

## MILITARY TRIBUNATE IN THE CAREERS OF ROMAN SENATORS OF THE SEVERAN PERIOD.

### PART 2: SPECIAL DISTINCTIONS (*DONA MILITARIA*, *ADLECTIONES*, *COMMENDATIO AUGUSTI*)

by

DANUTA OKOŃ

**ABSTRACT:** In this article, the second in a series devoted to the office of the military tribune in the senatorial *cursus honorum* in the Severan period, the following findings are presented: (1) in the group of 123 military tribunes from the Severan period who subsequently became senators, special distinctions (*dona militaria*, *adlectio*, *commendatio*) were awarded to 49 people (approx. 40%); (2) *dona militaria* were granted to 8 of them; most people from this group are attested as *homines novi* and came from the provinces; (3) the gradual disappearance of references to *dona* in the source material may be the result of the intentional damage of inscriptions relating to emperors as award givers (e.g., due to the *damnatio memoriae*) or a change in the character of these distinctions (financial rewards replacing the traditional *dona*); (4) *dona* did not have any greater impact on the subsequent *adlectio* or *commendatio*; they did not become a part of the senatorial mode of promotion; (5) we know of 23 former tribunes who were *adlected* among the former magistrates; *homines novi* and provincials were the most numerous among them; (6) we know of 28 former tribunes who became *candidati Augusti* for magistracies; representatives of *gentes senatoriae* and residents of Italy were the most numerous among them; (7) *candidati* were people from the senatorial order, whereas *adlecti* were people from various orders; (8) in the group of 49 senators with special distinctions that was analysed, those distinguished once and twice dominate.

#### I. PRELIMINARY REMARKS

This paper is the second publication devoted to the office of the military tribune in the senatorial *cursus honorum*. In the previous one<sup>1</sup>, I analysed the general conditions: the source nomenclature for this office, the appointment procedure with the system of favouritism, quantitative issues and the *origo* and *ordo* of tribunes. The most important conclusions from that paper can be summarised as follows:

---

<sup>1</sup> *Military Tribune in the Careers of Roman Senators of the Severan Period. Part 1: Introductory Issues*, Eos CVI 2019, pp. 59–76.

- The following terms were generally used to describe the office of the military tribune in epigraphic and literary material: *tribunus militum*, *tribunus legionis*, and *tribunus laticlavus*.
- The title of *tribunus angusticlavus* is not found in the epigraphic material, but only in literary sources.
- The decision to appoint tribunes was formally made by the emperor, following the recommendations of people from his entourage and the staff of the provinces (governors).
- The average term of office of a military tribune was 2 years.
- Around 588 *tribuni laticlavii* and five times as many *angusticlavii* served in the legions in the Severan period; service in one legion was the standard, but 13 served in two legions.
- Out of 123 tribunes who subsequently became senators, 62 were from the senatorial order (including 23 descendants of consuls) and 12 from the equestrian order; the social status of the others remains unclear.
- Comparisons of the *origo* and *ordo* of tribunes show the dominant role of favouritism in their efforts to be appointed to this office. This is explicitly mentioned in literary sources, while other sources document this phenomenon indirectly.

The above findings significantly clarify and supplement our knowledge. They also constitute a starting point for further deliberations.

In this article, I will present the extent to which holding the military tribunate was associated with special distinctions: *dona militaria* (military distinctions), *adlectio* (co-optation among former magistrates), and *commendatio Augusti* (imperial recommendation). As in the previous article, I will include all the tribunes from both the senatorial order (*laticlavii*) and the equestrian order (*angusticlavii*) – if they were subsequently awarded adlection into the Senate. I will try to discover the type and number of special distinctions found in their *cursus*, the conditions that determined their award (*ordo* and *origo*), as well as their impact on the careers of individual senators at the stage from the quaestorship to the praetorship<sup>2</sup>. The following text in no way changes the career typology outlined in the second volume of my *Album senatorum*<sup>3</sup>, but it complements my previous research in an important way.

All the senators featured in the text below have biographical entries in the first volume of the *Album senatorum*<sup>4</sup>.

---

<sup>2</sup> The next article is in progress, discussing the praetorian and consular careers of former military tribunes.

<sup>3</sup> OKOŃ 2018, ch. IV: “Senatorial Careers – Conditions”.

<sup>4</sup> OKOŃ 2017.

II. *DONA MILITARIA*

During their military service, tribune officers could receive so-called *dona maiora*: *coronae*<sup>5</sup>, *hastae purae*<sup>6</sup> and *vexilla*<sup>7</sup>, whereas sub-commissioned officers<sup>8</sup> and soldiers were awarded *dona minora*<sup>9</sup>: *torques*, *phalerae*, *armillae* and

---

<sup>5</sup> The following types of *coronae* are known: *aurea*, *muralis*, *vallis/castrensis*, *civica*, *navalis/classica*, *obsidionalis*, *ovalis*, *triumphalis*. In the absence of archaeological sources, we can only hypothesise as to their appearance and workmanship. In the case of the *corona aurea*, its raw material seems apparently obvious, but the term *aurea* could refer not only to the type of metal used (gold), but also to its colour (golden). As this distinction was quite common in various military groups, I have opted for the second of these possibilities (for financial reasons). Thus the *corona aurea* was not really made of gold, but rather it was golden in colour. Sources mentioning other gold crowns should be interpreted in a similar way. According to Aulus Gellius (V 6), the following crowns were also gold: “*muralis [...] et castrensis et navalis*”, which is confirmed by Polybius (VI 39) for the *corona muralis* and by Festus (*De verborum significatione* 49 L) for the *corona vallis* (*castrensis*). On the other hand, the *corona civica* was made of oak or holly leaves, the *corona obsidionalis* was made of grass, the *corona triumphalis* was made of laurel leaves and, later, indeed of gold and the *corona ovalis* was made of myrtle. It should be added that the same officer could receive several crowns of the same kind or of different types. – During the Severan period, only the *corona aurea*, *muralis* and *vallis* are attested in epigraphic sources, while numismatic sources attest to the *corona triumphalis* in the case of emperors. They all belonged to the gold category (although in fact only the *corona triumphalis* was indeed made of gold), a fact which sheds an interesting light on the changes in the character of military distinctions.

<sup>6</sup> Since *hastae purae* could be awarded many times, only their number is mentioned in epigraphic material, e.g. *hastae purae II*. They were made of wood and covered with metal. A notable inscription from the Severan period relating to C. Didius Saturninus (*CIL* XI 7264 = *ILS* 9194) presents him as the holder of the *hasta pura argentea*, which clearly indicates that *hastae* were made of silver (in fact, silver-plated), so they were slightly less prestigious decorations than the gold-plated *coronae*.

<sup>7</sup> In the case of the *vexillum*, sources use the terms *vexillum* or *vexillum argenteum*. The inscriptions in honour of two praetorian prefects, T. Furius Victorinus and M. Bassaeus Rufus, are exceptions here. Furius (*CIL* VI 41143 = *ILS* 9002) was awarded, among other decorations, *vexilla obsidionalia* for his part in the victory over the Parthians (in the times of M. Aurelius and L. Verus); Bassaeus (*CIL* VI 1599 = *ILS* 1326) was awarded, among other decorations, *vexilla obsidionalia* for his role in the victory in the Sarmatian war (in the times of M. Aurelius and Commodus). The term *obsidionalis* was used in connection with the *corona obsidionalis*. It is possible that both distinctions (*vexillum* and *corona*) were awarded for achievements of the same or a similar type, especially given the decline of the *corona obsidionalis*. The term *argenteus*, on the other hand, is encountered as qualifying the *hasta pura*; it means silver or silver-plated. Bearing in mind the number and position of people distinguished with both types of the *vexillum*, it seems almost certain that the *vexillum obsidionale* was much more prestigious.

<sup>8</sup> I include centurions in this group, despite LE BOHEC (2018: 73), who considers them to be officers, an opinion which in my view is too rash. That they should be considered as non-commissioned officers is confirmed, among other things, by the *dona militaria*: centurions were awarded the *dona minora* (as amply evidenced in inscriptions), and not the *dona maiora*, which was typical for officers.

<sup>9</sup> These decorations, intended for lower ranks, occur primarily in epigraphic and iconographic sources; in the case of the *phalerae* also in archaeological sources. Therefore, only in the case of the latter ones it is possible to learn something of their exact appearance, size and material (various metals and semi-precious stones). It may be assumed that the *dona minora* were financial rewards (with their

sometimes *corona* and *hasta pura*<sup>10</sup> (both from the *dona maiora* category, but awarded only once). Owing to this classification we can, in some cases, accurately determine the social status of a person who has been honoured or at what stage of his career he was, even if the inscription is not explicit about this<sup>11</sup>. Honorific inscriptions are often limited to the formula “*donis militaribus donatus/ornatus*”, which minimises the amount of information available about the *dona*. Moreover, they are not always presented in a chronological order, which causes additional difficulties. However, the fact that *dona* were awarded for combat merit (a heroic act, participation in a war or an expedition)<sup>12</sup> and that inscriptions often provide the specific name of the war (*Parthica*, *Mesopotamena*, etc.) or at least the name of the emperor, gives us a basis on which to formulate conclusions about the relationship between military distinctions and a honorand’s subsequent career, if it is at least partially documented. On the basis of epigraphical material, it can be concluded that the decision to award *dona* was made by the emperor, probably at the request of a tribune’s direct superiors, e.g. a legionary or provincial legate. This gave the young tribune an opportunity to be remembered by the emperor and to establish a good starting position in the competition for future offices.

