. Laelius et C. Triarius, Syriacis C. Cassius, Rhodiis C. Marcellus cum C. Coponio, Liburnicae atque Achaicae classi Scribonius Libo et M. Octauius. Toti tamen officio maritimo M. Bibulus praepositus cuncta administrabat; ad hunc summa imperii respiciebat
Reason for exclusion: A naval commander under Bibulus, and a colleague of D. Laelius, it is unlikely that Triarius was a junior officer. Triarius' most interesting role was, perhaps, at Pharsalus, where he was the man who advised Pompeius to hold his men in position and await Caesar's infantry charge (Caesar, *B.C*. 3.92).

L. Valerius C.f. Vibrio
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** V44: (1976-1977) 836, (1987) - , (1993) 2271; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 65; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD42
Primary evidence: CIL 11.4192 = CIL 9.4760 = AE 1995, 581 (Interamna Nahars, Regio 6, Italia)
Relevant text: L. Valerio C. f. / Vibrioni IIIIuir(o) / trib(uno) mil(itum) / arbitratu / Hieronis et Thiasi l(ibertis)
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Claudian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date, cf. [- - -] Aufidi[us - - -] (CIL 11.4183a).

Q. Varius Q.f. Ser(gia) Geminus
Catalogues: SUO: C354; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** PIR 187
Further bibliography: De Laet (1941) 91 no. 402; Wiseman (1971) 270 no. 463; Talbert (1984) 36
Post(s): CP
Date of post(s): CP before AD15
Future career: Proconsul
Primary evidence: CIL 9.3305 = ILS 932; CIL 6.3306 = ILS 932a (Superaequum, Regio 4, Italia)
Reason for exclusion: This individual held a civilian position.

283 L. Varus
Catalogues: SUO: C172; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.368, 3.178; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE *11
Further bibliography: Syme (1956b) 208
Post(s): MP(GC)
Date of post(s): MP(GC) in 42BC
Primary evidence: Appian, *B.C.* 4.74

284 M. Vecilius M.f. L.n. Campus
Catalogues: SUO: A381, C358; **DEV:** V58: (1976-1977) 843, (1987) 1763, (1993) 2272-2273; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 188; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Saddington (1985) 530 no. 16
Further bibliography: Dobson (1966) 69-70 n.42; Keppie (1983) 107; Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 73-74
Post(s): PF, MT
Date of post(s): PF before AD15, MT before AD15
Primary evidence: AE 1938, 110 = EDH HD022194, cf. AE 1937, 64 (Luceria, Regio 2, Italia)

285 (?Vedius Rufus)
Catalogues: SUO: A276; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 3*
Further bibliography: Fraenkel (1957) 57-58; Mankin (1995) 99ff.
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before 29BC
Primary evidence: Horace, *Ep.* 4
Relevant text: 'sectus flagellis hic triumuiralibus / praeconis ad fastidium / arat Falerni mille fundi iugera / et Appiam mannis terit / sedilibusque magnus in primis eques / Othone contempto sedet. / quid attinet tot ora nauium graui / rostrata duci pondere / contra latrones atque seruilem manum / hoc, hoc tribuno militum?'
Note: This poem inveighs against an unnamed military tribune, possibly Vedius Rufus (cf. Suolahti (1955) 316), or Pompeius Maenas (cf. Pompeius Maenas; Mankin (1995) 99ff.), although, as Mankin suggests, he is possibly a stock figure. However, given that Horace was the son of a freedman and a military tribune himself (cf. Q. Horatius Flaccus), the poem could be intended to represent the views of those who criticised Horace's own status (Mankin (1995) 99ff.; cf. Fraenkel (1957) 10-11).

286 A. Veius M.f.
Catalogues: SUO: A382; **DEV:** V61: (1976-1977) 845, (1987) - , (1993) 2273; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 189; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Nicolet (1967) 41 no. 19
Further bibliography: Mouritsen (1988) 76, 103
Post(s): MT(AP)
Date of post(s): MT(AP) before AD15
Primary evidence: CIL10.996 (Pompeii, Regio 1, Italia)

287 Q. Velanius
Catalogues: SUO: A220; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.212, 3.217; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Syme (1956b) 209ff.
Post(s): MT|MP
Date of post(s): MT|MP in 56BC
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.G.* 3.7.2-4, cf. 8.2-4, 9.3, 10.2, 16.4; Dio 39.40.1; Orosius 6.8.67
Note: On Q. Velanius, cf. T. Silius.

C. Veliternius C.f. Ter(etina) Sabinus
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** V62: (1976-1977) 844-845, (1987) - , (1993) 2273; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 395; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD42
Primary evidence: CIL 6.3541 (Roma)
Relevant text: M. Ouius M. f. Ter(etina) Rufus Venaf(e)r / Ferraniae C. f. Tertullai(!) uxori / Ouiae M. f. Pollai(!) filiae / C.Veliternio C. f. Ter(etina) Sabino / priuigno tr(ibuno) mil(itum)
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Claudian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

288 Velleius
Catalogues: SUO: C181; **DEV:** V63: (1976-1977) 845, (1987) 1765, (1993) 2273; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 88; **RE/PIR:** RE 3; PIR(2) 237
Other reference works: Saddington (1980) 29 no. 7
Further bibliography: Sumner (1970) 265; Woodman (1975) 273
Post(s): EP(PE)
Date of post(s): EP(PE) before AD4
Primary evidence: Velleius 2.104.3

289 C. Velleius
Catalogues: SUO: C181; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.385; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE *2
Other reference works: Saddington (1985) 529 no. 3; Welch (1995) 137 no. viii; Badian (1997) 6 no. viii
Post(s): PF
Date of post(s): PF before 48BC, PF before 42BC, PF before 40BC
Primary evidence: Velleius 2.76.1

290 C. Velleius Paterculus
Catalogues: SUO: A293, C233; **DEV:** V64: (1976-1977) 845-846, (1987) 1765, (1993) 2274; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 108; **RE/PIR:** RE 5; PIR(2) 237
Other reference works: Saddington (1980) 29 no. 8, (1999) 307 no. 15
Further bibliography: Sumner (1970) 265-270; Woodman (1975) 273; Saddington (1996a) 158, (2003) 19ff
Post(s): MT, EP(PE)
Date of post(s): MT before 2BC, ?MT before AD3, EP(PE) before AD4
Future career: Praetor AD24
Primary evidence: Velleius 2.101.2-3, 104.3; cf. 111.3-4

291 Q. Veranius
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** V65 bis: (1976-1977) - , (1987) 1765-1766, (1993) 2274; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** PIR 266
Other reference works: Saddington (1999) 306 no. 6
Further bibliography: Syme (1956a) 272-273; Sasel (1974) 467ff.; Balland (1981) 85ff.
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before 24BC
Future career: Pro legato
Primary evidence: AE 1981, 824 = BE 1982, 376 (Xanthos, Lycia); cf. IGR 3.703 (Cyanis, Asia)

292 M. Vergilius M.f. Teret(ina) Gallus Lusius
Catalogues: SUO: A383, C359, C360, C361; **DEV:** V66: (1976-1977) 847-848, (1987) 1766-1767, (1993) 2274-2275; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 301; **RE/PIR:** PIR 278
Other reference works: Pflaum (1960-1961) 23 no. 7; Dobson (1978) 170-171 no. 9; Holder (1980) 247 no. E56; Saddington (1980) 33 no. 29, (1985) 530 no. 19
Further bibliography: Alföldy (1968) 73-74; Maxfield (1981) 161-162; Saddington (1982) 59; Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 88; Spaul (2000) 253
Post(s): CENT(PP), EP(PCE), PF, MT(COHP/U)
Date of post(s): CENT(PP) circa AD15, EP(PCE) circa AD15, PF circa AD15, MT(COHP/U) circa AD15
Future career: Idiologus
Primary evidence: CIL 10.4862 = ILS 2690 (Venafrum, Regio 1, Italia)

Relevant text: Lusia M. f. Paullina / Sex. Vetuleni Cerialis / sibi et / M. Vergilio M. f. Ter(etina) Gallo Lusio / patri prim(o) pil(o) leg(ionis) XI praef(ecto) cohort(is) / Ubiorum peditum et equitum donato / hastis puris duabus et coronis aureis / ab diuo Aug(usto) et Ti. Caesare Aug(usto) praef(ecto) fabr(um) / III trib(uno) mil(itum) cohort(is) primae id[io]logo / ad Aegyptum IIuir(o) iterum pontif(ici) / A. Lusio A. f. Ter(etina) Gallo fratri / trib(uno) mil(itum) leg(ionis) XXII Cyrenaicae praef(ecto) equit(um)
Note: Given that he was awarded his military honours by both Augustus and Tiberius (probably during the campaigns of AD10-11), it is likely that Vergilius held his junior officer positions during the latter part of Augustus' reign and the early part of Tiberius' (cf. Alföldy (1968) 73-74; Saddington (1982) 59; Spaul (2000) 253). Although, as Maxfield points out, Tiberius was awarding military decorations on his own before the death of Augustus (Maxfield (1981) 161-162), it is still likely that Vergilius served under both emperors, and there is a clear parallel between Vergilius, who commanded a praetorian cohort, and A. Virgius L.f. Marsus (AE 1978, 286), who was *tribunus militum in praetorio diui Augusti et Tiberii Caesaris Augusti cohortium XI et IIII praetoriarum*. If the *cohors* named here is *cohors I Ubiorum equitata*, then Vergilius was one of the first commanders of this German unit, which combined infantry and cavalry and was generally stationed in one of the Danubian provinces (cf. Cheesman (1914) 29; Saddington (1982) 59; Spaul (2000) 252). However, as the unit is otherwise unattested until AD97, it is possible that this was a temporary formation of troops, possibly raised during the Pannonian revolt or after the defeat of Varus (cf. Alföldy (1968) 73-74). It does, however, show that the concept of a *cohors equitata*, if not the name itself, was present in the Augustan period (cf. Cheesman (1914) 29; Saddington (1982) 59; Spaul (2000) 253 n.1). Vergilius was clearly successful, as his military awards and the command of a praetorian cohort testify (on his praetorian command, cf. A. Virgius L.f. Marsus (AE 1978, 286)). Vergilius' son A. Lusius Gallus also pursued a military career, holding the military tribunate and the post of *praefectus equitum*, presumably during the reign of Tiberius (Demougin (1992) 258; on the Legio XXII Cyrenaica, presumably a mistake for Legio III Cyrenaica or Legio XXII, later Deiotariana, see Keppie (1990) 56), while his daughter Lusia Paullina married a senator, and had two consular sons. This is recorded on an inscription from Venafrum, probably the origin of the family (Dobson (1978) 170), set up by A. Lusius Gallus and dedicated to both his sister and his father. The inscription names Lusia Paullina first, and in the most prominent lettering (note that Lusius Gallus names himself "frater" not "filius"), and probably belongs to a large round mausoleum (based on Augustus' own) from Venafrum which features two crossed *orcae* (Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 88).

293 P. V[e]rgi[nius] P.[f. Pu]p(inia) Paetus
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** V68: (1976-1977) 849, (1987) 1767, (1993) 2276; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 191; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Forni (1982a) 48; Devijver and van Wonterghem (1990) 76
Post(s): MT(AP)
Date of post(s): MT(AP) before AD15
Primary evidence: AE 1966, 120 = AE 1967, +6 = AE 1980, 411 (Sassina, Regio 6, Italia)

Vertiscus
Catalogues: SUO: C105; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): -
Date of post(s): [51BC]
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.G.* 8.12.4-5
Reason for exclusion: This individual was not a Roman citizen, and therefore should not be considered to be a junior officer.