Only eight senators known to us from the Severan period (former tribunes)<sup>13</sup> have *dona militaria* attested in their *cursus*. From the group of the *laticlavii* these are C. Caesonius Macer Rufinianus<sup>14</sup>, who received them from Marcus

---

former name retained), and the decorated soldier himself financed the placing of their symbols on his armour, hence the differences in their appearance, quality and the material. Given this situation, it becomes obvious why the inscriptions of the Severan period never specify what material the *dona minora* were made of, despite the fact that, as indicated by archaeological remains, they differed from each other. – As regards other distinctions for lower ranks, one should mention *albata dec[u]rsio*, which was an honorary parade in a white robe, a rare type of an honorary distinction for combat merits. See the following cases: M. Iulius Rufus, a centurion from the Flavian period (*AE* 2006, 1480 = *AE* 2007, 1461); L. Antonius Naso, a *primipilaris* and later a tribune of the praetorians from the same period (*CIL* III 14387 = *IGLS* VI 2781 = *AE* 2004, 82); NN, a *primipilaris* (*CIL* III 14387 = *IGLS* VI 2798 = *ILS* 9198 = *AE* 2004, 82); Cn. Iulius Rufus, a *primipilaris* from the time of the Antonines (*AE* 1998, 1435). This distinction was not in use in the times of the Severans.

<sup>10</sup> From the time of the Severans, there is no instance of the *hasta pura* being awarded to someone of lower than equestrian status.

<sup>11</sup> What is helpful in this respect is knowing about the maximum number of *coronae*, *vexillae* and *hastae purae* which a single honorand could obtain. Commanders of the consular rank could receive four such distinctions in each category. For those of the praetorian rank the number was three, and for tribunes two. See MAXFIELD 1972: 45 f. and 1981.

<sup>12</sup> It should be remembered that these distinctions were awarded both to ordinary soldiers and non-commissioned officers (centurions) for their performance in actual warfare, and to their commanders (legionary legates, prefects of *vexillationes*), who did not directly take part in warfare, but only gave orders.

<sup>13</sup> *Dona* were also awarded to C. Vettius Sabinianus Iulius Hospes, but then he was already the governor of Pannonia Inferior.

<sup>14</sup> “Donatus donis militaribus a divo Marco” (*CIL* XIV 3900 = *ILS* 1182 = *InscrIt* IV 12, 102), specific distinctions not given.

Aurelius; [...]anus S[...]”<sup>15</sup> and an unknown praetor?<sup>16</sup> (*AE* 2003, 365), who probably received them from Commodus; an unknown consul?<sup>17</sup> (*AE* 1922, 38 = *ILJug* 2080), who was awarded by Septimius Severus, as (probably?) was T. Statilius Barbarus<sup>18</sup>. From the group of the *angusticlavii*, these are M. Macrinus Avitus Catonius Vindex<sup>19</sup> and M. Valerius Maximianus<sup>20</sup>, who were given awards by Marcus Aurelius, and C. Domitius Antigonus<sup>21</sup>, who probably received *dona* from Septimius Severus. Thus, the inscriptions attest three emperors (Marcus Aurelius, Commodus and Septimius Severus) as award givers. The fact that there is no mention of successive emperors (from the Severan dynasty) may be because almost all of them were sentenced to *damnatio memoriae* and, consequently, were not mentioned in inscriptions<sup>22</sup>. It cannot be assumed that all distinctions disappeared from military life, but it is possible that their character changed, e.g. they were replaced by financial awards, which would explain the lack of attestation in epigraphical sources.

Only in the case of M. Valerius Maximianus does the inscription mention (once, although *dona* were awarded four times<sup>23</sup>) a specific deed – the capture of the leader of the barbarians, Valaon, for which Valerius was awarded with “equo et phaleris et armis”, an award which resembles the republican *spolia opima*, especially if we assume that the bounty received originally belonged to the defeated leader. In other cases we lack such information. However, it should be noted that in four of them: [...]anus S[...], an unknown praetor, M. Macrinus Avitus Catonius Vindex and M. Valerius Maximianus, the inscriptions indicate what types of distinctions were awarded (*corona muralis*, *corona vallaris*, *hastae purae*, *vexilla*, *equus*, *phalerae*, *arma*). One can get the impression that the

<sup>15</sup> “[... donis] / [mi]litaribus c[oroni]s ... item]que vexillis [...]” (*AE* 2003, 1189 = *AE* 2004, 930 = *AE* 2011, 764).

<sup>16</sup> “[donato donis militari]b(us) ab Imp(eratore) Co[m]modo Aug(usto)...], [...has]tis puris d[uabus...]” (*CIL* IX 431 + 437 = *AE* 1969–1970, 143 = *Supp. It.* XX 2003, pp. 127 f., no 11 = *AE* 2003, 365).

<sup>17</sup> “[... donis] [don]ato bi[s] ab imp.] Sep[timio Severo]” (*AE* 1922, 38 = *ILJug* 2080).

<sup>18</sup> “[donatus donis militaribus b]ello Parth(ico) Mesop(otameno)” (*CIL* VI 41197 = *CIL* VI 1522 = *ILS* 1144).

<sup>19</sup> “Donatus donis militaribus in bello Germanico ab Imperatore Marco Aurelio Anonino Augusto hastis puris II et vexillis II, corona murali et vallari” (*CIL* VI 1449 = *ILS* 1107).

<sup>20</sup> “Don(is) don(ato) bello Phart(ico) (!) [...] ab Imp(eratore) Antonino Aug(usto) coram laudato et equo et phaleris et armis donato quod manu sua ducem Naristarum Valaonem interemisset” (*AE* 1956, 124).

<sup>21</sup> “[ornatus militaribus honoribus]” (*AE* 1966, 262).

<sup>22</sup> See KIENAST 1990: 156–181. As the author notes, even in the case of Caracalla, who was not officially condemned by the Senate, instances of damaging inscriptions with his name are found.

<sup>23</sup> Three times during the *quattuor militiae* and once as a legionary legate. He captured Valaon as the *praefectus alae I Aravacorum*, that is during his fourth *militia*.

accuracy of the enumeration of the *dona* depends on the importance and length of the honorand's career – in the case of a senator with a rich *cursus*, the enumeration of awards received before entering the Senate may have seemed unnecessary and hence it was restricted.

Of all the tribunes under discussion (8), one came from Italy<sup>24</sup>, three from the West<sup>25</sup>, one from the East<sup>26</sup>, while three are of an unknown origin<sup>27</sup>. This confirms the thesis that the military staff were of provincial origin in that period; this phenomenon is already apparent in the times of the last Antonines.

It should be added that, out of the whole group, five were *homines novi*<sup>28</sup> and three were of origins unclear to us<sup>29</sup>; we do not find, however, representatives of *gentes senatoriae*.

The small number of beneficiaries of these awards (8 out of 123) leads us to conclude that young tribunes (at least *laticlavii*)<sup>30</sup> were generally not given major combat tasks, as they were treated as youth learning the craft of war. *Dona* were more often awarded to heroic soldiers, primarily centurions<sup>31</sup>. Thus it can be concluded that *dona* remained typical of military circles and were not included in the senatorial mode of promotion, although they indirectly influenced this promotion (e.g. as an argument when presenting candidates for offices or in the case of favouritism related to these offices).

For those few military tribunes who received awards, the tribunate and the *dona militaria* acquired during its term constituted a good basis for their further career, for promotion to magistracies and distinctions (see part V: Summary and Conclusions). It is worth emphasising that six out of the eight *donati* rose to consulship<sup>32</sup>.

The above findings complement previous research on the *dona militaria*. A fundamental monograph by V. MAXFIELD<sup>33</sup> mentions two senators of the

<sup>24</sup> C. Caesonius Macer Rufinianus.

<sup>25</sup> Anonymus consul? (*AE* 1922, 38 = *ILJug* 2080), M. Macrinus Avitus Catonius Vindex, M. Valerius Maximianus.

<sup>26</sup> C. Domitius Antigonus.

<sup>27</sup> T. Statilius Barbarus, [...]anus S[...], Anonymus praetor (*AE* 2003, 365).

<sup>28</sup> C. Caesonius Macer Rufinianus, C. Domitius Antigonus, [...]anus S[...], M. Macrinus Avitus Catonius Vindex, M. Valerius Maximianus.

<sup>29</sup> T. Statilius Barbarus, Anonymus consul? (*AE* 1922, 38 = *ILJug* 2080), Anonymus praetor? (*AE* 2003, 365).

<sup>30</sup> The situation was different in the case of *angusticlavii*, who may have been decurions or *primipilares* promoted to the equestrian order. At that time, they could have been aged 30 and older with rich experience in various fields.

<sup>31</sup> This fact is emphasised by DOBSON 1993: 125.

<sup>32</sup> C. Caesonius Macer Rufinianus, C. Domitius Antigonus, T. Statilius Barbarus, M. Macrinus Avitus Catonius Vindex, M. Valerius Maximianus, Anonymus consul? (*AE* 1922, 38 = *ILJug* 2080).

<sup>33</sup> MAXFIELD 1972: 45 f. In her later work (MAXFIELD 1981), the discussion of the *dona* only covers the period up to the time of Commodus.

Severan period (including one former tribune) who were distinguished in this way (an unknown consul mentioned in *AE* 1922, 38 and Claudius Gallus), while Y. LE BOHEC in an equally fundamental work on the Roman army<sup>34</sup> only notes that references to *dona* disappear from epigraphical sources during the time of Caracalla. Also in his entry on the *Dona militaria* in *Der Neue Pauly*, LE BOHEC mentions these distinctions only until the times of Commodus. It may be added that A. VON DOMASZEWSKI pointed this out many years ago<sup>35</sup>, linking the phenomenon of the elimination of the *dona* with the coming to power of new oriental despotic regimes (“das neue orientalische despotische Regiment”). Even before him, similar statements had been made by B. BORGHESE<sup>36</sup> and O. FIEBIGER<sup>37</sup>. As regards more recent works, P. FAURE mentions several cases of *dona militaria* during the reign of the Severans (awarded to centurions), although he emphasises that they were gradually replaced by financial awards<sup>38</sup>. The lack of sources does not allow me to draw conclusions whether similar changes took place in relation to officers, but I do not exclude such a possibility.

### III. ADLECTIONES

Another distinction which is encountered in the *cursus* of Roman officers is *adlectio* (co-optation among the former magistrates)<sup>39</sup>. Two forms of *adlectio* may be discerned: internal and external. Internal *adlectio* was applied to people from the senatorial order and constituted an acceleration of their career by co-opting them among former officials at a given level in spite of the fact that they had not actually held the office in question. External *adlectio* was of a similar character, the difference being that the promoted people simultaneously changed their social status (usually by being raised from the equestrian to the senatorial order<sup>40</sup>). In both forms, the level of promotion was decided by the emperor by virtue of his censorial power and the age of the person honoured with *adlectio* was taken into account<sup>41</sup>.

<sup>34</sup> LE BOHEC 2002: 66.

<sup>35</sup> VON DOMASZEWSKI 1967: 184. The book was first published in 1908.

<sup>36</sup> BORGHESE 1864: II 340, 469.

<sup>37</sup> FIEBIGER 1903.

<sup>38</sup> FAURE 2013: 296.

<sup>39</sup> From the literature on the *adlectio* in the imperial period, particularly important are: CHASTAGNOL 1975 and 1992; CORIAT 1978; LEUNISSEN 1989 and 1993; PFLAUM 1960–1961.

<sup>40</sup> Cases of the advancement to the senatorial order of people of lower than equestrian status are attested for the Severan period, e.g.: [...]s Verus, a centurion, adlected probably by Macrinus; Claudius Aelius Pollio, a centurion who captured Diadumenianus (Macrinus' son), rewarded with *adlectio* by Elagabalus.

<sup>41</sup> It is worth recalling that the minimum age requirements for taking office (since the time of Augustus) were as follows: quaestorship: 25, aedile/tribunate: 27, praetorship: 30. If the



It should be remembered in this context that the first obligatory office in the senatorial *cursus*, the quaestorship, already guaranteed entry to the Senate and was therefore attractive to people keen to make a career in the Roman Empire. There were at least 20 quaestors each year in the Severan period<sup>42</sup>; if there were more candidates in a given year, the office could be difficult to reach. Thus *adlectio* gave the emperor the possibility of granting the rank of quaestor above the set limit, thus eliminating conflicts among the candidates (and also among their *gentes* and patrons). It also created opportunities for the promotion of deserving army officers, as evidenced by the collected examples (see below).

In the case of the next rank, the tribunate/aedilate, the situation was similar. There were a total of 16 tribunes of the plebs and aediles each year, thus four former quaestors had no chance of holding these offices. This number could increase from year to year, so inevitable tensions resulted, though they were somewhat alleviated by the fact that patricians bypassed this level of promotion. Those dissatisfied could be awarded by the emperor with *adlectio inter tribunicios/aedilicios*. In the same way he could additionally promote, by means of external *adlectio*, deserving army officers from equestrian families who were of an age appropriate for this level (27–29 years). The other face of *adlectio inter tribunicios/aedilicios* was the need to find enough candidates for the praetorship. There were 18 praetors each year, which meant that if all the tribunes and aediles declared their candidacy for the praetorship, they would still be two candidates short. Owing to the consistent use of the *adlectio* procedure, a reservoir of people who could run for the office of praetor was created, making it possible to fill the office without problems.

*Adlectio inter praetorios* was used for slightly different reasons. After the praetorship, numerous posts awaited senators: governorships of legions, governorships of praetorian provinces, curatorships of roads, town curatorships, etc. As a rule, representatives of *gentes senatoriae* held up to four posts of praetorian rank, while *homines novi* received five to nine such posts<sup>43</sup>. However, not every former praetor wanted to go to a (sometimes distant) province and live for the next few years in a legionary camp or in its vicinity; as a result, there were vacancies. In this situation, *adlectio* was of help, moving lower-level senators higher in the hierarchy or advancing meritorious equestrians (especially those who had held *tres/quattuor militiae* and could take command of a legion). It should be added that former equestrians were much more willing than senators

---

promoted person was younger than 25, he could be co-opted into the senatorial order without indicating the office being held (*adlectus in amplissimum ordinem*). In this case his further *cursus* proceeded in a standard way, according to the rules applicable to senators. See OKOŃ 2016 and 2018.

<sup>42</sup> See OKOŃ 2018: 17 for the possibility that this limit increased.

<sup>43</sup> OKOŃ 2018, ch. V: “Career Models”.



to take up provincial posts, as they had become accustomed to such conditions during their previous service.

To sum up, *adlectio*, despite being used as a general term, had various forms and consequently various meanings. *Adlectio inter quaestorios* guaranteed entry into the Senate, *adlectio inter tribunicios/aedilicios* was a form of supplementing the list of candidates for the praetorship, and *adlectio inter praetorios* was a means of ensuring that the positions of the praetorian rank would be filled. *Adlectiones* were, therefore, an important element in the policy of providing the Empire with all the required officials in central government; they were a necessity, not merely a whim of the ruler.

We currently know of 23 senators from the Severan period who were awarded *adlectio* after the military tribunate; as many as 21 of them were awarded this distinction only once. Two instances of *adlectio* being awarded more than once are worth discussing in more detail; they concern T. Flavius Secundus Philippianus (*adlectio* awarded three times) and Tib. Claudius Candidus (*adlectio* awarded twice).

The first case, that of T. Flavius Secundus Philippianus, who came from the East, caused numerous problems for researchers of that period. His *cursus* is known thanks to an inscription from Lugdunum, the dedication of an altar erected in the period when Philippianus was the legate of the province of Gallia Lugdunensis<sup>44</sup>. The offices mentioned in the inscription are presented chronologically as follows: as a military tribune of the Legio VII Gemina in Castra Legionis in Spain he became *adlectus inter quaestorios, tribunicios* and *praetorios*, which means that he did not hold any of the obligatory magistracies at all. If he served the military tribunate as *angusticlavus*, his first *adlectio (inter quaestorios)* was external, and the next two were internal. However, if he was a *tribunus laticlavus*, then all of the three *adlectiones* were internal. I also do not exclude the possibility that there was only one *adlectio (inter praetorios)*, and that automatic co-optation among the lower senatorial magistrates (*inter quaestorios, inter tribunicios*) was an overinterpretation on the part of the person responsible for the text of the inscription.

Having received *adlectio inter praetorios*, Philippianus commanded two legions, the I Minervia in Bonn and the XIV Gemina in Carnuntum, followed by the legateship of Gallia Lugdunensis during the reign of three Augusti (Severus,

---

<sup>44</sup> CIL XIII 1673 = ILS 1152 (= CIL III, p. CLXXIV): “[Io]vi Dep[ulsori] / Bonae Menti ac R[e]duci Fortuna[e] red[hibita] et suscepta / provincia / T(itus) Flavius Secundus Philippi[us] nus v(ir) c(larissimus) leg(atus) Aug(ustorum) prov(inciae) Lug(dunensis) / leg(atus) legg(ionum) I M(inerviae) et XIII gem(inae) allect(us) / inter praetorios tribunici/os quaestorios trib(unus) militum / leg(ionis) VII gem(inae) cum Iulia Nepotil[is] c(larissima) f(emina) sua et T(itus) Fl(avius) Victorino Philippi[us] c(larissimo) i(uveneris) trib(unus) mil(itum) leg(ionis) V Ma(cedonicae) et T(itus) Fl(avius) Aristo Ulpiano c(larissimo) p(ater) uero lec(to) in patricias familias / aram constituit ac / dedicavit.

Caracalla and Geta). This apparently simple listing of offices and appointments raises a lot of controversy.

The career of the senator under discussion largely coincided with the period of civil wars during the reign of Septimius Severus. The honorific inscription, from which we know his *cursus*, was dedicated in Lugdunum “Iovi Depulsori, Bonae Menti ac Reduci Fortunae” due to “redhibita et suscepta provincia” (i.e. the recovering of the province)<sup>45</sup>, which clearly refers to the war with Clodius Albinus (hence its placement). However, the inscription may be selective, i.e. it may only enumerate functions directly related to warfare, omitting all others, e.g. administrative and religious ones, thus causing problems with the reconstruction of the *cursus* of Philippianus.

It is usually assumed (incorrectly, in my opinion) that Philippianus became *adlectus in amplissimum ordinem* around 180, and in 193 he was the legate of the Legio XIV Gemina, which supported Septimius Severus in his struggle for power. If so, in 196–198 he would have been the legate of Gallia Lugdunensis, the province which he lost in 196 and regained in 197 after the battle of Lugdunum<sup>46</sup>. This seems to be confirmed by the inscription dedicated to the gods on the occasion of his regaining of the province. However, this hypothesis does not explain why Philippianus was the legate of three Augusti in 198<sup>47</sup> (a mistake?) or on account of what merits he was awarded three *adlectiones* by M. Aurelius/Commodus. If they were given to him for his achievements in the Marcomannic Wars, it is surprising that there is no reference to this fact in the inscription, e.g. in the form of mentioning his having been awarded *dona militaria*. It is worth remembering that the inscription mentions Philippianus’ military activity and *dona* undoubtedly belonged to this sphere.