294 Vespasius Pollio
Catalogues: SUO: A384, A384a, A384b, C362; **DEV:** V74: (1976-1977) 851-852, (1987) 1768, (1993) 2277; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 192; **RE/PIR:** PIR 299
Other reference works: Dobson (1978) 165 no. 2; Saddington (1996b) 247 no. 11, (1999) 309 no. 25
Further bibliography: Syme (1939) 575 n.70
Post(s): MT, IP(PCAST)
Date of post(s): MT before AD15, IP(PCAST) before AD15
Primary evidence: Suetonius, *Vesp.*1.3; cf. AE 1989, 201 = EDH HD014733 (Nursia, Regio 4, Italia)

295 Vestalis
Catalogues: SUO: C363; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 220; **RE/PIR:** PIR(2) 621
Other reference works: Saddington (1987) 270 no. 8, (1988a) 309 no. 33, (1990) 270 no. 4
Further bibliography: Dobson (1966) 171 no. 10
Post(s): CENT(PP), MP(GC)
Date of post(s): CENT(PP) before AD15, MP(GC) before AD15
Primary evidence: Ovid, *Pont*. 4.7.1-2, 15-16, 49

L. Veturius L.f. Homuncio
Catalogues: SUO: A385; **DEV:** V85: (1976-1977) 858-859, (1987) - , (1993) 2279 ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 396; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Birley (1978) 263-264
Post(s): MT, EP(PE)
Date of post(s): MT before AD42, EP(PE) before AD42
Primary evidence: CIL 10.8241 (Aquinum, Regio 1, Italia)
Relevant text: L. Veturio L. f. / Homuncioni / tr(ibuno) mil(itum) bis leg(ionis) XV / Apollinar(is) et leg(ionis) VII / Macedonic(ae) praef(ecto) eq(uitum) / pontific(i) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum) public(ae)
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Claudian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

296 Q. Veturius Q.f. Pom(ptina) Pexsus
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** V86: (1976-1977) 859, (1987) 1770, (1993) 2279; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 190; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Dobson (1966) 70 n.43
Further bibliography: Duncan-Jones (1965) 242 no. 575; Christol and Demougin (1982) 147-148; Demougin (1992) 170; Devijver (1992b) 420-421
Post(s): MT, PF
Date of post(s): MT before AD15, PF before AD15
Primary evidence: CIL 11.3205 = ILS 4948 = AE 2003, +29 (Nepet, Regio 7, Italia)

297 M'. Vibius M'.f. Vel(ina) Balbinus
Catalogues: SUO: A386, C364, C365; **DEV:** V91: (1976-1977) 861, (1987) 1770-1771, (1993) 2280; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 105; **RE/PIR:** PIR 377
Other reference works: Holder (1980) 245 no. E35; Saddington (1980) 32 no. 22, (1985) 531 no. 20, (1999) 308 no. 21
Further bibliography: Wiseman (1971) 27; Chastagnol (1973) 598-599; Corbier (1974) 30-31; Birley (1978) 258; Saddington (2003) 23
Post(s): MT, PF, EP(PE)
Date of post(s): MT before AD5, PF before AD5, EP(PE) before AD5
Future career: Proconsul
Primary evidence: CIL 9.5645 (Trea, Regio 5, Italia)

298 Vibius Curius
Catalogues: SUO: C126; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.271; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE *8, cf. *2
Post(s): EP|SEN
Date of post(s): EP|SEN in 49BC
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.C*. 1.24.3; cf. Cicero, *ad Att*. 9.6.1

299 L. Vibius Paciaecus
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.313, 3.153; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE L. Iunius Paciaecus *4.530, no.7
Further bibliography: Wiseman (1971) 248
Post(s): MP
Date of post(s): MP in 45BC
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.Hisp*. 3.4; cf. Cicero, *ad Fam*. 6.18.2, *ad Att*. 12.2.1

C. Vibius T.f. Clu(stumina) Pansa
Catalogues: SUO: A277; **DEV:** V102: (1976-1977) 867-868, (1987) 1773, (1993) 2282; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 397; **RE/PIR:** RE 11*
Further bibliography: Syme (1959) 210; Birley (1978) 268; Saddington (1982) 147; Eck (1987)

206; Spaul (1994) 250
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT before AD42
Primary evidence: CIL 6.3542 (Roma)
Relevant text: C. Vibius T. f. Clu(stumina) Pansa / tr(ibunus) mil(itum) bis / Domitiae L. f. Maximae uxori et / L. Domitio L. f. Ouf(entina) Liberali / fratri uxoris
Reason for exclusion: Pre-Claudian, but insufficient evidence for a more precise date

L. Vibius C.f. Vel(ina) Publilianus
Catalogues: SUO: A387, A388, C366; **DEV:** V104: (1976-1977) 869, (1987) 1773, (1993) 2282; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 636; **RE/PIR:** RE 12.1555
Other reference works: Saddington (1980) 40 no. 92, (1999) 313 no. 47
Further bibliography: Saddington (1982) 67
Post(s): EP(PCE), MT
Date of post(s): EP(PCE) before AD69, MT before AD69
Primary evidence: CIL 14.3548 = Inscr.It. 4.1.47 = ILS 2706 (Tibur, Latium, Italia)
Relevant text: C. Vibius C. f. Vel(ina) / Publilianus scr(iba) q(uaestorius) / praef(ectus) coh(ortis) IIII / Thracum equitatae / tribunus militum [b]is / leg(ionis) IIII Macedonicae et / leg(ionis) XXI Rapacis / in Germania / reuersus inde / Herculi Inuicto d(onum) d(edit)
Reason for exclusion: Vibius' career, and his post of *praefectus cohortis IIII Thracum equitate* in particular, suggests that he is of Claudian or Neronian date (cf. Devijver (1976-1977) 869; Saddington (1999) 312 no. 47). The form of this dedicatory inscription, with the name of the god placed at the end of the inscription, also suggests a later date (cf. Saddington (1982) 67; Demougin (1992) 538).

300 Vibius Sicca
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 2A.2.2186
Other reference works: Welch (1995) 134-135 no. v; Badian (1997) 5 no. v
Post(s): PF
Date of post(s): PF in 63BC
Primary evidence: Plutarch, *Cic*. 32.2; cf. *ad Att*. 3.2, 3.4

L. Vibrius A.[f.] Vo[l(tinia)] Punicus
Catalogues: SUO: A389, C367; **DEV:** V109: (1976-1977) 872-873, (1987) 1774, (1993) 2283; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 398; **RE/PIR:** PIR 419
Other reference works: Pflaum (1960-1961) 28, 53; Dobson (1978) 185 no. 44; Holder (1980) 247 no. E57
Further bibliography: Thomasson (1972) 79-80; Saddington (1992) 270
Post(s): MT, CENT(PP), EP(PE)
Date of post(s): MT before AD54, CENT(PP) before AD54, EP(PE) before AD54
Future career: Praefectus Corsicae
Primary evidence: CIL 12.2455 (inter Augustum et lacum Lemannum, Gallia Narbonensis)
Relevant text: L. Vibrio A. [f.] Vo[l(tinia)] / Punico praef(ecto) / equitum / primopilo trib(uno) / mil(itum) praef(ecto) Corsicae / [C.] Vibrius Punicus / [M.] Octauianus / [patri]
Reason for exclusion: Vibrius' career, as Demougin ((1992) 328-329) argues, may not be presented in chronological order on his monument: it is unlikely that he held the post of *primipilus* between a military tribunate and an equestrian prefecture (although see [- - -] (AE 1982, 694)). The usual sequence of these posts would be: *primipilus*, *tribunus militum*, *praefectus equitum*, *praefectus Corsicae*. As Corsica was governed by an equestrian prefect from AD6 until the time of Nero, he must have been active during this period, and if his posts are listed in chronological order, then holding a military tribunate after an equestrian prefecture would suggest a Claudian date (cf. ch. 5). Dobson ((1978) 185; cf. Saddington (1992) 270) suggests only that he is pre-Neronian. Thomasson ((1972) 79; cf. Pflaum (1960-1961) 28), argues that the post of *praefectus Corsicae* was a military one, as it involved the control of only semi-pacified areas (cf. Dobson (1978) 185, Saddington (1992) 268). Such a position would be analagous to that of Baebius Atticus (*praefectus ciuitatium Moesiae et Treballiae, praefectus ciuitatium in Alpibus maritumis*; CIL 5.1838 = ILS 1349, 1389), Sex. Pedius Lusianus Hirrutus (*praefectus Raetis Vindolicis uallis Poeninae et leuis armaturae*; CIL 9.3044 = ILS 2689), or Sex. Iulius Rufus (*praefectus I cohortis Corsorum et ciuitatum Barbariae in Sardinia* under Tiberius (CIL 14.2954;

cf. Saddington (1992) 266)). Thomasson also suggests that this may have been a sexegenary position, and that Vibrius held the post for only six months (Thomasson (1972) 79-80).

L. Vibullius Rufus
Catalogues: SUO: C127; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.271; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE *1
Other reference works: Welch (1995) 139 no. xi; Badian (1997) 7 no. xi
Post(s): SEN
Date of post(s): SEN in 49BC
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.C.* 1.15; Cicero, *ad Att.* 7.24, 8.1.1, 2.4, 11A, 11B.1, 15.1; cf. Caesar, *B.C.* 1.34, 38
Reason for exclusion: This individual held a senior officer position.

301 A. Virgius L.f. Marsus
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 318; **RE/PIR:** -
Other reference works: Saddington (1985) 531 no. 21, (1996b) 247 no. 10
Post(s): CENT(PP), IP(PCAST), PF, MT(COHP/U)
Date of post(s): CENT(PP) before AD20, IP(PCAST) before AD20, PF before AD20, MT(COHP/U) before AD20
Primary evidence: AE 1978, 286 = AE 1996, 513 (Marruuium, Regio 4, Italia)
Relevant text: A. Virgio L. f. Marso / prim(o) pil(o) leg(ionis) III Gallicae / iterum praef(ecto) castr(orum) Aegy(pti) / praef(ecto) fabr(um) tr(ibuno) mil(itum) in praet(orio) / diui Aug(usti) et Ti. Caesaris Aug(usti) / cohort(ium) XI et IIII praetoriar(um) / IIIIuir(o) quinq(uennali) delato hon/ore ab dec(urionibus) et popul(o) in col(onia) Troad(ensium) / Aug(usta) et Marru(u)io testamento / dedit uicalibus Anninis imagin(es) / Caesarum argentias(!) quinque / et sestertia X milia / uicales Annini{s} honor(is) / causa
Note: Marsus' career as a junior officer can be dated to the late Augustan and early Tiberian periods by his holding of two tribunates in the praetorian guard, particularly his command of Cohors XI Praetoria, which was to become Cohors XI Urbana (cf. L. Ouinius L.f. Teret(ina) Rufus (CIL 10.4872)); Keppie (1996a) 109-110). He rose from the primipilate to become *praefectus castrorum* of the legionary camp in Egypt (although not the *praefectus castrorum Aegypti*: on Virgius Marsus' early career, cf. L. Cirpinius T.f. Vel(ina) (CIL 9.5748); Dobson (1982) 334; Demougin (1992) 269; Keppie (1996a) 108; Saddington (1996b) 244), before holding the post of *praefectus fabrum*, which indicates that he must have been both an experienced and a trusted officer (cf. Demougin (1992) 269). His command of two cohorts in the praetorian guard is referred to with an unusual construction: "tr(ibuno) mil(itum) in praet(orio) / diui Aug(usti) et Ti. Caesaris Aug(usti) / cohort(ium) XI et IIII praetoriar(um)", a construction paralleled by only three other inscriptions, two of which are Augustan - M. Vergilius Gallus (cf. M. Vergilius M.f. Teret(ina) Gallus Lusius (CIL 10.4862)) and L. Ouinius Rufus (cf. L. Ouinius L.f. Teret(ina) Rufus (CIL 10.4872)); the third, that of C. Baebius Atticus (ILS 1349), belongs to the Claudian era. The construction is intended, presumably, to indicate that the position of military tribune in charge of a praetorian cohort was different, and almost certainly superior, to the ordinary military tribunate. However, Virgius Marsus' cursus contains a far greater circumlocution than any of these inscriptions, and this suggests, perhaps, that Virgius' inscription was seeking to define a post which was not clearly understood by the majority of contemporaries; for this reason we might conclude, as Demougin suggests, that he may have commanded two praetorian cohorts before they were moved to Rome (Demougin (1992) 268). It is also possible, as Keppie suggests, that a degree of confusion was introduced by the magistrates at Marruvium who constructed the text (Keppie (1996a) 109); and the explicit reference ("in praetorio diui Augusti et Ti. Caesaris Augusti") to both Augustus and Tiberius is surely intended, in keeping with the dedication of five silver statues of members (unidentified) of the imperial house, to demonstrate Virgius Marsus' loyalty and close connections to the imperial family. Virgius had strong connections with the East, serving in Syria with Legio III Gallica, and honoured by the citizens of Alexandreia Troas (cf. Demougin (1992) 269-272).

302 C. (Visellius) Varro
Catalogues: SUO: A187, A189; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.81, 84; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE *2
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT in 80BC, MT in 79BC
Future career: Aedilis curulis 59BC
Primary evidence: Cicero, *Verr.* 2.1.71; cf. *Brut.* 264

P. Vitellius
Catalogues: SUO: C368; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 75; **RE/PIR:** RE 7; PIR 503
Other reference works: Pflaum (1960-1961) 1018
Post(s): CP
Date of post(s): CP before AD15
Primary evidence: Suetonius, *Vit.* 2.2
Reason for exclusion: This individual held a civilian position.

[. Vitr]asius C.f. [- - -] [P]ollio
Catalogues: SUO: - ; **DEV:** V122: (1976-1977) 879-880, (1987) 1777-1778, (1993) 2284-2285; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 424; **RE/PIR:** PIR 523-524
Other reference works: Pflaum (1960-1961) 5; Holder (1980) 245 no. E36; Saddington (1980) 35 no. 47
Further bibliography: Brunt (1976) 143; Eck (1981) 250; Thomasson (1984) 343 no. 16
Post(s): EP(PE)
Date of post(s): EP(PE) before AD38
Future career: Praefectus Aegypti
Primary evidence: CIL 10.3871 = AE 1981, 230 = EDH HD003960 (Capua, Regio 1, Italia); cf. Dio 58.19.6
Relevant text: [- - - Vitr]asio C. f. / [- - - P]ollioni / [procu]ratori / [Ti. Caes(aris) Augu]sti Gallia/[rum Aquit]aniae et / [Lugdunens]is praef(ecto) eq(uitum) / IIIIuir(o) / [quin]q(uennali) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum)
Reason for exclusion: Two, almost certainly closely related, Vitrasii Polliones are known to have governed Egypt in the early Principate (cf. PIR 523-524; Demougin (1992) 348). The first, who died in AD32, was followed by the second from AD38-41 (cf. PIR 523-524; Brunt (1976) 143; Eck (1981) 250; Thomasson (1984) 343 no. 16; Demougin (1992) 347). It is unclear to which man this inscription refers, but given that it seems to be in inverse order, it may well be the latter of the two (cf. Demougin (1992) 347). If it is the latter (which I regard as more likely), then he was a junior officer in the Tiberian period, if the former, then he was a junior officer in the late Augustan or early Tiberian periods. He held municipal office beyond Capua, which did not have IIIIuiri - he may well have originated from Cales (cf. Demougin (1992) 348).

303 C. Volcatius Tullus
Catalogues: SUO: C96, A226a; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.232; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE *8
Post(s): MP
Date of post(s): MP in 53BC
Primary evidence: Caesar, *B.G.* 6.29.4

Volumnius
Catalogues: SUO: C224; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 87; **RE/PIR:** RE 22; PIR 640
Post(s): -
Date of post(s): [9BC]
Primary evidence: Josephus, *B.J.* 1.535, *A.J.* 16.332; cf. *B.J.* 1.538, 542, *A.J.* 16.280, 354, 369
Relevant text: Josephus, *B.J.* 1.535: Οὐολούμνιόν τε τὸν στρατοπεδάρχην;
Josephus, *A.J.* 16.332: ταῦτ᾽ ἐκείνης ὁμολογούσης ὁ μὲν Ἡρώδης Ἀρχέλαον ἐξεληλέγχθαι τῆς πρὸς αὐτὸν δυσνοίας ὑπολαβὼν δίδωσιν Ὀλύμπῳ καὶ Οὐολομνίῳ γράμματα κελεύσας ἐν παράπλῳ μὲν Ἐλαιούσῃ τῆς Κιλικίας; Josephus, *B.J.* 1.538: προκαθίζουσίν τε οἱ ἡγεμόνες γραφὲν αὐτοῖς ὑπὸ Καίσαρος, Σατορνῖνός τε καὶ οἱ περὶ Πεδάνιον πρέσβεις, σὺν οἷς [καὶ] Οὐολούμνιος ἐπίτροπος; Josephus, *A.J.* 16.280: περὶ ὧν ἐπί τε Σατορνίνου καὶ Οὐολομνίου τῶν Συρίας ἐπιστατούντων ἐγίνοντο λόγοι
Reason for exclusion: At least one person with the name of Volumnius was a procurator in Syria under Cn. Sentius Saturninus (Pflaum (1960-1961) 1080; Demougin (1992) 93-94). It is possible that the first mention of a Volumnius in the *de bello Iudaico* (at *B.J.* 1.535), referring to a στρατοπεδάρχης, refers to the same individual (unfortunately, no title is found in the corresponding passage in the Antiquitates Iudaicae). If so, then the term στρατοπεδάρχης is unlikely to have meant "praefectus castrorum" (Shatzman (1991) 209), although individuals holding military prefectures and positions as procurators are not unknown. It is more likely that two different individuals named Volumnius are referred to here (cf. Thackeray (1926) 255 n.2; Shatzman (1991) 209), one a *praefectus castrorum* or a close equivalent (perhaps an instructor, cf. Shatzman (1991) 209) in the army of Herod, and the other a procurator. This does not, however,

resolve the issue of whether or not Volumnius the στρατοπεδάρχης, as well as Gratus and Rufus (who commanded Herod's infantry and cavalry respectively), were Roman officers. They were probably Roman citizens, either by birth or by acquisition (Shatzman (1991) 109), but this does not mean that they were Roman officers: it is likely that they were, as Gracey and Shatzman suggest, military specialists - possibly from Antonius' forces - serving as mercenaries in the service of a client king (Gracey (1986) 314; Shatzman (1991) 209). Josephus certainly had a high opinion of both Gratus and Rufus' military abilities (Josephus, *B.J.* 2.52). The suggestion of Thackeray ((1926) 255 n.2; cf. Gracey (1986) 314) that Volumnius was a military tribune is almost certainly incorrect (cf. Shatzman (1991) 209 n.154).

304 P. Volumnius (?Eutrapelus)
Catalogues: SUO: C164; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.356; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE *7
Other reference works: Saddington (1985) 529 no. 1; Welch (1995) 142-143 no. xiv; Badian (1997) 8 no. xiv
Post(s): PF
Date of post(s): PF in 44BC, PF in 43BC, PF in 42BC
Primary evidence: Corn. Nepos, *Att.* 12.4

L. Volumnius Seuerus
Catalogues: SUO: A390, C369, C370; **DEV:** V129: (1976-1977) 883-884, (1987) - , (1993) - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): IP(PCOH), MT, EP(PE)
Date of post(s): IP(PCOH) after AD68, MT after AD68, EP(PE) after AD68
Primary evidence: CIL 14.2495, 2495a (Tusculum, Regio 1, Italia)
Relevant text: CIL 14.2495: Mineruae / sacrum / L. Volumni / Verus et Seuerus / praef(ectus) coh(ortis) tr(ibunus) mil(itum) / praef(ectus) eq(uitum) ; CIL 14.2495a: Volumni duo / Verus et Seuerus / Dianae Inuictae / d(onum) d(ederunt)
Reason for exclusion: The two Volumnii, who were presumably brothers, are recorded in two dedicatory inscriptions of uncertain date from Tusculum. Given their equestrian cursus, and the dedication to Diana Inuicta, they were probably officers in the second century AD, although a slightly earlier date cannot be ruled out (Devijver (1976-1977) 883-884). The close family association on both tombstones is interesting, as is, perhaps, the use of religious iconography on the inscription that lists their military careers (cf. CIL 14.2495 adnot.).

305 L. Volumni(us) L.f. Ani(ensi) (?Strabo)
Catalogues: SUO: A178; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.35, 3.223-234; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Further bibliography: Cichorius (1922) 150 no. 14; Criniti (1970) 113-114
Post(s): ?MT
Date of post(s): ?MT in 89BC
Primary evidence: Criniti (1970) 16-26 = CIL 6.37045 = CIL 1.709 = CIL 16, p.145 = ILLRP 515 = ILS 8888 = AE 1909, 30 = AE 1910, +126 = AE 1910, +153 = AE 1910, +162 = AE 1910, 207 = AE 1910, 218 = AE 1911, 126 = AE 1912, +10 = AE 1912, +117 = AE 1912, +287 = AE 1920, +130 = AE 1923, +103 = AE 2003, +831 = EDH HD019742 (Roma)
Note: See the discussion of *consilia* in ch. 1.

L. Volumnius Verus
Catalogues: SUO: A391, C371, C372; **DEV:** V131: (1976-1977) 884, (1987) - , (1993) - ; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** -
Post(s): IP(PCOH), MT, EP(PE)
Date of post(s): IP(PCOH) after AD68, MT after AD68, EP(PE) after AD68
Primary evidence: CIL 14.2495, 2495a (Tusculum, Latium, Italia)
Reason for exclusion: On L. Volumnius Verus, see L. Volumnius Seuerus.

306 L. Volusenus L.f. Clu(stumina) Clemens
Catalogues: SUO: A392, C373, C374; **DEV:** V132: (1976-1977) 884-885, (1987) 1780, (1993) 2286-2287; **BRO:** - ; **DEM:** 234; **RE/PIR:** PIR 649
Other reference works: Pflaum (1960-1961) 17-18 no. 4; Holder (1980) 245 no. E37; Saddington (1980) 32 no. 23
Further bibliography: Pflaum (1982) 120; Firpo (1985) 21ff.; Fitz (1987) 256
Post(s): MT, EP(PE)

Date of post(s): MT before AD15, EP(PE) before AD15
Future career: Sent to Egypt by Tiberius 'ad iur(is) dict(ionem)'
Primary evidence: CIL 11.6011 = ILS 2691 = AE 1985, 375 = AE 1988, 925 (Sestinum, Regio 6, Italia); cf. CIL 6.6016, AE 1981, 337

307 C. Volusenus Quadratus
Catalogues: SUO: A221, C100, C107, C143; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.212, 239, 246, 284, 3.224; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE Volusienus *2, *3
Further bibliography: Welch (1998) 88-89
Post(s): MT, EP|MT, EP(PE)
Date of post(s): MT in 56BC, EP|MT in 52BC, EP(PE) in 51BC, EP(PE) in 48BC
Primary evidence: 56BC: Caesar, *B.G.* 3.5.2; 52BC: Caesar, *B.G.* 8.23.4-6; cf. Dio 40.43.1; 51BC: Caesar, *B.G.* 8.48; 48BC: Caesar, *B.C.* 3.60.4

Q. Volusius
Catalogues: SUO: C106, C111; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.246, 2.254, 3.225; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE 5*
Further bibliography: Syme (1964b) 156; Wiseman (1971) 277-278 no. 514
Post(s): CP
Date of post(s): CP in 51BC, CP in 50BC
Future career: ?Praetor
Primary evidence: 51BC: Cicero, *ad Att.* 5.21.6, cf. 5.11.4; 50BC: Cicero, *ad Fam.* 5.20.4
Reason for exclusion: This individual held a civilian position.

308 C. Vulteius Capito
Catalogues: SUO: A240; **DEV:** - ; **BRO:** 2.264-265; **DEM:** - ; **RE/PIR:** RE Volteius *5
Post(s): MT
Date of post(s): MT in 49BC
Primary evidence: Lucan 4.462-581; Florus 2.13.33; Schol. Bern. 137, 154 Usener

Appendix B

A chronologically ordered list of postholding by the numbered junior officers (alphabetical by officer's name within each year), each individual identification number appearing in italics after the name of the officer.