That is why I suggest that Philippianus’ career should be dated to a later period. As I understand it, he fought as a tribune of Legio VII Gemina in Spain in 196–197 on the side of the troops who opted for Septimius Severus. In this capacity he took part in the victorious battle of Lugdunum, and the triple award of *adlectio* was a result of his attitude and undoubted bravery (*dona* were out of the question, because this was an internal war). According to this reconstruction, the first *adlectio* was awarded after the battle of Lugdunum, i.e. in 197 or

---

<sup>45</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>46</sup> *PIR*<sup>2</sup> F 362 (GROAG); *RE* VI (1909), col. 2616, no 175 (GOLDFINGER); *RE* XII (1924), col. 1431, no 1742 (RITTERLING); BARBIERI 1952, no 241; FITZ 1993–1995: 554, 559, 626–628.

<sup>47</sup> Namely of Severus, Caracalla and Geta, i.e. between 209 and 211, because in this period Geta obtained the title of Augustus, and Severus and Caracalla already held this title. See KIENAST 1990: 166. In the literature on the subject, the third “G” in *Auggg(ustorum)* is usually tacitly recognised as a later addition or an error (see analogous cases, e.g. *CIL* VI 228); consequently, it is assumed that Philippianus was a legate in 196–198. If this is so, the title of Geta was entered “in advance” (since he was then only Caesar) or added later (around 209–211). This is, in my opinion, possible, but not particularly likely.

198 (when Philippianus was around 27), the next around 198–199 and the third in 201–202, after which he was the legate of two legions and finally the legate of Gallia Lugdunensis. In this capacity he hosted Septimius Severus along with his court in 208 as the latter was marching on an expedition in Britain<sup>48</sup>. As governor, he founded an altar with the above-mentioned inscription (in 209 or a little later) commemorating the successful battle of Lugdunum and the recovery of the province from the enemy, an achievement to which he had personally contributed<sup>49</sup>. My proposal also explains the complicated titulature of his sons which appears in the inscription. The older one, T. Flavius Victorinus Philippianus, as *clarissimus iuvenis* is a *tribunus militum legionis V Macedonicae*, while the younger one, T. Flavius Aristus Ulpianus, as *clarissimus puer* became *lectus in patricias familias*. In practice, this means that Philippianus, the father of these two young men, was probably an equestrian who was promoted to the senatorial order, but his older son was born before this promotion (hence his more modest status), while the younger one was born after his father's *adlectio*, as the son of a senator, and he became a patrician in his childhood, which is clearly a reward for his father's attitude during the civil war. Probably the sons came from two successive marriages. The mother of the older one came from a more modest family (unknown to us), while the mother of the younger one (as his *cognomina* Aristus Ulpianus indicate) was from a consular family of the Ulpii Arabiani represented during the reign of the Severans by M. Ulpius Arabianus (consul around 194–196) and his son M. Ulpius Domitius Aristaeus Arabianus. Philippianus' second marriage was, in a way, a consequence of the special honours that were given to him after the Battle of Lugdunum. Thus his career is typical of a period

---

<sup>48</sup> The chronology of Philippianus' career would be as follows: born around 170–171. A tribune in Spain until 196–197 (*angusticlavius*?), he fought against Albinus' troops in Spain and Gaul, taking part in the battle of Lugdunum in 197. In 197–198 he was *adlected* for the first time (*inter quaestorios*); around 198–199 *adlectus inter tribunicios*; and around 201–202 *adlectus inter praetorios*. The commander of Legio I Minervia around 202–204; of Legio XIV Gemina around 205–207; the legate of Gallia Lugdunensis around 208–211.

<sup>49</sup> The selection of the three deities as recipients of the inscription is noteworthy. Iuppiter Depulsor (pushing away enemies) was a deity especially worshipped in the Danube region and honoured by military men of various formations and levels. Dedications were associated with a direct threat to this region, especially in the second half of the second century. The appearance of similar dedications in other provinces (Proconsular Africa, Spain, Gaul) may have been associated with the return of veterans to their home provinces (and the transfer of a cult which was significant for them) or with the further career of the worshippers of Iuppiter Depulsor in other regions of the Empire. The figure of Philippianus, owing to his command of the legion in Carnuntum in Pannonia and his subsequent governorship of Gallia, fits into this model. The second honoured deity, Bona Mens, was the personification of the clear mind; in the context of Severus' expedition to Britain, this deity could be summoned to provide the Emperor with good plans and their successful implementation. The third deity, Fortuna Redux, looked after successful returns and in my opinion she was also summoned due to the *expeditio Britannica*. Thus, the choice of the deities as recipients of the inscription was not accidental and clearly indicated the intentions of the founder.

of a civil war, when the victorious side gains everything by climbing to the top of the social hierarchy despite a weak starting position; it is also a good illustration of the process of the fluctuation of elites in times of upheaval.

The second case is that of Tib. Claudius Candidus, who came from Africa; after *tres militiae* and the function of *procurator XX hereditatum per Gallias Lugdunensem et Belgicam et utramque Germaniam*, he became “adlectus inter tribunicios item praetorios”<sup>50</sup>. His co-optation among the former tribunes suggests that he was over 27 years old at that time. The first *adlectio* was external, while the second one was internal, and as a result Candidus (like Philippianus) did not hold any of the obligatory senatorial offices. This is a good example illustrating the fact that equestrian magistracies supplemented senatorial ones by providing the knowledge and skills appropriate to public service. The inscription does not specify the reason why the *adlectio* was awarded twice; we may assume that some wartime merits were taken into account and that the procuratorial office held between the third *militia* and *adlectio* (Candidus was *praepositus copiarum expeditionis Germanicae secundae*) was to give Candidus a chance to earn some money and thus meet the financial census required from senators. Certainly the promotion was granted by Commodus, an emperor who, as the *Historia Augusta* attests (*HA Pert.* 6, 10), was liberal in bestowing such distinctions.

After another promotion (*inter praetorios*) Candidus performed a number of civil functions (*curator civitatum Teanensium*, *legatus pro praetore provinciae Asiae*, *logista civitatis splendidissimae Nicomedensium item Ephesiorum*) and later became one of Septimius Severus’ military commanders (*dux exercitus Illyrici expeditione Asiana item Parthica item Gallica*)<sup>51</sup>. Before the Gallic expedition, he probably became a suffect consul, evidently due to his combat merits. It is worth adding that he was a countryman of Septimius Severus and a companion in the military service of his brother Geta (from the Legio II Augusta, in which he was a *tribunus angusticlavius*); moreover, he enjoyed the support of a powerful patron, Q. Antistius Adventus Postumius Aquilinus (consul around 167 and the legate of Germania Inferior and Britain).

Both cases illustrate what the careers of people with particular services rendered to the princeps on the battlefield looked like. The scarcity of similar

<sup>50</sup> CIL II2/14, 2, 975 = CIL II 4114 = ILS 1140 = RIT 130.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibidem*. In my opinion, the chronology of Candidus’ career is as follows: born around 152; the first *militia* around 170–172; the second, the military tribunate in Legio II Augusta in Britain, around 172–173 (under Antistius’ governorship); the third, *praepositus copiarum expeditionis Germanicae secundae*, around 178–179; the procuratorship around 180–182; *adlectio inter tribunicios* around 182–183; *inter praetorios* around 184–185; then civil offices (*curator civitatum Teanensium*, *legatus pro praetore provinciae Asiae*, *logista civitatis splendidissimae Nicomedensium item Ephesiorum*) until he took command in the expedition against Pescennius Niger in 193. The Parthian expedition until 195–196, consulship around 195–196, Gallic expedition 196–197. After this expedition, Candidus became *XVvir sacris faciundis*, *legatus Augusti pro praetore provinciae Hispaniae citerioris*, et in ea dux terra marique adversus rebelles hostes publicos.

appointments underlines the importance of both senators in the circles of power. It should also be noted that decisions about promotions were often forced by natural considerations, i.e. the dying out of the old *gentes* and a lack of senators of an appropriate age willing to undertake public service.

Out of the remaining 21 people, there are 10 instances of internal *adlectio* and 11 of the external type, which allows us to conclude that a single *adlectio* was standard. The mechanisms by which it was applied did not differ from the general mechanisms presented above. In the Severan period, numerous external and internal wars could have influenced the acceleration or slowdown of careers, so specific conditions emerged which affected the promotion of individual people.

In the group of senators with internal *adlectio*, four became *adlecti inter quaestorios*, i.e. were co-opted among the former quaestors: Ti. Cl(audius) Me[vius? P]riscus Ruf[inus I]unior, T? Cuspidius Flaminius Severus, L. Iulius Apronius Maenius Pius Salamallianus, Anonymus consul<sup>52</sup> (*CIL* IX 1592 = *ILS* 1126).

Three of them were *adlecti inter tribunicios*: C. Aemilius Berenicianus, [...]us L.f. Fab. Annian[us], Iulius Pompilius Piso T. Vibius [...]atus Laevillus Berenicianus, while the next three were *adlecti inter praetorios*: L. Marius Maximus Perpetuus Aurelianus, L. Valerius Publicola Messalla Helvidius Thrasea Priscus Minicius Natalis, [...]anus S[...].

All of the senators listed (who had been *tribuni laticlavii*) bypassed one of the obligatory offices, but otherwise their *cursus* was standard. Those who were promoted to the level of ex-quaestors clearly obtained *adlectio* for merits in military service, which immediately preceded their entry into the Senate. Seven<sup>53</sup> out of ten *adlecti* from the senatorial order were later appointed consuls, which shows that their position in the circles of power was well established and that their merits and experience were appreciated.

In the group of senators with external *adlectio*, two (the youngest ones) became *adlecti in amplissimum ordinem*: Ti. Claudius Subatianus Proculus (after four *militiae*)<sup>54</sup> and C. Vettius Sabinianus Iulius Hospes (after two out of four *militiae*)<sup>55</sup>.

---

<sup>52</sup> This senator was also made patrician; however, since it is impossible to identify him, it is hard to determine why he was awarded the distinction twice.

<sup>53</sup> T? Cuspidius Flaminius Severus, L. Iulius Apronius Maenius Pius Salamallianus, Anonymus consul (*CIL* IX 1592 = *ILS* 1126), C. Aemilius Berenicianus, Iulius Pompilius Piso T. Vibius [...]atus Laevillus Berenicianus, L. Marius Maximus Perpetuus Aurelianus, L. Valerius Publicola Messalla Helvidius Thrasea Priscus Minicius Natalis.

<sup>54</sup> *Praefectus cohortis III Alpinorum, tribunus cohortis VI civium Romanorum, praefectus alae constantium, subpraefectus classis praetoriae Misenatium* (*CIL* VIII 4323 = 18528; *AE* 1911, 107 = *ILS* 9488). This proves that a young equestrian after the fourth *militia* could enter the standard senatorial *cursus*, starting with the quaestorship (at the age of 25).

<sup>55</sup> *Praefectus cohortis II Flaviae Comagenorum, tribunus militum legionis I Italicae* (*AE* 1920, 45 = *ILAfr.* 281).

None of the *tribuni angusticlavii* known to us became adlected *inter quaestorios*. It is possible that the line of people of the senatorial order was long and blocked such a promotion for equestrians. Two of them were probably *adlecti inter tribunicios*: Ti. Claudius Claudianus and C. Iulius Avitus, which meant that they held neither the quaestorship nor the tribunate/aedilate. Others (7) entered the Senate through *adlectio inter praetorios*: Q. Cerellius Apollinaris, L. Didius Marinus, C. Domitius Antigonus, M. Macrinus Avitus Catonius Vindex, M. Valerius Maximianus, Anonymus legatus Aquitaniae and most likely [L.? S]ept(imi)us Maria[nus]; this means that they did not hold any obligatory office from the senatorial *cursus honorum*.

The careers of Vettius and Subatianus, young *equites* promoted early enough to go through the complete senatorial *cursus*, are particularly interesting. In the first case, that of Vettius, what was decisive was most likely his merits in military service on the Roman border (in Dacia and Moesia), while in the second case, that of Subatianus, his taking the side of Septimius Severus during his march to Rome (193 AD) was appreciated. Other equestrians entered the senate at a later age, when they were old enough to be ranked among the former tribunes or praetors. Before their adlection they served not only *tres/quattuor militiae*, but also civil procuratorships, so they were experienced in many areas. This resulted in a long and fruitful career; it is worth mentioning that nine of them became consuls<sup>56</sup>.

The *origo* of the *adlecti* (in both categories) is also worth considering. Among the people with a single internal *adlectio* (10), three came from Italy<sup>57</sup>, two from the East<sup>58</sup>, one from Africa<sup>59</sup> and two from either Italy or the East<sup>60</sup>, while the origin of two people is unknown<sup>61</sup>. Among the people with a single external *adlectio* (11), two came from Italy<sup>62</sup>, four from the East<sup>63</sup>, two from Africa<sup>64</sup>, two from the West<sup>65</sup> and one from the Latin-speaking part of the Empire<sup>66</sup>.

---

<sup>56</sup> Ti. Claudius Subatianus Proculus, C. Vettius Sabinianus Iulius Hospes, Ti. Claudius Claudianus, C. Iulius Avitus, C. Domitius Antigonus, M. Macrinus Avitus Catonius Vindex, M. Valerius Maximianus, Anonymus legatus Aquitaniae, [L.? S]ept(imi)us Maria[nus].

<sup>57</sup> L. Valerius Publicola Messalla Helvidius Thrasea Priscus Minicius Natalis, Ti. Cl(audius) Me[vlus? P]riscus Ruffinus Iunior, Anonymus consul (*CIL* IX 1592 = *ILS* 1126).

<sup>58</sup> L. Iulius Apronius Maenius Pius Salamallianus, C. Aemilius Berenicianus.

<sup>59</sup> L. Marius Maximus Perpetuus Aurelianus.

<sup>60</sup> Iulius Pompilius Piso T. Vibius [...]atus Laevillus Berenicianus, [...]us L.f. Fab. Annian[us].

<sup>61</sup> T? Cuspidius Flaminus Severus, [...]anus S[...].

<sup>62</sup> Q. Cerellius Apollinaris, Anonymus legatus Aquitaniae.

<sup>63</sup> C. Domitius Antigonus, C. Iulius Avitus, L. Didius Marinus, [L.? S]ept(imi)us Maria[nus].

<sup>64</sup> Ti. Claudius Subatianus Proculus, Ti. Claudius Claudianus.

<sup>65</sup> M. Valerius Maximianus, M. Macrinus Avitus Catonius Vindex.

<sup>66</sup> C. Vettius Sabinianus Iulius Hospes.



In total (23)<sup>67</sup>: five *adlecti* came from Italy, seven from the East, four from Africa and two from the West, while the origin of the rest is unknown or unclear (several options are possible). The data relating to the *origo* show that provincials were the predominant group among the *adlecti*; apparently, they needed the support of the emperor more frequently in order to be given promotion to offices.

To sum up, *adlectio* (internal and external) was a form of supplementing the staff of the imperial administration with people who did not follow, either in part or at all, the standard senatorial path going back to republican tradition. In the case of those who belonged to the senatorial order, it was a kind of a safety valve that discharged intra-group tensions, while in the case of equestrians it was a form of reward for their past service. What is especially important is the fact that in the case of *adlectiones* the decision was entirely in the hands of the princeps, who formed the elite of the Empire in this way.

#### IV. COMMENDATIO AUGUSTI

Another form of special distinction was *commendatio Augusti* or an imperial recommendation for an obligatory senatorial office (that of quaestor, tribune/aedile or praetor)<sup>68</sup>. In the Severan period, as part of the system of senatorial promotion mentioned earlier, *commendatio* guaranteed the election to a given magistracy in practical terms<sup>69</sup>. In numerous senatorial inscriptions we find the

---

<sup>67</sup> Including 21 people with a single *adlectio* (internal or external) and two with multiple *adlectio*.

<sup>68</sup> The literature on the subject of *commendatio* is quite modest: LEVICK 1967; OKOŃ 2008; GIZEWSKI 2003; also the already cited works by BARBIERI (1952) and LEUNISSEN (1989). It is worth mentioning in this context a book by APPEL (2019); although it does not discuss the imperial period, it is an excellent introduction to the presentation of the electoral procedures operating in it.

<sup>69</sup> To explain the essence of the *commendatio*, one should present its evolution from the times of the Republic. Originally, this term meant a spoken recommendation: during the election of magistrates in the Campus Martius, each citizen could approach voters and recommend his candidate. Those who put forward such recommendations were relatives, friends, acquaintances, patrons and clients – either of the candidate himself or of the people supporting him. During his short rule, Julius Caesar introduced the practice of sending the *comitia* a list of his candidates who were to be (and were) elected (Suet. *Iul.* 41). Thus the *commendatio* evolved from a spoken informal recommendation into a written “official” designation. This applied to half of all the positions available in the senatorial *cursus* with the exception of the consulship to which all appointments were made by Caesar alone (most frequently from among himself and his friends). In the case of the other half of the positions, unrestricted elections were allowed. During the second triumvirate a change was introduced: now it was the triumvirs who appointed all the magistrates according to their own will (Cass. Dio XLVIII 32, 1; 35, 1–3). Later Augustus abandoned this practice and returned to general elections, in the course of which he walked through the Campus Martius personally convincing the people to vote for his candidates (Suet. *Aug.* 56). Thus he referred to the old customs (a spoken recommendation) in order to keep up the appearances of the Republic. He did so until his health deteriorated; then he began sending a list with the names of his candidates to the *comitia* (8 AD), although he did not oblige the citizens to vote for them. The next princeps, Tiberius, transferred

following phrases: *quaestor candidatus Augusti*, *tribunus plebis candidatus Augusti*, *praetor candidatus Augusti*<sup>70</sup>. A *candidatus*, after obtaining his *nominatio*, held the office in the normal manner (which distinguished him from an *adlectus*), so he had to meet the age qualifications for his office<sup>71</sup>.

It must be said that whereas *adlectio* allowed the list of officials at a given level to be completed, it was *commendatio* that opened it. The difference between *adlectio* and *commendatio* was a matter of prestige; it was definitely more honourable to achieve an office from the first places on the list than to be added to the list of former officials. It should be remembered that *commendatio* was used only for members of the senatorial order, whereas *adlectio* was used for representatives of various orders.

In the group of 123 senators (former military tribunes) identified from the Severan period, 28 were *candidati Augusti*, of whom twelve received the

---

the election of magistrates to the Senate, changing the electoral body but maintaining the republican custom of the *commendatio* understood as a spoken recommendation. The *Tabula Hebana*, an epigraphic document from the time of Tiberius, describes primary elections in the Senate, and it mentions whitewashed boards on which the names of the candidates were written (“*tabulas dealbatas in quib(us) nomina candidatorum scripta sint*”, see *AE* 1949, 215). There is no indication that those recommended by the princeps were specially marked on the boards. A list of names was read out before the actual elections (*nominatio*). We know that Tiberius personally described each of the candidates (*Tac. Ann.* II 28), characterising them either briefly or extensively. Undoubtedly, this method of presentation can be considered an imperial recommendation and a guide for senators on how to vote. After 27 AD (when he left Rome for ever), Tiberius used to send a list of names to inform the Senate about his own voting preferences (*Tac. Ann.* I 15). Over time, the practice of written *commendatio* became established. – The list of candidates for magistracies was created by the consuls; if the emperor was one of the consuls, he prepared the list and read it in the Senate with appropriate comments. There is no data on how many willing to hold a given office won the Emperor’s favour. The only information we have comes from Tacitus (*Ann.* I 15), who mentions that Tiberius limited himself to recommending four candidates (“*quattuor candidatos commendaret, sine repulsa et ambitu designandos*”). It is difficult to say whether this limit was maintained by subsequent principes; this is rather doubtful given the ever-growing number of officials, e.g. praetors. It can be assumed that the number of candidates recommended by the Emperor increased, although, due to the lack of sources, the extent of this growth cannot be determined. Notwithstanding these issues, the category of *candidati Augusti*, i.e. people who ran for magistracies and in practical terms for whom the support of the princeps made their election certain, was permanently established. From the time of Vespasian, in fact, being a *candidatus Augusti* was tantamount to being appointed. The famous passage from the *lex de Imperio Vespasiani* reads: “*utique quos magistratum potestatem imperium curationemve cuius rei petentes senatus populoque Romano commendaverit quibusque suffragationem suam dederit promiserit, eorum comitis quibusque extra ordinem ratio habeatur*” (*FIRA* I, pp. 154–156). Although Pliny the Younger praised Trajan in the *Panegyricus* for giving the senators freedom of discussion during the elections, he did not specify whether the Emperor’s candidates were also debated (*Plin. Pan.* 69, 2; 76, 2).