89BC	[- - -] (CIL 6.37045) *(5)*	?MT
	L. [- - -] (CIL 6.37045) *(6)*	?MT
	[- - -]f. Suc(cusana) (CIL 6.37045) *(7)*	?MT
	D. Aebuti(us) D.f. Cor(nelia) *(25)*	?MT
	[M. Aem]ili(us) Q.f. Pal(atina) (?Lepidus) *(26)*	?MT
	T. Anni(us) T.f. Ouf(entina) *(32)*	?MT
	P. Attius P.f. Ouf(entina) *(45)*	?MT
	M. Aureli(us) M.f. Vol(tinia) (?Scaurus) *(53)*	?MT
	Cn. Corneli(us) Cn.f. Pal(atina) *(94)*	?MT
	C. Fundili(us) C.f. Q[ui(rina)]) *(129)*	?MT
	Q. Hortensius Hortalus *(138)*	MT
	M. [M]aian[i(us)] M.[f. Se]r(gia) (?Gallus) *(168)*	?MT
	M. Malolei(us) M.[f.] *(169)*	?MT
	T. Pompei(us) T.f. Cor(nelia) (?Longinus) *(224)*	?MT
	C. Rabeiri(us) C.f. Gal(eria) *(241)*	?MT
	M. Teiedi(us) M.f. Pol(lia) *(264)*	?MT
	L. Volumni(us) L.f. Ani(ensi) (?Strabo) *(305)*	?MT
88BC	L. [Minucius] Basilus *(186)*	MP|MT
	Minucius Rufus (1) *(188)*	NP
	C. Popillius (1) *(234)*	NP
87BC	P. Annius *(31)*	MT
	P. Caelius *(64)*	MP(GC)
	Ap. Claudius *(82)*	MT
	C. Flauius Fimbria *(122)*	EP(PE)
	C. [Marcius] Censorinus *(175)*	MP|EP
	L. Petronius *(217)*	PF|MP|MT
86BC	Erucius *(113)*	MP(GC)|MP|MT
	A. Gabinius *(130)*	MT
	L. [Minucius] Basilus *(186)*	MT
85BC	C. Flauius Fimbria *(122)*	LEG|EP(PE)
before 84BC	C. Antonius [Hybrida] *(35)*	EP
82BC	(Octauius?) Balbus *(198)*	EP
circa 80BC	C. Octauius Graecinus *(199)*	MT
80BC	C. (Visellius) Varro *(302)*	MT
79BC	C. (Visellius) Varro *(302)*	MT
78BC	Q. Caecilius Metellus Celer *(62)*	MT|MP|SEN
	L. Cornelius L.f. Vot(uria) *(95)*	PF

	L. Valerius Flaccus *(281)*	MT
77BC	L. Insteius L.f. Fal(erna) *(141)*	MP(GC)
	L. Valerius Flaccus *(281)*	MT
76BC	C. Insteius *(140)*	EP(PE)
	C. Tarquitius Priscus *(263)*	EP|SEN|LEG
	L. Valerius Flaccus *(281)*	MT
circa 75BC	Marcius Libo *(178)*	PF
74BC	P. Valerius *(280)*	MP(GC)
before 73BC	C. Octauius C.f. C.n. C.pr[on.] *(197)*	MT
	M. Valerius M.f. M'.[n.] Messalla (Niger) *(282)*	MT
72BC	C. Cornelius C.f. *(93)*	MP(GC)
	C. Iulius Caesar *(142)*	MT
	M. Pomponius *(229)*	EP(PE)
	[Q. Seruilius] Caepio *(255)*	MT
71BC	C. Popillius (2) *(235)*	MT
69BC	L. Cassius (?Longinus) *(72)*	MT
	M. Crepereius *(103)*	MT
	P. Iunius P.f. *(148)*	NP
	Cn. Tremellius Scrofa *(276)*	MT
67BC	P. Clodius Pulcher *(90)*	?MT
	P. Clodius Pulcher *(90)*	NP
	M. Porcius Cato (1) *(237)*	MT
circa 66BC	Pompeius Trogus *(227)*	EP
65BC	Seruilius *(253)*	NP
64BC	[- - -] (Cicero, *Murena* 73) *(16)*	PF
before 63BC	M. Petreius *(215)*	MT
	M. Petreius *(215)*	MP
	P. Sestius *(257)*	MT
63BC	Faustus Cornelius Sulla *(102)*	MT|MP
	C. Meuulanus *(182)*	MT
	Vibius Sicca *(300)*	PF
62BC	L. Cornelius Balbus *(97)*	PF
	Cn. Plancius *(221)*	MT
61BC	L. Cornelius Balbus *(97)*	?PF
59BC	L. Cornelius Balbus *(97)*	PF
58BC	P. Considius *(91)*	MP
	P. Licinius Crassus *(158)*	EP
	Mamurra *(172)*	PF
57BC	M. Antonius *(34)*	EP
56BC	M. Antonius *(34)*	EP
	D. Iunius Brutus Albinus *(149)*	NP
	T. Silius *(259)*	MT|MP

	T. Terrasidius *(266)*	MT|MP
	M. Trebius Gallus *(274)*	MT|MP
	Q. Velanius *(287)*	MT|MP
	C. Volusenus Quadratus *(307)*	MT
55BC	M. Antonius *(34)*	EP
	Mamurra *(172)*	?PF
54BC	Q. Atrius *(44)*	NP
	Q. Laberius Durus *(155)*	MT
	M. Orfius *(204)*	MT
	Petronius *(216)*	?MT
53BC	Coponius (1) *(92)*	MP(GC)
	M. Curtius Postumus *(104)*	MT
	Egnatius *(110)*	?EP
	Petronius *(216)*	MT
	C. Trebonius *(275)*	IP
	C. Volcatius Tullus *(303)*	MP
52BC	M. Aristius *(41)*	MT
	D. Iunius Brutus Albinus *(149)*	MP
	C. Volusenus Quadratus *(307)*	EP|MT
51BC	D. Antonius *(33)*	MP
	Q. Atius Varus *(43)*	EP(PE)
	L. Clodius *(86)*	PF
	Q. Fufidius Q.f. *(126)*	MT
	Sex. Lucilius *(161)*	MT
	Q. (Paconius) Lepta *(207)*	PF
	M. Scaptius (1) *(248)*	EP
	C. Volusenus Quadratus *(307)*	EP(PE)
circa 50BC	L. Septumius L.f. Arn(ensi) *(251)*	MT
50BC	Q. Fufidius Q.f. *(126)*	MT
	Q. (Paconius) Lepta *(207)*	PF
49BC	C. Attius Paelignus *(46)*	MP(GC)
	Cn. Domitius *(106)*	EP(PE)
	[?Flaminius] Flamma *(120)*	NP
	C. Gallonius *(131)*	MP(GC)
	L. Iulius Caesar *(143)*	NP
	Sex. Iulius Caesar *(144)*	MP
	P. Ligarius *(159)*	MT|MP
	Q. Lucretius Vespillo *(165)*	MP(GC)
	Q. Lucretius Vespillo *(165)*	NP
	N. Magius *(167)*	PF
	Minucius Rufus (2) *(189)*	NP
	L. Nasidius *(193)*	NP
	C. Sentius C.f. Aemilia *(249)*	MT

	C. Seruilius C.f. Teretina Brocchus *(254)*	MT
	M. Tullius Cicero *(278)*	EP
	Vibius Curius *(298)*	EP|SEN
	C. Vulteius Capito *(308)*	MT
before 48BC	Fuluius Postumus *(128)*	?MP
	C. Velleius *(289)*	PF
48BC	Q. Atius Varus *(43)*	EP(PE)
	L. Cassius *(70)*	NP
	L. Iulius Caesar *(143)*	NP
	Iustuleius *(153)*	MP
	P. Ligarius *(159)*	MT|MP
	Q. Lucretius Vespillo *(165)*	NP
	Minucius Rufus (2) *(189)*	NP
	Octacilius Crassus *(196)*	MP(GC)
	M. Opimius *(203)*	EP(PE)
	Cn. Pompeius Theophanes *(226)*	PF
	L. Septimius *(250)*	MT
	L. Staberius *(261)*	MP(GC)
	L. Titius *(272)*	MT
	M. Tullius Cicero *(278)*	EP
	C. Volusenus Quadratus *(307)*	EP(PE)
47BC	D. Carfulenus *(68)*	MP
	P. Ligarius *(159)*	MT|MP
	L. Nasidius *(193)*	NP
46BC	[- - -] (Ovid, *Fasti* 4) *(17)*	MT
	Q. Aquila *(38)*	NP
	C. Auienus *(50)*	MT
	L. Cispius (?Laeuus) *(81)*	NP
	P. Cornelius *(96)*	MP(GC)
	A. Fonteius *(125)*	MT
	P. Ligarius *(159)*	MT|MP
	L. Liuineius Regulus *(160)*	MP|MP(GC)
	C. Minucius Reginus *(187)*	MP(GC)
	Pacideius (1) *(205)*	MP|EP
	Pacideius (2) *(206)*	MP
	Titius (1) *(270)*	MT
	Titius (2) *(271)*	MT
before 45BC	P. Caucilius *(76)*	IP|IP(PCAST)
circa 45BC	[?L.] Tillius C.f. Cor(nelia) *(267)*	MT
	C. Tillius C.f. Cor(nelia) Rufus *(268)*	MT
45BC	Clodius Arquitius *(87)*	EP
	C. Marcius (?Crispinus) *(176)*	MT

	L. Munatius Flaccus *(190)*	?MP(GC)
	L. Vibius Paciaecus *(299)*	MP
before 44BC	Q. Caecilius Q.f. Atticus *(60)*	?MP
	M. Caesius Scaeua *(66)*	EP(PE)
44BC	Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus *(107)*	NP
	P. Volumnius (?Eutrapelus) *(304)*	PF
43BC	C. Catius Vestinus *(75)*	MT
	C. Clodius *(85)*	?MP
	Q. Horatius Flaccus *(137)*	?MT
	M. Iunius Silanus *(152)*	MP|LEG
	L. (Marcius) Figulus *(177)*	NP
	C. Popillius Laenas *(236)*	MT
	L. Sextilius Rufus *(258)*	NP
	L. Sextilius Rufus *(258)*	MP(GC)
	[?Q.] Terentius Culleo *(265)*	MP(GC)
	M. Tullius Cicero *(278)*	EP
	P. Volumnius (?Eutrapelus) *(304)*	PF
before 42BC	C. Lacontius M.f. *(156)*	MT
	C. Velleius *(289)*	PF
42BC	Clodius *(84)*	NP|IP
	C. Flauius *(121)*	PF
	Q. Horatius Flaccus *(137)*	MT
	[L.] Pinarius Scarpus *(220)*	IP
	M. Porcius Cato (2) *(238)*	IP
	Roscius (1) *(242)*	?IP(PCAST)
	M. Tullius Cicero *(278)*	EP
	L. Varus *(283)*	MP(GC)
	P. Volumnius (?Eutrapelus) *(304)*	PF
41BC	Q. Curtius Salassus *(105)*	MP
	M. Feridius *(117)*	MT
before 40BC	C. Velleius *(289)*	PF
40BC	C. Iulius Helenus *(145)*	NP|LEG
	P. Seruilius Rullus *(256)*	EP|SEN
39BC	C. Iulius Helenus *(145)*	NP|LEG
circa 38BC	T. Marius C.f. Ste(llatina) Siculus *(180)*	MT
	T. Marius C.f. Ste(llatina) Siculus *(180)*	?MP
	T. Marius C.f. Ste(llatina) Siculus *(180)*	NP(PC)
before 36BC	[- - -] (AE 1933, 199) *(1)*	MT
circa 36BC	M. Mindius Marcellus *(184)*	NP(PC)
36BC	Flauius Gallus *(123)*	MP

	Ofillius *(202)*	MT
after 36BC	[- - -] Sabinus (2) *(245)*	?EP
before 31BC	C. Baebius T.f. Clu(stumina) *(54)*	MT
	Q. Caerellius M.f. Qui(rina) *(65)*	MT
	[. ?Corne]lius Alexidis f. Cor(nelia) Menodor(us) *(100)*	PF
	[. ?Corne]lius Alexidis f. Cor(nelia) Menodor(us) *(100)*	MT
	Cn. Dupilius Cn. f. Hor(atia) *(108)*	MT
	C. Papirius C. f. Vel(ina) Masso *(211)*	MT
	C. Rosius C.f. Arn(ensi) Sabinus *(243)*	MT
	[?L. Va]leri[us] L.f. Cor(nelia) *(279)*	MT
circa 31BC	T. Satanus T.f. Sabinus *(246)*	PF
31BC	C. Baebius T.f. Clu(stumina) *(54)*	MP(GC)
circa 30BC	C. Cornelius Cn.f. Gallus *(99)*	PF
before 29BC	C. Aqutius (?Aclutius) L.f. Teret(ina) Gallus *(40)*	MT
	Q. Caecilius Q.f. Atticus *(60)*	MT
	M. Cincius L.f. Hor(atia) *(79)*	MT
	L. Firmius L.f. *(118)*	MT
	L. Sergius L.f. Lepidus *(252)*	MT
	M'. Titius M'.f. Fab(ia) *(273)*	MT
	(?Vedius Rufus) *(285)*	MT
before 28BC	Fabia[nus(?) - - - S]ab(atina) M.f. *(114)*	MT
	[- - -] Patruus *(213)*	?MT
	[- - -] Patruus *(213)*	?EP(PE)
28BC	Albius Tibullus *(28)*	?MT
after 27BC	[- - -] Tro(mentina) Maximus *(181)*	MT
	[- - -] Tro(mentina) Maximus *(181)*	PF
26BC	Ti. Claudius Nero *(83)*	MT
after 26BC	Q. Allius Q.f. Vel(ina) Rufus *(30)*	MT
	Q. Allius Q.f. Vel(ina) Rufus *(30)*	PF
	Q. Allius Q.f. Vel(ina) Rufus *(30)*	NP(PC)|IP(PCOH)
before 25BC	C. Iulius Papius *(146)*	?MP
	[L.] Ti[t]inius L.f. Aem(ilia) Sulpicianus *(269)*	MT
	[L.] Ti[t]inius L.f. Aem(ilia) Sulpicianus *(269)*	MT(PL)
25BC	Ti. Claudius Nero *(83)*	MT
before 24BC	Q. Veranius *(291)*	MT
before 21BC	[- - -]ius Sex.f. [- - -] *(19)*	PF
	[- - -]ius Sex.f. [- - -] *(19)*	MT(PL)