<sup>70</sup> The term *aedilis candidatus Augusti* is not found in the epigraphic material from the reign of the Severans. But this might be due to the incompleteness of our evidence. We do not encounter the term *consul candidatus Augusti* either, but in this case it is understandable, because the decision about the appointment to the consulship belonged to the emperor alone.

<sup>71</sup> See n. 40 above.

emperor's support once, fourteen twice and two three times (M. Gavius Crispus Num[isi]us Iunior, [...]ius T[...]). Thus *commendatio* granted once and twice can be considered as standard, whereas granting it three times can be seen as an exception worthy of closer examination.

The first of these two senators, M. Gavius Crispus Num[isi]us Iunior, came from an old Italian aristocratic family; he was a descendant of the consul of the year 155, M. Gavius Appalius Maximus; through his mother he was related to Camurius Numisius Iunior, the consul of the year 161. His grandfather was probably T. Appalius T.f. Vel(ina) Alfinus Secundus, an equestrian and an imperial procurator, while his (adoptive) grandfather was M. Gavius Maximus, a praetorian prefect from the time of Antoninus Pius. Thus, it can be concluded that Crispus' origins were distinguished; we find in his family both senators who rose to the consulship and equestrians of merit. All the obligatory magistracies held by Crispus (the quaestorship, the tribunate and the praetorship) as well as imperial *commendationes* for them probably coincided with Commodus' rule<sup>72</sup>, which suggests that he was the emperor's friend. It is worth adding that he later held at least two praetorian posts (*legatus legionis X Geminae, proconsul Lyciae et Pamphyliae*), which was standard for members of the senatorial order of non-patrician origin. He then reached the consulship (maybe still under Commodus) and the proconsulship of the province of Asia (under Septimius Severus). It is difficult to date his career more precisely, but if we assume that he governed Lycia et Pamphylia at the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century and Asia under Severus<sup>73</sup>, then he must have served in the army (as a tribune) around 170–175<sup>74</sup>, that is, during the Marcomannic Wars, in which his legion, IV Flavia, participated actively. It is possible that his war merits stood at the beginning of Crispus' promotions and

---

<sup>72</sup> I do not exclude the possibility that the first *commendatio* coincided with the rule of Marcus Aurelius, although there is no mention of this in the inscription, which is somewhat surprising in the case of the deified emperor. Crispus' career was reconstructed on the basis of several fragmentary inscriptions. See *AE* 1975, 795 = *SEG* XXVI 1253 + *ZPE* XXXVII 1980, op. 31–33 = *IvEph.* III 682; *CIL* XIV 4238 = *InscrIt* IV 1, 141; *CIL* VI 1556 + *CIL* X 6663 + 6665 + 8292 = *ZPE* XXXVII 1980, pp. 35 ff.; ŞAHİN 1999, no 156; *CIL* X 8292 = ECK, *ZPE* CXXXI 2000, pp. 251 ff. (anonymous) = *AE* 2000, 1453. – On the basis of information derived from these inscriptions, we arrive at the following *cursus* (*in ordine inverso*): *fetialis, consul, proconsul provinciae Asiae, proconsul provinciae Lyciae et Pamphyliae* [...] / [...] / *legatus legionis X geminae, praetor candidatus, tribunus plebei candidatus, quaestor candidatus, tribunus laticlavus legionis IIII Flaviae, X vir stlitibus iudicandis*. Despite many efforts by researchers (especially W. ECK), Crispus' *cursus* still appears incomplete; it seems to lack e.g. the *dona militaria* for his participation in the Marcomannic Wars.

<sup>73</sup> I provide the dating of Crispus' stay in these provinces following THOMASSON 1984: no 26: 221; no 30: 057; THOMASSON 2009: no 26: 221; no 30: 057.

<sup>74</sup> Obviously, the timing depends on whether the proconsulship of Asia around 200 was held by Crispus at the age of 50 or 45. A different age was hardly an option, and if we assume a gap of 10–15 years between the consulship and the proconsulship of Asia, we come to the conclusion that he was consul around 185–190 and the legionary tribune around 170–175, i.e. evidently during the Marcomannic Wars (166–181). I establish Crispus' date of birth as being around 150–155.

that they were supplemented by his friendship with the emperor. This must be how he achieved the honour of the triple *commendatio*. I find no other justification.

The second person awarded the triple *commendatio*, [...]ius T[...], came from Gaul, as is indicated by the location of his honorific inscription. The inscription is damaged (which is not attributable to *damnatio memoriae*) and there are various possible ways to reconstruct the text<sup>75</sup>. Since my analyses show that multiple *commendationes* were more often awarded to people coming from the old *gentes* (see below), it is possible that the anonymous person was just such a case.

It is possible that there were more cases similar to the above-mentioned senators, but the scarcity of source material makes it impossible to assess the scale of the phenomenon.

It is worth paying attention to the social (*ordo*) and territorial (*origo*) origins of the people who received an imperial recommendation. In the group of people with a double *commendatio* (14), we find eight representatives of the old *gentes*<sup>76</sup>, two representatives of the *homines novi*<sup>77</sup> and four people of unclear origin<sup>78</sup>. In the group of people with a single *commendatio* (12), we see four representatives of *gentes senatoriae*<sup>79</sup>, five representatives of the *homines novi*<sup>80</sup> and three people of unclear origin<sup>81</sup>. It can be clearly seen that the criterion distinguishing members of the old *gentes* from representatives of the *homines novi* is the number of recommendations for one person – we find multiple *candidati*

<sup>75</sup> CIL XII 1862 = ILN L 1, 53: “[...]io Volt. T[...] / [...]ati Cati[...] / [...] trib. mil. leg. XI[...] / [...] quaest. ca]nd. trib. plebei [...] / [...] praet. [...] Aug. [...]”. In the lacuna, after the words *trib. plebei*, one can only insert the word *candidatus*, as any other proposals to supplement the lacuna would be illogical. Doubts are raised by the last line, which can be supplemented in two ways: “praet(ori) [cand(idato)] Aug(usti)” or “praet(ori) [leg(ato)] Aug(usti)”. If we take the first option, the *commendatio* would be triple: *quaestor candidatus, tribunus plebis candidatus, praetor candidatus*; if we take the second, it would be double: *quaestor candidatus, tribunus plebis candidatus*. Research practice suggests the first option. I do not take into account the proposal by PFLAUM (1978: 322 f.), who resolved the abbreviation *AVG* as *AVG(ur)*, because in inscriptions relating to the senatorial *cursus*, religious functions are usually mentioned at the beginning, right after the *nomen*.

<sup>76</sup> C. Caerellius Fufidius Annius Ravus Pollitianus, Q. Hedijs Lollianus Plautius Avitus, Q. Hedijs Rufus Lollianus Gentianus, [Lusius Laberius ? S]eptius [Ruti]lianus, [...] P. Neratius M[acer aut -arcellus], C. Novius Rusticus Venuleius Apronianus, Anonymus praetor (CIL VI 31780 = CIL VI 41202/3), Anonymus consul (CIL VI 1553 = CIL VI 41200).

<sup>77</sup> Ti. Claudius Subatianus Proculus, T. Clodius Aurelius Saturninus.

<sup>78</sup> Anonymus praetor (AE 2003, 365), M. Annaeus Saturninus Clodianus Aelianus, M. Caecilius Flavius Proculus; [P]riscus.

<sup>79</sup> M. Fabius Magnus Valerianus, C. Vettius Gratus Sabinianus, Iulius Pompilius Piso T. Vibius [...]jatus Laevillus Berenicianus, Anonymus consul (CIL IX 1592 = ILS 1126).

<sup>80</sup> Ti. Claudius Claudianus, L. Marius Maximus Perpetuus Aurelianus, L. Marius Perpetuus, Q. Petronius Melior, P. Plotius Romanus Cassianus Neo.

<sup>81</sup> T. Marcius [C]le[mens?], [...] Tursidius (vel T. Ursidius) [...] Manilianus Titule[ius] Aelianus, Anonymus legatus Thraciae.

*Augusti* more frequently among the aristocracy, while single ones appear more often in the group of *homines novi*.

In total, among the *candidati Augusti* (28)<sup>82</sup> we find thirteen representatives of the old families, seven *homines novi* and eight people of unclear origin, so the group was dominated by senatorial aristocracy.

As regards the *origo*, in the group of double *candidati* six were from Italy<sup>83</sup>, three from Africa<sup>84</sup> and five people were of unknown origin<sup>85</sup>. In the group of single *candidati* we find three people from Italy<sup>86</sup>, three from Africa<sup>87</sup>, two from the Latin-speaking part of the Empire<sup>88</sup>, one from Italy or Africa<sup>89</sup>, one from Italy or Asia<sup>90</sup> and two of unknown origin<sup>91</sup>. Comparing the two groups, we notice that the category of those recommended twice was dominated by Italians, while the category of those recommended once was dominated by provincials.

In total, in the group of 28 *candidati*, ten came from Italy, six from Africa and one from the West, while six were of unknown origin; we also find a few cases of people with two or three probable options of origin. In the whole group, the greatest number were from Italy.

The comparison of the *ordo* and *origo* of the *candidati Augusti* indicates that when giving recommendations the principes were guided not so much by the personal achievements of the candidates (which, at this stage of their lives, were probably not numerous), but by the tradition that favoured those who came from the old *gentes* (often originating from Italy). This situation was probably also influenced by the fact that the relatives, kinsmen and friends of the members of *gentes senatoriae* functioned in higher circles of power, which greatly facilitated their promotion.

We can draw additional conclusions by analysing the people awarded with *commendatio* according to the level of the office they held. Of all the candidates, sixteen gained support for the quaestorship, eleven for the tribunate, nineteen for

---

<sup>82</sup> For the sake of full clarity: 2 triple *candidati* + 14 double + 12 single.

<sup>83</sup> C. Caerellius Fufidius Annius Ravus Pollitianus, T. Clodius Aurelius Saturninus, Q. Hedi-  
Lollianus Plautius Avitus, Q. Hedi Rufus Lollianus Gentianus, [...] P. Neratius M[acer aut -arcel-  
lus], C. Novius Rusticus Venuleius Apronianus.

<sup>84</sup> Ti. Claudius Subatianus Proculus, M. Annaeus Saturninus Clodianus Aelianus, [Lusius La-  
berius ? S]eptius [Ruti]lianus.

<sup>85</sup> Anonymus praetor? (*AE* 2003, 365), M. Caelius Flavus Proculus, [P]riscus, Anonymus  
consul (*CIL* VI 1553 = 41200), Anonymus praetor (*CIL* VI 31780 = 41202/3).

<sup>86</sup> Q. Petronius Melior, Anonymus consul (*CIL* IX 1592 = *ILS* 1126), T. Marcius [C]le[mens?].

<sup>87</sup> Ti. Claudius Claudianus, L. Marius Maximus Perpetuus Aurelianus, L. Marius Perpetuus.

<sup>88</sup> M. Fabius Magnus Valerianus, C. Vettius Gratus Sabinianus.

<sup>89</sup> P. Plotius Romanus Cassianus Neo.

<sup>90</sup> Iulius Pompilius Piso T. Vibius [...]atus Laevillus Berenicianus.

<sup>91</sup> [...] Tursidius (aut T. Ursidius) [...] Manilianus Titule[ius] Aelianus, Anonymus legatus  
Thraciae (*AE* 1907, 48 = *IGR* I 1481).

the praetorship (46 cases in total for 28 people). *Commendatio* was of particular significance in the case of the quaestorship, because it meant the introduction to the Senate and an opportunity for a career spanning the whole Empire. Out of sixteen people recommended for the quaestorship, nine were descendants of senatorial families and three were *homines novi*, while the social origin of the others is unknown to us. In the case of the next level – the tribunate/aedilate, five (out of eleven) recommended senators came from senatorial families, three were *homines novi* and the social origin of the others is unknown. While the rank of tribune/aedile did not yet open the path to an administrative career on a larger scale, this path was opened by the praetorship, giving the opportunity to take on such functions as legionary commands and provincial governorships. In this case, nineteen people were recommended: nine descendants of *gentes senatoriae*, three *homines novi* and seven of undetermined origin.

At all levels, representatives of *gentes senatoriae* predominated over *homines novi* – slightly less so at the level of the tribunate/aedilate, which was the result, on the one hand, of the fact that patricians bypassed this level and, on the other, of a smaller number of people waiting for this office (20 former quaestors), so for people of more noble birth it was easier than for *homines novi* to get this rank.

From the whole group of 28 tribunes with *commendatio Augusti*, at least fifteen later achieved the consulship. Descendants of *gentes senatoriae* achieved it after a fairly short praetorian career (up to 4 offices), whereas *homines novi* after a longer one (5–9 offices). The result was that *homines novi* remained in active service for a much longer time and were therefore definitely more useful – this is the context in which *commendatio* should be considered in their careers. It should also be remembered that those starting their careers in the equestrian order and passing through *militiae* had much more experience than the sons of senators, who could, but did not have to hold any office prior to the quaestorship, because the vigintivirate and the military tribunate (*laticlavus*) were not obligatory.

It can be assumed that in the Severan period (as before) *commendatio* had two meanings. For representatives of old families (who would have achieved offices in the standard procedure anyway) it was a form of distinction obliging the candidate and his family to be loyal to the princeps. I do not exclude the possibility that the princeps planned to win the favour of families in question in this way, which was especially important during the period of the destabilisation of power. Promoting the old aristocracy also gained importance during the period of the greater influx of *homines novi* to the Senate; it gave the impression of a balanced personal policy. In the case of *homines novi*, *commendatio* was also a form of distinction, but the princeps' intention was first of all to ensure that the candidate would be given the office in a specific time. This leads to the conclusion that the emperor already had an administrative career mapped out for these individuals or a specific role for them to fulfil in the Senate. New people in the Senate also strengthened the imperial party, which was especially important in the context of strengthening the power of a new



dynasty. It must be remembered that, despite all these nuances, both representatives of *gentes senatoriae* and *homines novi* met the requirements for senatorial magistrates with regard to education, competence and property.

To sum up, the recommendation was determined by the will of the princeps according to his own political priorities. On the other hand, external factors such as tradition and the support for a given candidate from the members of his *gens* or his influential patrons, the endorsement of his former superiors and his own merits (including military merits at the stage of the tribunate) also determined the choice of this or that candidate.

## V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

A list of special awards makes it possible to illustrate the scale of imperial support of the group of military tribunes<sup>92</sup>.

NO.	NOMEN / NUMBER IN THE <i>ALBUM SENATORUM</i> <sup>93</sup>	DONA MILITARIA	ADLECTIO IN / INTER				CANDIDATUS AUGUSTI		
			amplissimum ordinem	quaestorios	tribunicios	praetorios	quaestor	tribunus plebis	praetor
a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j
1.	C. Aemilius Berenicianus – no 26				X (i)				
2.	[...]us L.f. Fab. Annian[us] – no 58				X (i)				
3.	C. Caesonius Macer Rufinianus – no 224	X							
4.	<u>C. Caerellius Fufidius Annius Ravus Pollitianus</u> – no 217						X	X	
5.	Q. Cerellius Apollinaris – no 265					X? (e)			
6.	Ti. Claudius Candidus – no 291				X (e)	X (i)			
7.	Ti. Claudius Claudianus – no 296				X (e)				X
8.	Ti. Claudius Subatianus Proculus – no 342		X (e)					X	X
9.	Ti. Cl(audius) Me[vius? P]riscus Ruf[inus I]unior – no 316			X (i)					

<sup>92</sup> The representatives of *gentes senatoriae* are underlined. The letter (e) in the category of *adlectiones* stands for an external *adlectio*, and the letter (i) for an internal one.

<sup>93</sup> Each senator's nomen is followed, for the reader's convenience, by the number under which he is listed, with a biographical entry, in vol. I of my *Album senatorum* (Okoń 2017).

a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j
10.	T. Clodius Aurelius Saturninus – no 353						X		X
11.	T.? Cuspidius Flaminius Severus – no 393			X (i)					
12.	L. Didius Marinus – no 396					X? (e)			
13.	C. Domitius Antigonus – no 401	X				X (e)			
14.	<u>M. Fabius Magnus Valerianus</u> – no 428						X		
15.	T. Flavius Secundus Philippianus – no 480			X (i/e)	X (i)	X (i)			
16.	<u>M. Gavius Crispus Num[isi]us Iunior</u> – no 522						X	X	X
17.	<u>Q. Hedius Lollianus Plautius Avitus</u> – no 534						X		X
18.	<u>Q. Hedius Rufus Lollianus Gentianus</u> – no 536						X		X
19.	L. Iulius Apronius Maenius Pius Salamallianus – no 557			X (i)					
20.	C. Iulius Avitus – no 563				X (e)				
21.	L. Marius Maximus Perpetuus Aurelianus – no 699					X (i)		X	
22.	L. Marius Perpetuus – no 700						X		
23.	Q. Petronius Melior – no 796							X	
24.	P. Plotius Romanus Cassianus Neo – no 808						X		
25.	[L.? S]ept(imius) Maria[nus] – no 916					X? (e)			
26.	T. Statilius Barbarus – no 937	X							
27.	<u>L. Valerius Publicola Messalla Helvidius Thrasea Priscus Minicius Natalis</u> – no 988					X (i)			
28.	<u>C. Vettius Gratus Sabinianus</u> – no 1010						X		
29.	[...]anus S[...] – no 1593	X				X (i)			
30.	Anonymus consul? ( <i>AE</i> 1922, 38 = <i>ILJug</i> 2080) – no 1077	X							

a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j
31.	<u>Anonymus consul (CIL IX 1592 = ILS 1126)</u> – no 1076			X (i)					X
32.	Anonymus praetor? (AE 2003, 365) – no 1125	X					X		X
33.	Anonymus legatus Aquitaniae (AE 1992, 1794) – no 1611					X (e)			
34.	M. Annaeus Saturninus Clodianus Aelianus – no 1231							X	X
35.	M. Caelius Flavius Proculus – no 1276							X	X
36.	<u>Iulius Pompilius Piso T. Vibius [...]</u> atus Laevillus Berenicianus – no 1421				X (i)				X
37.	<u>[Lusius Laberius ? S]eptius [Ruti]lianus</u> – no 1447							X	X?
38.	M. Macrinus Avitus Catonius Vindex – no 1451	X				X (e)			
39.	T. Marcius [C]le[mens?] – no 1458								X
40.	[...] P. Neratius M[acer aut -arcellus] – no 1480							X?	X
41.	<u>C. Novius Rusticus Venuleius Apronianus</u> – no 1483						X	X	
42.	[P]riscus – no 1509						X		X
43.	[...]ius T[...] – no 1559						X	X	X?
44.	[...]Tursidius (aut T. Ursidius) [...] Manilianus Titule[ius] Aelianus – no 1566								X
45.	M. Valerius Maximianus – no 1578	X				X (e)			
46.	C. Vettius Sabinianus Iulius Hospes – no 1012		X (e)						
47.	<u>Anonymus consul (CIL VI 1553 = CIL VI 41200)</u> – no 1606						X		X
48.	Anonymus legatus Thraciae (AE 1907, 48 = IGR I 1481) – no 1620						X		
49.	<u>Anonymus praetor (CIL VI 31780 = CIL VI 41202/3)</u> – no 1623						X		X