	[- - -]ius Sex.f. [- - -] *(19)*	NP(PC)
	[- - -]ius Sex.f. [- - -] *(19)*	?EP(PCE)
	Cn. Pollienus Cn.f. *(222)*	MT
before 20BC	Q. Caecilius Q.f. A[nien(si)] (1) *(58)*	MT
	Q. Caecilius Q.f. An[ien(si)] (2) *(59)*	MT
	A. Castricius Myriotalenti f. *(73)*	MT
	A. Castricius Myriotalenti f. *(73)*	EP(PE)
	A. Castricius Myriotalenti f. *(73)*	NP(PC)
	C. Papirius C.f. Clu(stumina) Carbo *(210)*	MT
circa 20BC	[- - -]lius Ti.f. Pup(inia) Clemens *(20)*	MT(AP)
before 15BC	L. Blatius L.f. Serg(ia) Ventinus *(56)*	MT
	Q. Octauius L.f. C.n. L.pron. Ser(gia) Sagitta *(201)*	PF
	Q. Octauius L.f. C.n. L.pron. Ser(gia) Sagitta *(201)*	EP(PE)
	Q. Octauius L.f. C.n. L.pron. Ser(gia) Sagitta *(201)*	MT(AP)
before 14BC	Q. Pinarius L.f. Aem(ilia) *(219)*	MT
11BC	Hostilius Rufus *(139)*	IP(PCAST)
before 10BC	[- - -]us T.f. Teret(ina) *(24)*	MT
	[- - -]us T.f. Teret(ina) *(24)*	EP(PE)
	[- - -]us T.f. Teret(ina) *(24)*	IP(PCAST)
	[- - -]us T.f. Teret(ina) *(24)*	PF
	[- - -]us T.f. Teret(ina) *(24)*	NP(PN)
before 5BC	A. Octauius A.f. Ligus *(200)*	MT
before 2BC	M. Holconius M.f. Rufus *(136)*	MT(AP)
	T. Sornius T.f. Vel(ina) *(260)*	PF
	C. Velleius Paterculus *(290)*	MT
before AD3	C. Caristanius C.f. Ser(gia) Fronto Caesianus Iulius *(69)*	PF
	M. Tullius M.f. *(277)*	MT(AP)
	C. Velleius Paterculus *(290)*	?MT
AD3	Passienus Rufus *(212)*	MT
before AD4	L. Aponius [- - -] *(36)*	EP(PE)
	L. Aponius [- - -] *(36)*	MT
	L. Aponius [- - -] *(36)*	IP(PCAST)
	Velleius *(288)*	EP(PE)
	C. Velleius Paterculus *(290)*	EP(PE)
after AD4	Cn. Petronius Cn.f. Pom(ptina) Asellio *(218)*	MT
	Cn. Petronius Cn.f. Pom(ptina) Asellio *(218)*	EP(PE)
	Cn. Petronius Cn.f. Pom(ptina) Asellio *(218)*	PF
before AD5	M'. Vibius M'.f. Vel(ina) Balbinus *(297)*	MT
	M'. Vibius M'.f. Vel(ina) Balbinus *(297)*	PF

	M'. Vibius M'.f. Vel(ina) Balbinus *(297)*	EP(PE)
circa AD6	Q. Aemilius Q.f. Pal(atina) Secundus *(27)*	IP(PCOH)
	Q. Aemilius Q.f. Pal(atina) Secundus *(27)*	PF
after AD6	C. Ennius C.f. Vol(tinia) Marsus *(112)*	MT
	C. Ennius C.f. Vol(tinia) Marsus *(112)*	PF
before AD7	[- - -] (AE 1964, 107) *(2)*	IP(PCAST)
AD7	[- - -] (Velleius 2.112.6) *(18)*	IP(PCAST)
AD8	M'. Ennius *(111)*	IP(PCAST)|MP(GC)
before AD9	Cn. Lerius C.f. Flaccus *(157)*	MT
	Cn. Pompeius C.f. Teret(ina) Proculus *(225)*	MT
AD9	L. Caedicius *(63)*	IP(PCAST)
	Ceionius *(77)*	IP(PCAST)
	L. Eggius *(109)*	IP(PCAST)
after AD9	C. Caristanius C.f. Ser(gia) Fronto Caesianus Iulius *(69)*	MT
	C. Caristanius C.f. Ser(gia) Fronto Caesianus Iulius *(69)*	IP(PCOH)
before AD11	P. Iuuentius Rufus *(154)*	MT
AD11	M. Florus *(124)*	IP(PCOH)
	Sex. Palpellius P.f. Vel(ina) Hister *(208)*	MT
before AD14	[- - -] Niger *(194)*	?MT
	[- - -] Niger *(194)*	?EP(PE)
AD14	Aufidienus Rufus *(47)*	IP(PCAST)
	M'. Ennius *(111)*	IP(PCAST)
	Facundus *(116)*	IP(PCOH)
before AD15	[- - -] (CIL 5.3346) *(3)*	MP(GC)
	[- - -]f. Pap(iria) (CIL 6.32935) *(4)*	?MT
	[- - -]f. Pap(iria) (CIL 6.32935) *(4)*	PF
	[- - -] (CIL 6.41050) (1) *(8)*	EP(PE)
	N[- - -] (CIL 6.41050) (2) *(9)*	EP(PE)
	[- - -] (CIL 6.41050) (3) *(10)*	EP(PE)
	[- - -] (CIL 6.41050) (4) *(11)*	EP(PE)
	[- - -] (CIL 6.41050) (5) *(12)*	EP(PE)
	[- - -] (CIL 9.3159) *(13)*	MT(AP)
	[- - -] M.f. Fal(erna) [- - -] (CIL 10.3888) *(14)*	MT(AP)
	[- - -] (CIL 11.4791) *(15)*	MT(AP)
	[- - -u]rius C.f. Aem(ilia) Gallu[s] *(21)*	IP(PLA)
	[- - -]rnius L.f. Hor(atia) Asiati[cus - - -] *(22)*	MT(AP)
	[- - -]us *(23)*	MT
	M. Allius M.f. Men(enia) Ru[fus] *(29)*	PF
	M. Allius M.f. Men(enia) Ru[fus] *(29)*	MT(AP)

L. Appuleius L.f. *(37)*	MT
L. Aquillius Florus Turcianus Gallus *(39)*	MT
M. Arrius M.f. Maximus *(42)*	EP(PE)
T. Aufidius T.f. Ani(ensi) Balbus *(48)*	MT
T. Aufidius T.f. Ani(ensi) Spinter *(49)*	MT
Sex. Aulienus Sex.f. Ani(ensi) *(51)*	MT
Sex. Aulienus Sex.f. Ani(ensi) *(51)*	IP(PLA)
Sex. Aulienus Sex.f. Ani(ensi) *(51)*	IP(PCAST)
Sex. Aulienus Sex.f. Ani(ensi) *(51)*	NP(PC)
Sex. Aulienus Sex.f. Ani(ensi) *(51)*	PF
L. Aurelius Sex.f. *(52)*	PF
L. Aurelius Sex.f. *(52)*	MT(AP)
P. Baebius P.fil. Pobl(ilia) Tuticanus *(55)*	MT(AP)
P. Baebius P.fil. Pobl(ilia) Tuticanus *(55)*	EP(PE)
Q. Caecilius L.f. *(57)*	MT|MT(AP)
Q. Caecilius L.f. *(57)*	PF
L. Caecilius L.f. Flaccus *(61)*	?MT
Sex. Campatius M.f. M.n. *(67)*	MT
L. Cassius L.f. Corneo[lus] *(71)*	MT
L. Cassius L.f. Corneo[lus] *(71)*	IP(PCAST)|PF
C. Castricius T.f. Caluus *(74)*	MT
L. Cellius L.f. Men(enia) *(78)*	MT(AP)
L. Cirpinius T.f. Vel(ina) *(80)*	IP(PCAST)
A. Clodius A.f. Men(enia) Flaccus *(88)*	MT(AP)
T. Clodius C.[f. ?C.n.] Pro[culus] *(89)*	MT
T. Clodius C.[f. ?C.n.] Pro[culus] *(89)*	PF
P. Cornelius P.f. Sabat(ina) Cicatricula *(98)*	MT
P. Cornelius P.f. Sabat(ina) Cicatricula *(98)*	IP(PCOHORTIUM)|IP(PCOH)
P. Cornelius P.f. Sabat(ina) Cicatricula *(98)*	EP(PE)
P. Cornelius P.f. Sabat(ina) Cicatricula *(98)*	NP(PC)
[P. Corneli]us Orestinus *(101)*	MT
C. Fabricius C.f. Ani(ensi) Tuscus *(115)*	IP(PCOH)
C. Fabricius C.f. Ani(ensi) Tuscus *(115)*	MT
C. Fabricius C.f. Ani(ensi) Tuscus *(115)*	PF
C. Fabricius C.f. Ani(ensi) Tuscus *(115)*	EP(PEA)
C. Flacc[inius? C.]f. C[.n.] Flaccus *(119)*	MT
L. Fuluius L.f. Lesso *(127)*	MT
Q. Gau[i]us A.f. Aqui[l]a *(132)*	MT(AP)
Q. Gauius T.f. Cla(udia) Pedo *(133)*	MT(AP)
Q. Gauius T.f. Cla(udia) Pedo *(133)*	PF
Q. Gauius T.f. Cla(udia) Pedo *(133)*	EP(PE)
[- - - Ca]m(ilia) Glabeo *(134)*	MT
Q. Granius M.f. Labeo *(135)*	MT

[.] Iulius Po[s]idonius *(147)*	MT
T. Iunius D.f. Ani(ensi) Montanus *(150)*	MT
T. Iunius D.f. Ani(ensi) Montanus *(150)*	EP(PE)
T. Iunius D.f. Ani(ensi) Montanus *(150)*	PF
M. Iunius C.f. Gal(eria) Proculus *(151)*	EP(PE)
M. Iunius C.f. Gal(eria) Proculus *(151)*	?PF
C. Lucilius C.f. Benignus Ninnianus *(162)*	MT(AP)
P. Lucilius P.f. P.nep. P.pron. P.abnep. Gamala *(163)*	MT
M. Lucretius Decidianus Rufus *(164)*	MT(AP)
M. Lucretius Decidianus Rufus *(164)*	PF
L. Mammi[us - - -] Men(enia) (1) *(170)*	?MT
[L.? Ma]mmius Ti.f. [Men(enia)] (2) *(171)*	MT
Cn. Manlius Cn.f. Pa[p(iria)] *(173)*	MT(COHP/U)
Cn. Manlius Cn.f. Pa[p(iria)] *(173)*	IP(PCOHORTIUM)|IP(PCOH)
M. Manlius C.f. Pollio *(174)*	MT(AP)
M. Manlius C.f. Pollio *(174)*	PF
L. Marcius Q.f. Gal(eria) Optatus *(179)*	MT
Post. Mimisius C.f. Sardus *(183)*	MT
M. Minicius T.f. [- - -] *(185)*	MT(AP)
M. Minicius T.f. [- - -] *(185)*	PF|EP(PE)
M. Munatuleius M.f. Ani(ensi) Marcellus *(191)*	MT(AP)
L. Nasidienus Agrippa *(192)*	MT
P. Numicius Pica Caesianus *(195)*	EP(PE)
Sex. Papinius Q.f. Allenius *(209)*	MT
[S]ex. Pedius Sex.f. Ar[n(ensi)] Lusianus Hirrutus *(214)*	MP(GC)
[S]ex. Pedius Sex.f. Ar[n(ensi)] Lusianus Hirrutus *(214)*	IP(PLA)
L. Pompeius M.f. Pol(lia) *(223)*	MT(AP)
T. Pompullius L.f. Lappa *(231)*	MT(AP)
T. Pompullius L.f. Lappa *(231)*	PF
L. Pontius L.f. Strabo *(233)*	MT
L. Pontius L.f. Strabo *(233)*	EP(PE)
L. Pontius L.f. Strabo *(233)*	NP(PC)
[- - - Qu]adratus Maesianus Celsus *(240)*	MT
[- - -] Sabidin[ius - - -] *(244)*	MT(AP)
Satrius N.f. Teret(ina) Rufus *(247)*	MT(AP)
M. Sufenas M.f. P[roculus] *(262)*	IP(PCOH)
M. Vecilius M.f. L.n. Campus *(284)*	PF
M. Vecilius M.f. L.n. Campus *(284)*	MT
A. Veius M.f. *(286)*	MT(AP)
P. V[e]rgi[nius] P.[f. Pu]p(inia) Paetus *(293)*	MT(AP)
Vespasius Pollio *(294)*	MT

	Vespasius Pollio *(294)*	IP(PCAST)
	Vestalis *(295)*	MP(GC)
	Q. Veturius Q.f. Pom(ptina) Pexsus *(296)*	MT
	Q. Veturius Q.f. Pom(ptina) Pexsus *(296)*	PF
	L. Volusenus L.f. Clu(stumina) Clemens *(306)*	MT
	L. Volusenus L.f. Clu(stumina) Clemens *(306)*	EP(PE)
circa AD15	C. Pontius C.f. Paelignus *(232)*	MT
	L. Purtisius Atinas *(239)*	MT(COHA)
	M. Vergilius M.f. Teret(ina) Gallus Lusius *(292)*	EP(PCE)
	M. Vergilius M.f. Teret(ina) Gallus Lusius *(292)*	PF
	M. Vergilius M.f. Teret(ina) Gallus Lusius *(292)*	MT(COHP/U)
before AD19	Pomponianus *(228)*	EP(PE)
	T. Pomponius T.f. Pol(lia) Petra *(230)*	PF
	T. Pomponius T.f. Pol(lia) Petra *(230)*	MT
	T. Pomponius T.f. Pol(lia) Petra *(230)*	EP(PE)
	T. Pomponius T.f. Pol(lia) Petra *(230)*	?IP
before AD20	A. Virgius L.f. Marsus *(301)*	IP(PCAST)
	A. Virgius L.f. Marsus *(301)*	PF
	A. Virgius L.f. Marsus *(301)*	MT(COHP/U)

Appendix C

A list of postholding by the numbered junior officers ordered alphabetically by type of post (for each type of post, the list is ordered first chronologically, then alphabetically by officer's name within each year). Each individual identification number appears in italics after the name of the officer. Where there is doubt about an officer's holding of a post, an asterisk appears before his name.

Equestrian prefects

EP	87BC	*C. [Marcius] Censorinus *(175)*
	before 84BC	C. Antonius [Hybrida] *(35)*
	82BC	(Octauius?) Balbus *(198)*
	76BC	*C. Tarquitius Priscus *(263)*
	circa 66BC	Pompeius Trogus *(227)*
	58BC	P. Licinius Crassus *(158)*
	57BC	M. Antonius *(34)*
	56BC	M. Antonius *(34)*
	55BC	M. Antonius *(34)*
	53BC	*Egnatius *(110)*
	52BC	*C. Volusenus Quadratus *(307)*
	51BC	M. Scaptius (1) *(248)*
	49BC	M. Tullius Cicero *(278)*
		*Vibius Curius *(298)*
	48BC	M. Tullius Cicero *(278)*
	46BC	*Pacideius (1) *(205)*
	45BC	Clodius Arquitius *(87)*
	43BC	M. Tullius Cicero *(278)*
	42BC	M. Tullius Cicero *(278)*
	40BC	*P. Seruilius Rullus *(256)*
	after 36BC	*[- - -] Sabinus (2) *(245)*
EP(PCE)	before 21BC	*[- - -]ius Sex.f. [- - -] *(19)*
	circa AD15	M. Vergilius M.f. Teret(ina) Gallus Lusius *(292)*
EP(PE)	87BC	C. Flauius Fimbria *(122)*
	85BC	*C. Flauius Fimbria *(122)*
	76BC	C. Insteius *(140)*
	72BC	M. Pomponius *(229)*
	51BC	Q. Atius Varus *(43)*
		C. Volusenus Quadratus *(307)*
	49BC	Cn. Domitius *(106)*
	48BC	Q. Atius Varus *(43)*
		M. Opimius *(203)*
		C. Volusenus Quadratus *(307)*

	before 44BC	M. Caesius Scaeua *(66)*
	before 28BC	*[- - -] Patruus *(213)*
	before 20BC	A. Castricius Myriotalenti f. *(73)*
	before 15BC	Q. Octauius L.f. C.n. L.pron. Ser(gia) Sagitta *(201)*
	before 10BC	[- - -]us T.f. Teret(ina) *(24)*
	before AD4	L. Aponius [- - -] *(36)*
		Velleius *(288)*
		C. Velleius Paterculus *(290)*
	after AD4	Cn. Petronius Cn.f. Pom(ptina) Asellio *(218)*
	before AD5	M'. Vibius M'.f. Vel(ina) Balbinus *(297)*
	before AD14	*[- - -] Niger *(194)*
	before AD15	[- - -] (CIL 6.41050) (1) *(8)*
		N[- - -] (CIL 6.41050) (2) *(9)*
		[- - -] (CIL 6.41050) (3) *(10)*
		[- - -] (CIL 6.41050) (4) *(11)*
		[- - -] (CIL 6.41050) (5) *(12)*
		M. Arrius M.f. Maximus *(42)*
		P. Baebius P.fil. Pobl(ilia) Tuticanus *(55)*
		P. Cornelius P.f. Sabat(ina) Cicatricula *(98)*
		Q. Gauius T.f. Cla(udia) Pedo *(133)*
		T. Iunius D.f. Ani(ensi) Montanus *(150)*
		M. Iunius C.f. Gal(eria) Proculus *(151)*
		*M. Minicius T.f. [- - -] *(185)*
		P. Numicius Pica Caesianus *(195)*
		L. Pontius L.f. Strabo *(233)*
		L. Volusenus L.f. Clu(stumina) Clemens *(306)*
	before AD19	Pomponianus *(228)*
		T. Pomponius T.f. Pol(lia) Petra *(230)*
EP(PEA)	before AD15	C. Fabricius C.f. Ani(ensi) Tuscus *(115)*

Infantry prefects

IP	53BC	C. Trebonius *(275)*
	before 45BC	*P. Caucilius *(76)*
	42BC	*Clodius *(84)*
		[L.] Pinarius Scarpus *(220)*
		M. Porcius Cato (2) *(238)*
	before AD19	*T. Pomponius T.f. Pol(lia) Petra *(230)*
IP(PCAST)	before 45BC	*P. Caucilius *(76)*
	42BC	*Roscius (1) *(242)*
	11BC	Hostilius Rufus *(139)*
	before 10BC	[- - -]us T.f. Teret(ina) *(24)*
	before AD4	L. Aponius [- - -] *(36)*
	before AD7	[- - -] (AE 1964, 107) *(2)*

	AD7	[- - -] (Velleius 2.112.6) *(18)*
	AD8	*M'. Ennius *(111)*
	AD9	L. Caedicius *(63)*
		Ceionius *(77)*
		L. Eggius *(109)*
	AD14	Aufidienus Rufus *(47)*
		M'. Ennius *(111)*
	before AD15	Sex. Aulienus Sex.f. Ani(ensi) *(51)*
		*L. Cassius L.f. Corneo[lus] *(71)*
		L. Cirpinius T.f. Vel(ina) *(80)*
		Vespasius Pollio *(294)*
	before AD20	A. Virgius L.f. Marsus *(301)*
IP(PCOH)	after 26BC	*Q. Allius Q.f. Vel(ina) Rufus *(30)*
	circa AD6	Q. Aemilius Q.f. Pal(atina) Secundus *(27)*
	after AD9	C. Caristanius C.f. Ser(gia) Fronto Caesianus Iulius *(69)*
	AD11	M. Florus *(124)*
	AD14	Facundus *(116)*
	before AD15	*P. Cornelius P.f. Sabat(ina) Cicatricula *(98)*
		C. Fabricius C.f. Ani(ensi) Tuscus *(115)*
		*Cn. Manlius Cn.f. Pa[p(iria)] *(173)*
		M. Sufenas M.f. P[roculus] *(262)*
IP(PCOHORTIUM)	before AD15	*P. Cornelius P.f. Sabat(ina) Cicatricula *(98)*
		*Cn. Manlius Cn.f. Pa[p(iria)] *(173)*
IP(PLA)	before AD15	[- - -u]rius C.f. Aem(ilia) Gallu[s] *(21)*
		Sex. Aulienus Sex.f. Ani(ensi) *(51)*
		[S]ex. Pedius Sex.f. Ar[n(ensi)] Lusianus Hirrutus *(214)*

Military prefects

MP	88BC	*L. [Minucius] Basilus *(186)*
	87BC	*C. [Marcius] Censorinus *(175)*
		*L. Petronius *(217)*
	86BC	*Erucius *(113)*
	78BC	*Q. Caecilius Metellus Celer *(62)*
	before 63BC	M. Petreius *(215)*
	63BC	*Faustus Cornelius Sulla *(102)*
	58BC	P. Considius *(91)*
	56BC	*T. Silius *(259)*
		*T. Terrasidius *(266)*
		*M. Trebius Gallus *(274)*
		*Q. Velanius *(287)*
	53BC	C. Volcatius Tullus *(303)*
	52BC	D. Iunius Brutus Albinus *(149)*
	51BC	D. Antonius *(33)*

	49BC	Sex. Iulius Caesar *(144)*
		*P. Ligarius *(159)*
	before 48BC	*Fuluius Postumus *(128)*
	48BC	Iustuleius *(153)*
		*P. Ligarius *(159)*
	47BC	D. Carfulenus *(68)*
		*P. Ligarius *(159)*
	46BC	*P. Ligarius *(159)*
		*L. Liuineius Regulus *(160)*
		*Pacideius (1) *(205)*
		Pacideius (2) *(206)*
	45BC	L. Vibius Paciaecus *(299)*
	before 44BC	*Q. Caecilius Q.f. Atticus *(60)*
	43BC	*C. Clodius *(85)*
		*M. Iunius Silanus *(152)*
	41BC	Q. Curtius Salassus *(105)*
	circa 38BC	*T. Marius C.f. Ste(llatina) Siculus *(180)*
	36BC	Flauius Gallus *(123)*
	before 25BC	*C. Iulius Papius *(146)*
MP(GC)	87BC	P. Caelius *(64)*
	86BC	*Erucius *(113)*
	77BC	L. Insteius L.f. Fal(erna) *(141)*
	74BC	P. Valerius *(280)*
	72BC	C. Cornelius C.f. *(93)*
	53BC	Coponius (1) *(92)*
	49BC	C. Attius Paelignus *(46)*
		C. Gallonius *(131)*
		Q. Lucretius Vespillo *(165)*
	48BC	Octacilius Crassus *(196)*
		L. Staberius *(261)*
	46BC	P. Cornelius *(96)*
		*L. Liuineius Regulus *(160)*
		C. Minucius Reginus *(187)*
	45BC	*L. Munatius Flaccus *(190)*
	43BC	L. Sextilius Rufus *(258)*
		[?Q.] Terentius Culleo *(265)*
	42BC	L. Varus *(283)*
	31BC	C. Baebius T.f. Clu(stumina) *(54)*
	AD8	*M'. Ennius *(111)*
	before AD15	[- - -] (CIL 5.3346) *(3)*
		[S]ex. Pedius Sex.f. Ar[n(ensi)] Lusianus Hirrutus *(214)*
		Vestalis *(295)*

Military tribunes

MT	89BC	*[- - -] (CIL 6.37045) *(5)*
		*L. [- - -] (CIL 6.37045) *(6)*
		*[- - -]f. Suc(cusana) (CIL 6.37045) *(7)*
		*D. Aebuti(us) D.f. Cor(nelia) *(25)*
		*[M. Aem]ili(us) Q.f. Pal(atina) (?Lepidus) *(26)*
		*T. Anni(us) T.f. Ouf(entina) *(32)*
		*P. Attius P.f. Ouf(entina) *(45)*
		*M. Aureli(us) M.f. Vol(tinia) (?Scaurus) *(53)*
		*Cn. Corneli(us) Cn.f. Pal(atina) *(94)*
		*C. Fundili(us) C.f. Q[ui(rina)]) *(129)*
		Q. Hortensius Hortalus *(138)*
		*M. [M]aian[i(us)] M.[f. Se]r(gia) (?Gallus) *(168)*
		*M. Malolei(us) M.[f.] *(169)*
		*T. Pompei(us) T.f. Cor(nelia) (?Longinus) *(224)*
		*C. Rabeiri(us) C.f. Gal(eria) *(241)*
		*M. Teiedi(us) M.f. Pol(lia) *(264)*
		*L. Volumni(us) L.f. Ani(ensi) (?Strabo) *(305)*
	88BC	*L. [Minucius] Basilus *(186)*
	87BC	P. Annius *(31)*
		Ap. Claudius *(82)*
		*L. Petronius *(217)*
	86BC	*Erucius *(113)*
		A. Gabinius *(130)*
		L. [Minucius] Basilus *(186)*
	circa 80BC	C. Octauius Graecinus *(199)*
	80BC	C. (Visellius) Varro *(302)*
	79BC	C. (Visellius) Varro *(302)*
	78BC	*Q. Caecilius Metellus Celer *(62)*
		L. Valerius Flaccus *(281)*
	77BC	L. Valerius Flaccus *(281)*
	76BC	L. Valerius Flaccus *(281)*
	before 73BC	C. Octauius C.f. C.n. C.pr[on.] *(197)*
		M. Valerius M.f. M'.[n.] Messalla (Niger) *(282)*
	72BC	C. Iulius Caesar *(142)*
		[Q. Seruilius] Caepio *(255)*
	71BC	C. Popillius (2) *(235)*
	69BC	L. Cassius (?Longinus) *(72)*
		M. Crepereius *(103)*
		Cn. Tremellius Scrofa *(276)*
	67BC	*P. Clodius Pulcher *(90)*
		M. Porcius Cato (1) *(237)*
	before 63BC	M. Petreius *(215)*

	P. Sestius *(257)*
63BC	*Faustus Cornelius Sulla *(102)*
	C. Meuulanus *(182)*
62BC	Cn. Plancius *(221)*
56BC	*T. Silius *(259)*
	*T. Terrasidius *(266)*
	*M. Trebius Gallus *(274)*
	*Q. Velanius *(287)*
	C. Volusenus Quadratus *(307)*
54BC	Q. Laberius Durus *(155)*
	M. Orfius *(204)*
	*Petronius *(216)*
53BC	M. Curtius Postumus *(104)*
	Petronius *(216)*
52BC	M. Aristius *(41)*
	*C. Volusenus Quadratus *(307)*
51BC	Q. Fufidius Q.f. *(126)*
	Sex. Lucilius *(161)*
circa 50BC	L. Septumius L.f. Arn(ensi) *(251)*
50BC	Q. Fufidius Q.f. *(126)*
49BC	*P. Ligarius *(159)*
	C. Sentius C.f. Aemilia *(249)*
	C. Seruilius C.f. Teretina Brocchus *(254)*
	C. Vulteius Capito *(308)*
48BC	*P. Ligarius *(159)*
	L. Septimius *(250)*
	L. Titius *(272)*
47BC	*P. Ligarius *(159)*
46BC	[- - -] (Ovid, *Fasti* 4) *(17)*
	C. Auienus *(50)*
	A. Fonteius *(125)*
	*P. Ligarius *(159)*
	Titius (1) *(270)*
	Titius (2) *(271)*
circa 45BC	[?L.] Tillius C.f. Cor(nelia) *(267)*
	C. Tillius C.f. Cor(nelia) Rufus *(268)*
45BC	C. Marcius (?Crispinus) *(176)*
43BC	C. Catius Vestinus *(75)*
	*Q. Horatius Flaccus *(137)*
	C. Popillius Laenas *(236)*
before 42BC	C. Lacontius M.f. *(156)*
42BC	Q. Horatius Flaccus *(137)*
41BC	M. Feridius *(117)*

40BC	*L. Maenius *(166)*
circa 38BC	T. Marius C.f. Ste(llatina) Siculus *(180)*
before 36BC	[- - -] (AE 1933, 199) *(1)*
36BC	Ofillius *(202)*
before 31BC	C. Baebius T.f. Clu(stumina) *(54)*
	Q. Caerellius M.f. Qui(rina) *(65)*
	[. ?Corne]lius Alexidis f. Cor(nelia) Menodor(us) *(100)*
	Cn. Dupilius Cn. f. Hor(atia) *(108)*
	C. Papirius C. f. Vel(ina) Masso *(211)*
	C. Rosius C.f. Arn(ensi) Sabinus *(243)*
	[?L. Va]leri[us] L.f. Cor(nelia) *(279)*
before 29BC	C. Aqutius (?Aclutius) L.f. Teret(ina) Gallus *(40)*
	Q. Caecilius Q.f. Atticus *(60)*
	M. Cincius L.f. Hor(atia) *(79)*
	L. Firmius L.f. *(118)*
	L. Sergius L.f. Lepidus *(252)*
	M'. Titius M'.f. Fab(ia) *(273)*
	(?Vedius Rufus) *(285)*
before 28BC	Fabia[nus(?) - - - S]ab(atina) M.f. *(114)*
	*[- - -] Patruus *(213)*
28BC	*Albius Tibullus *(28)*
after 27BC	[- - -] Tro(mentina) Maximus *(181)*
26BC	Ti. Claudius Nero *(83)*
after 26BC	Q. Allius Q.f. Vel(ina) Rufus *(30)*
before 25BC	[L.] Ti[t]inius L.f. Aem(ilia) Sulpicianus *(269)*
25BC	Ti. Claudius Nero *(83)*
before 24BC	Q. Veranius *(291)*
before 21BC	Cn. Pollienus Cn.f. *(222)*
before 20BC	Q. Caecilius Q.f. A[nien(si)] (1) *(58)*
	Q. Caecilius Q.f. An[ien(si)] (2) *(59)*
	A. Castricius Myriotalenti f. *(73)*
	C. Papirius C.f. Clu(stumina) Carbo *(210)*
before 15BC	L. Blatius L.f. Serg(ia) Ventinus *(56)*
before 14BC	Q. Pinarius L.f. Aem(ilia) *(219)*
before 10BC	[- - -]us T.f. Teret(ina) *(24)*
before 5BC	A. Octauius A.f. Ligus *(200)*
before 2BC	C. Velleius Paterculus *(290)*
before AD3	*C. Velleius Paterculus *(290)*
AD3	Passienus Rufus *(212)*
before AD4	L. Aponius [- - -] *(36)*
after AD4	Cn. Petronius Cn.f. Pom(ptina) Asellio *(218)*
before AD5	M'. Vibius M'.f. Vel(ina) Balbinus *(297)*
after AD6	C. Ennius C.f. Vol(tinia) Marsus *(112)*

before AD9	Cn. Lerius C.f. Flaccus *(157)*
	Cn. Pompeius C.f. Teret(ina) Proculus *(225)*
after AD9	C. Caristanius C.f. Ser(gia) Fronto Caesianus Iulius *(69)*
before AD11	P. Iuuentius Rufus *(154)*
AD11	Sex. Palpellius P.f. Vel(ina) Hister *(208)*
before AD14	*[- - -] Niger *(194)*
before AD15	*[- - -]f. Pap(iria) (CIL 6.32935) *(4)*
	[- - -]us *(23)*
	L. Appuleius L.f. *(37)*
	L. Aquillius Florus Turcianus Gallus *(39)*
	T. Aufidius T.f. Ani(ensi) Balbus *(48)*
	T. Aufidius T.f. Ani(ensi) Spinter *(49)*
	Sex. Aulienus Sex.f. Ani(ensi) *(51)*
	*Q. Caecilius L.f. *(57)*
	*L. Caecilius L.f. Flaccus *(61)*
	Sex. Campatius M.f. M.n. *(67)*
	L. Cassius L.f. Corneo[lus] *(71)*
	C. Castricius T.f. Caluus *(74)*
	T. Clodius C.[f. ?C.n.] Pro[culus] *(89)*
	P. Cornelius P.f. Sabat(ina) Cicatricula *(98)*
	[P. Corneli]us Orestinus *(101)*
	C. Fabricius C.f. Ani(ensi) Tuscus *(115)*
	C. Flacc[inius? C.]f. C[.n.] Flaccus *(119)*
	L. Fuluius L.f. Lesso *(127)*
	[- - - Ca]m(ilia) Glabeo *(134)*
	Q. Granius M.f. Labeo *(135)*
	[.] Iulius Po[s]idonius *(147)*
	T. Iunius D.f. Ani(ensi) Montanus *(150)*
	P. Lucilius P.f. P.nep. P.pron. P.abnep. Gamala *(163)*
	*L. Mammi[us - - -] Men(enia) (1) *(170)*
	[L.? Ma]mmius Ti.f. [Men(enia)] (2) *(171)*
	L. Marcius Q.f. Gal(eria) Optatus *(179)*
	Post. Mimisius C.f. Sardus *(183)*
	L. Nasidienus Agrippa *(192)*
	Sex. Papinius Q.f. Allenius *(209)*
	L. Pontius L.f. Strabo *(233)*
	[- - - Qu]adratus Maesianus Celsus *(240)*
	M. Vecilius M.f. L.n. Campus *(284)*
	Vespasius Pollio *(294)*
	Q. Veturius Q.f. Pom(ptina) Pexsus *(296)*
	L. Volusenus L.f. Clu(stumina) Clemens *(306)*
circa AD15	C. Pontius C.f. Paelignus *(232)*
before AD19	T. Pomponius T.f. Pol(lia) Petra *(230)*

MT(AP)	circa 20BC	[- - -]lius Ti.f. Pup(inia) Clemens *(20)*
	before 15BC	Q. Octauius L.f. C.n. L.pron. Ser(gia) Sagitta *(201)*
	before 2BC	M. Holconius M.f. Rufus *(136)*
	before AD3	M. Tullius M.f. *(277)*
	before AD15	[- - -] (CIL 9.3159) *(13)*
		[- - -] M.f. Fal(erna) [- - -] (CIL 10.3888) *(14)*
		[- - -] (CIL 11.4791) *(15)*
		[- - -]rnius L.f. Hor(atia) Asiati[cus - - -] *(22)*
		M. Allius M.f. Men(enia) Ru[fus] *(29)*
		L. Aurelius Sex.f. *(52)*
		P. Baebius P.fil. Pobl(ilia) Tuticanus *(55)*
		*Q. Caecilius L.f. *(57)*
		L. Cellius L.f. Men(enia) *(78)*
		A. Clodius A.f. Men(enia) Flaccus *(88)*
		Q. Gau[i]us A.f. Aqui[l]a *(132)*
		Q. Gauius T.f. Cla(udia) Pedo *(133)*
		C. Lucilius C.f. Benignus Ninnianus *(162)*
		M. Lucretius Decidianus Rufus *(164)*
		M. Manlius C.f. Pollio *(174)*
		M. Minicius T.f. [- - -] *(185)*
		M. Munatuleius M.f. Ani(ensi) Marcellus *(191)*
		L. Pompeius M.f. Pol(lia) *(223)*
		T. Pompullius L.f. Lappa *(231)*
		[- - -] Sabidin[ius - - -] *(244)*
		Satrius N.f. Teret(ina) Rufus *(247)*
		A. Veius M.f. *(286)*
		P. V[e]rgi[nius] P.[f. Pu]p(inia) Paetus *(293)*
MT(COHA)	circa AD15	L. Purtisius Atinas *(239)*
MT(COHP/U)	before AD15	Cn. Manlius Cn.f. Pa[p(iria)] *(173)*
	circa AD15	M. Vergilius M.f. Teret(ina) Gallus Lusius *(292)*
	before AD20	A. Virgius L.f. Marsus *(301)*
MT(PL)	before 25BC	[L.] Ti[t]inius L.f. Aem(ilia) Sulpicianus *(269)*
	before 21BC	[- - -]ius Sex.f. [- - -] *(19)*

Naval prefects

NP	88BC	Minucius Rufus (1) *(188)*
		C. Popillius (1) *(234)*
	69BC	P. Iunius P.f. *(148)*
	67BC	P. Clodius Pulcher *(90)*
	65BC	Seruilius *(253)*
	56BC	D. Iunius Brutus Albinus *(149)*
	54BC	Q. Atrius *(44)*
	49BC	[?Flaminius] Flamma *(120)*

		L. Iulius Caesar *(143)*
		Q. Lucretius Vespillo *(165)*
		Minucius Rufus (2) *(189)*
		L. Nasidius *(193)*
	48BC	L. Cassius *(70)*
		L. Iulius Caesar *(143)*
		Q. Lucretius Vespillo *(165)*
		Minucius Rufus (2) *(189)*
	47BC	L. Nasidius *(193)*
	46BC	Q. Aquila *(38)*
		L. Cispius (?Laeuus) *(81)*
	44BC	Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus *(107)*
	43BC	L. (Marcius) Figulus *(177)*
		L. Sextilius Rufus *(258)*
	42BC	*Clodius *(84)*
	40BC	*C. Iulius Helenus *(145)*
	39BC	*C. Iulius Helenus *(145)*
NP(PC)	circa 38BC	T. Marius C.f. Ste(llatina) Siculus *(180)*
	circa 36BC	M. Mindius Marcellus *(184)*
	after 26BC	*Q. Allius Q.f. Vel(ina) Rufus *(30)*
	before 21BC	[- - -]ius Sex.f. [- - -] *(19)*
	before 20BC	A. Castricius Myriotalenti f. *(73)*
	before AD15	Sex. Aulienus Sex.f. Ani(ensi) *(51)*
		P. Cornelius P.f. Sabat(ina) Cicatricula *(98)*
		L. Pontius L.f. Strabo *(233)*
NP(PN)	before 10BC	[- - -]us T.f. Teret(ina) *(24)*

Praefecti fabrum

PF	87BC	*L. Petronius *(217)*
	78BC	L. Cornelius L.f. Vot(uria) *(95)*
	circa 75BC	Marcius Libo *(178)*
	64BC	[- - -] (Cicero, *Murena* 73) *(16)*
	63BC	Vibius Sicca *(300)*
	62BC	L. Cornelius Balbus *(97)*
	61BC	*L. Cornelius Balbus *(97)*
	59BC	L. Cornelius Balbus *(97)*
	58BC	Mamurra *(172)*
	55BC	*Mamurra *(172)*
	51BC	L. Clodius *(86)*
		Q. (Paconius) Lepta *(207)*
	50BC	Q. (Paconius) Lepta *(207)*
	49BC	N. Magius *(167)*
	before 48BC	C. Velleius *(289)*

48BC Cn. Pompeius Theophanes *(226)*
44BC P. Volumnius (?Eutrapelus) *(304)*
43BC P. Volumnius (?Eutrapelus) *(304)*
before 42BC C. Velleius *(289)*
42BC C. Flauius *(121)*
P. Volumnius (?Eutrapelus) *(304)*
before 40BC C. Velleius *(289)*
before 31BC [. ?Corne]lius Alexidis f. Cor(nelia) Menodor(us) *(100)*
circa 31BC T. Satanus T.f. Sabinus *(246)*
circa 30BC C. Cornelius Cn.f. Gallus *(99)*
after 27BC [- - -] Tro(mentina) Maximus *(181)*
after 26BC Q. Allius Q.f. Vel(ina) Rufus *(30)*
before 21BC [- - -]ius Sex.f. [- - -] *(19)*
before 15BC Q. Octauius L.f. C.n. L.pron. Ser(gia) Sagitta *(201)*
before 10BC [- - -]us T.f. Teret(ina) *(24)*
before 2BC T. Sornius T.f. Vel(ina) *(260)*
before AD3 C. Caristanius C.f. Ser(gia) Fronto Caesianus Iulius *(69)*
after AD4 Cn. Petronius Cn.f. Pom(ptina) Asellio *(218)*
before AD5 M'. Vibius M'.f. Vel(ina) Balbinus *(297)*
circa AD6 Q. Aemilius Q.f. Pal(atina) Secundus *(27)*
after AD6 C. Ennius C.f. Vol(tinia) Marsus *(112)*
before AD15 [- - -]f. Pap(iria) (CIL 6.32935) *(4)*
M. Allius M.f. Men(enia) Ru[fus] *(29)*
Sex. Aulienus Sex.f. Ani(ensi) *(51)*
L. Aurelius Sex.f. *(52)*
Q. Caecilius L.f. *(57)*
*L. Cassius L.f. Corneo[lus] *(71)*
T. Clodius C.[f. ?C.n.] Pro[culus] *(89)*
C. Fabricius C.f. Ani(ensi) Tuscus *(115)*
Q. Gauius T.f. Cla(udia) Pedo *(133)*
T. Iunius D.f. Ani(ensi) Montanus *(150)*
*M. Iunius C.f. Gal(eria) Proculus *(151)*
M. Lucretius Decidianus Rufus *(164)*
M. Manlius C.f. Pollio *(174)*
*M. Minicius T.f. [- - -] *(185)*
T. Pompullius L.f. Lappa *(231)*
M. Vecilius M.f. L.n. Campus *(284)*
Q. Veturius Q.f. Pom(ptina) Pexsus *(296)*
circa AD15 M. Vergilius M.f. Teret(ina) Gallus Lusius *(292)*
before AD19 T. Pomponius T.f. Pol(lia) Petra *(230)*
before AD20 A. Virgius L.f. Marsus *(301)*

Appendix D

A list of officers (ordered chronologically, with each post appearing on a separate line) who have been excluded from the list of those who were certainly or probably junior officers of the period 91BC – AD14 on the grounds that there is insufficient evidence to date them more precisely than (e.g.) to the period 'before AD38', 'before AD42', etc. It is likely that some of these officers will have served in the Augustan period, but it is not possible to say which did so.

before AD38	[- - -] (AE 1982, 694)	NP(PN)|PF|EP(PE)
	[- - -] (AE 1982, 694)	MT
	[- - -]scus	MT
	[- - -]us T.f. Nepos	MT
	M. Arrecinus M.f. [- - -] Clemens	MT
	M. Arrecinus M.f. [- - -] Clemens	PF
	[C]n. Clouatius Cn.f.	MT
	P. Coelius P.f. Etruscus	MT
	[- ?Cu]rtilius C.f. Aem(ilia)	MT
	[- ?Cu]rtilius C.f. Aem(ilia)	IP(PCOH)
	[- ?Cu]rtilius C.f. Aem(ilia)	EP(PE)
	[- ?Cu]rtilius C.f. Aem(ilia)	PF
	Q. Decius Q.f. M.n. Saturninus	MT
	Q. Decius Q.f. M.n. Saturninus	PF
	L. Laetilius L.f. Ste(llatina) Rufus	MT
	C. Meffius C.f. Cla(udia) Saxo	IP(PCOH)
	C. Meffius C.f. Cla(udia) Saxo	PF
	[- - -] Plautus Scaeua Vibianus	MT
	C. Purtisius C.f. Stel(latina) Atinas	PF
	C. Purtisius C.f. Stel(latina) Atinas	EP(PE)
before AD42	[- - -] (AE 2000, 539)	MT
	[- - -] (AE 2000, 539)	EP(PE)|PF
	[- - -] (AE 2000, 540)	EP(PE)
	[- - -] (CIL 5.4379)	MT
	[- - -] (CIL 11.712)	MT
	[- - -] (CIL 11.712)	EP(PE)|IP(PCAST)
	[- - -] (CIL 11.712)	PF
	[- - -] (CIL 11.4191)	MT
	[- - -] (CIL 11.4193)	MT
	[- - -] (CIL 11.4194)	MT
	[- - -]enticol. Q.f.	EP(PE)
	[- - -]nius L.f. Le[m(onia)]	MT
	[- - -]nius L.f. Le[m(onia)]	?EP(PE)
	[- - -]nius L.f. Le[m(onia)]	IP(PCAST)

[- - -]nius L.f. Le[m(onia)]	NP(PC)
M. Acilius M'.f. Gal(eria) Silo	IP(PCOH)
[. Alleni]dius M.f. [Vel(ina)]	MT
L. Ancharius C.f. Rom(ilia)	MT
L. Ancharius C.f. Rom(ilia)	PF
C. Atilius A.f. Glabrio	PF
C. Atilius A.f. Glabrio	IP(PCOH)
C. Aufidienus C.f. Villus	MT
[- - -] Aufidi[us - - -]	IP(PCOH)
[- - -] Aufidi[us - - -]	MT
P. Aufidius L.f.	MT
P. Aufidius L.f.	PF
P. Aurarius P.f. Pol(lia) Crass[us]	MT
[- - - ?Aus]picatus	MT
[- - - ?Aus]picatus	PF
[- - - ?Aus]picatus	?EP(PE)
L. Autronius T.f. Clu(stumina) Causus	MT
[.] Baebius P.f.	MT
L. Brutt[ienus L.f.] (1)	MT
L. Bruttie[nus L.f.] (2)	MT
M. Cestius P.f. Cla(udia)	PF
M. Cestius P.f. Cla(udia)	MT
[- - - P]ol(lia) Cimber	?MT
L. Cornelius L.f. Bocchus (2)	MT
L. Cornelius L.f. Bocchus (2)	PF
T. Crustidius T.f. Briso	EP(PE)
L. Fannius C.f. Tro(mentina)	MT
P. Fannius M.f.	EP(PE)
L. Flaminius L.f. Hister	MT
Q. Flaminius L.f. Hister	MT
Sex. Flaminius L.f. Hister	MT
M. Granius M.f. M.n. Cordus	MT
M. Granius M.f. M.n. Cordus	EP(PE)
M. Granius M.f. M.n. Cordus	PF
N. Herennius N.f. Men(enia) Celsus	PF
[- - -] T.f. Libo	EP(PE)
C. Licin[ius .f. ?Clu(stumina)]	MT
C. Ludius C.f. [S]er(gia) Rufus	MT
C. Musanus C.f.	MT
C. Musanus C.f.	IP(PCAST)
L. Octauius L.f. Cam(ilia) Rufus	MT
L. Octauius L.f. Cam(ilia) Rufus	PF
Sex. O[lius L.f.] A[e]m. Secu[ndus]	PF

	[- - - ?Pet]ronius Ti.f. Ti.n. [- - -]	MT
	[. P]inarius Sex.f. Clu(stumina)	MT
	[?T. P]inarius T.f. Clu(stumina) Natta	MT
	L. Pinarius L.f. Pup(inia) Ruscus	MT
	Sex. Pomponius C.f. Clu(stumina) Balbus	MT
	C. Pompullius P.f. Hor(atia)	MT
	C. Pompullius P.f. Hor(atia)	EP(PE)
	T. Pontinius [- - -]	EP(PE)
	T. Pontinius [- - -]	MT(COHP/U)
	P. Quinctius P.f. Pom(ptina)	MT
	M. Quinctius Q.f. Hor(atia) Chilo	MT
	Cn. Ricinius Cn.f. Pup(inia) Persa	MT
	C. Romanius P.f. Rom(ilia)	MT
	Ruso	EP(PE)
	L. Rustius Picen[s]	MT
	L. Rustius Picen[s]	EP(PE)
	[L.?] Staius L.f. R[u]tilus	MT
	M. Turtellius C. f. Rufus	MT
	L. Valerius C.f. Vibrio	MT
	C. Veliternius C.f. Ter(etina) Sabinus	MT
	L. Veturius L.f. Homuncio	MT
	L. Veturius L.f. Homuncio	EP(PE)
	C. Vibius T.f. Clu(stumina) Pansa	MT
before AD55	[- - -]f. Ser(gia) Cascellius	MT
	[?L.] C[orn]elius C.[f.] Bocchus (1)	MT
	[?L. Cornelius ?C.f. Boc]chus (2)	MT
	[?L. Cornelius ?C.f. Boc]chus (2)	PF
	[. C]ornelius [?L.]f. [B]occhus (1)	MT
before AD58	M. Magius M.f. Ga[l(eria)] Antiquus	IP(PCOH)
	M. Magius M.f. Ga[l(eria)] Antiquus	PF
	[Ma]mius Murrius Umber	MT
before AD69	[- - -]us T.f. Ter(etina) Rufus	MT
	[- - -]us T.f. Ter(etina) Rufus	NP(PC)
	L. Antonius M. Antonii Polemonis filius Cor[nel]ia Zeno	MT
	C. Claudius C.f. C.n. Sardus	NP(PC)
	P. Opsidius P.f. Rufus	MT
	P. Opsidius P.f. Rufus	PF
	Q. Rutilius P.f. Gal(eria) Flaccus Cornelianus	MT
before AD100	[- - -]rtius Q.f.	?MT
	[- - -] Sont[i]us [- - -] Ter(etina) Cimber	MT