The table above lists 49 people with special distinctions in their *cursus honorum* (*dona militaria*, *adlectio*, *commendatio Augusti*), which is about 40% of the entire group under analysis, comprising 123 senators. As a rule, they received distinctions once (23) or twice (21). Being awarded distinctions three times (5) was less frequent; those atypical cases have been discussed above. *Adlecti* predominated in the group of those distinguished once (12), while *candidati* were most dominant in the group of those distinguished twice or three times (20)<sup>94</sup>. It is worth noting that among those awarded twice, the majority (13) had one type of distinction (twelve double *commendatio*, one double *adlectio*), and only eight had different types (four *adlectio* + *commendatio*, four *dona* + *adlectio*). Also among those distinguished three times, people with distinctions of one type predominated (three out of five)<sup>95</sup>. A pattern may be noticed: the more distinctions in the career, the more often we encounter *candidati Augusti* (and the fewer of them, the more *adlecti*); another regular occurrence is the dominance of one type of distinctions.

Analysing the problem of special distinctions collectively, we find that their distribution was as follows: 8 *dona*, 23 *adlectiones*, 28 *commendationes Augusti*. There is a visible disproportion between the *strictly* military and the magistrate distinctions in favour of the latter and a slight dominance of *commendationes* over *adlectiones*.

The careers presented above of those who received *dona* confirm that *dona* were awarded for specific achievements and not for the mere fact of holding an office. Interestingly, three *donati* did not receive any other distinctions and their career was standard; out of the remaining five, one became a *candidatus Augusti* twice (no 32 in the table above), while four were awarded *adlectio inter praetorios* (three external and one internal). The latter four (as far as we can reconstruct their careers) later served higher military and administrative functions, e.g. legionary and provincial commands. There are no representatives of *gentes senatoriae* in the group of those who received *dona*, while attested *homines novi* dominate; one cannot avoid the impression that *dona militaria* were rather a feature of the equestrian (or even lower) *cursus*.

One should look at the careers of people with *adlectio* and *commendatio* in terms of their social origins (*ordo*). Among those *adlecti* whose *ordo* has been identified, there were few representatives of *gentes senatoriae*, while in the group of *candidati* it was just the opposite: they were the most numerous. This means that *adlectio* was, as a rule, a part of the advancement of *homines novi*,

---

<sup>94</sup> In the group of those distinguished twice: 16 *candidati*; in the group of those distinguished three times: 4 *candidati*.

<sup>95</sup> Two people were awarded *commendatio* three times, one was awarded *adlectio* three times, one was awarded *adlectio* and *commendatio* twice, one was awarded *dona militaria* and *commendatio* twice.

while *commendatio* belonged to the advancement of members of *gentes senatoriae*. All those recommended to the office (*candidati*) when they obtained imperial support were from the senatorial order, which distinguished this procedure from *adlectio*, applied to people from different orders.

On the basis of earlier analyses, it can additionally be stated that provincials were most numerous in the group of *adlecti*, while representatives of the Italian aristocracy formed the group of *candidati*. Research conducted in terms of the *origo* of these people confirms the great role of tradition in appointments to offices.

The above lists and analyses clearly show that the emperor had a number of instruments at his disposal to support a talented military tribune; at the same time, they prove that he did not use them frequently. At the early stage of a former tribune's career (up to the praetorship) what mattered were not so much one's own merits, but the influence of the *gens*, kinsmen, patrons and their possible relations with the ruling house. In the Roman senators' *cursus honorum*, important and prestigious offices appeared only after the praetorship and only then were they given a chance to demonstrate their own abilities. My next article will be devoted to this issue.

University of Szczecin  
danuta.okon@usz.edu.pl

ORCID: 0000-0003-1173-7043

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ALFÖLDY 1977: G. ALFÖLDY, *Konsulat und Senatorenstand unter den Antoninen. Prosopographische Untersuchungen zur senatorischen Führungsschicht*, Bonn 1977.
- APPEL 2019: H. APPEL, *Ite in suffragium. O wyborach w republikańskim Rzymie*, Toruń 2019.
- BARBIERI 1952: G. BARBIERI, *L'albo senatorio da Settimio Severo a Carino (193–285)*, Roma 1952.
- LE BOHEC 2002: Y. LE BOHEC, *L'armée romaine sous le Haut-Empire*, Paris 2002 (3<sup>rd</sup> edn.).
- 2018: Y. LE BOHEC, *L'armée romaine sous le Haut-Empire*, Paris 2018 (4<sup>th</sup> edn.).
- BORGHESI 1864: B. BORGHESI, *Œuvres complètes*, Paris 1864.
- CHASTAGNOL 1975: A. CHASTAGNOL, "Latus clavus" et "adlectio". *L'accès des hommes nouveaux au sénat romain sous le Haut-Empire*, RD LIII 1975, pp. 375–394.
- 1992: A. CHASTAGNOL, *Le Sénat romain à l'époque impériale. Recherches sur la composition de l'Assemblée et le statut de ses membres*, Paris 1992.
- CORIAT 1978: J.-P. CORIAT, *Les hommes nouveaux à l'époque des Sévères*, RD LVI 1978, pp. 5–27.
- DOBSON 1993: B. DOBSON, *The Roman Army: Wartime or Peacetime Army?*, in: D. BREEZE, B. DOBSON, *Roman Officers and Frontiers*, Stuttgart 1993, pp. 113–128.
- VON DOMASZEWSKI 1967: A. VON DOMASZEWSKI, *Die Rangordnung des römischen Heeres. Berichtigungen und Nachträge von Brian DOBSON*, Köln–Graz 1967.
- FAURE 2013: P. FAURE, *L'aigle et le cep: les centurions légionnaires dans l'Empire des Sévères*, vols. I–II, Bordeaux 2013.
- FIEBIGER 1903: O. FIEBINGER, *Dona militaria*, RE IX (1903), coll. 1528–1531.
- FITZ 1993–1995: J. FITZ, *Die Verwaltung Pannoniens in der Römerzeit*, vols. I–IV, Budapest 1993–1995.

- GIZEWSKI 2003: Ch. GIZEWSKI, *Candidatus*, *Brill's New Pauly. Antiquity II* (2003), col. 961.
- KIENAST 1990: D. KIENAST, *Römische Kaisertabelle. Grundzüge einer römischen Kaiserchronologie*, Darmstadt 1990.
- LEVICK 1967: B. LEVICK, *Imperial Control of the Elections under the Early Principate: Commendatio, Suffragatio, and "Nominatio"*, *Historia XVI* 1967, pp. 207–230.
- LEUNISSEN 1989: P.M.M. LEUNISSEN, *Konsuln und Konsulare in der Zeit von Commodus bis Severus Alexander (180–235 n. Chr.). Prosopographische Untersuchungen zur senatorischen Elite im römischen Kaiserreich*, Amsterdam 1989.
- 1993: P.M.M. LEUNISSEN, *Homines novi und Ergänzungen des Senats in der hohen Kaiserzeit. Zur Frage nach der Repräsentativität unserer Dokumentation*, in: W. Eck (ed.), *Prosopographie und Sozialgeschichte. Studien zur Methodik und Erkenntnismöglichkeit der kaiserzeitlichen Prosopographie*, Köln 1993, pp. 81–101.
- MAXFIELD 1972: V. MAXFIELD, *The Dona Militaria of the Roman Army*, Durham 1972.
- 1981: V. MAXFIELD, *The Military Decorations of the Roman Army*, London 1981.
- OKOŃ 2008: D. OKOŃ, *Consul designatus. Desygnacja na konsulat w okresie pryncypatu (30 r. p.n.e. – 235 r. n.e.)*, Szczecin 2008.
- 2016: D. OKOŃ, *Senatorial Cursus Honorum in the Period of the Republic and in the Early Empire. Selected Issues*, *Mnemon XVI* 2016, fasc. 2, pp. 97–118.
- 2017: D. OKOŃ, *Album senatorum*, vol. I: *Senatores ab Septimii Severi aetate usque ad Alexandrum Severum (193–235 AD)*, Szczecin 2017.
- 2018: D. OKOŃ, *Album senatorum*, vol. II: *Senators of the Severan Period (193–235 AD). A Prosopographic Study*, Szczecin 2018.
- PFLAUM 1960–1961: H.-G. PFLAUM, *Les carrières procuratoriennes équestres sous le Haut-Empire romain*, vols. I–III, Paris 1960–1961.
- 1978: H.-G. PFLAUM, *Les fastes de la province de Narbonnaise*, Paris 1978.
- ŞAHİN 1999: S. ŞAHİN, *Inchriften von Perge*, vol. I: *Vorrömische Zeit, frühe und hohe Kaiserzeit*, Bonn 1999 (Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien 54).
- THOMASSON 1984: B. THOMASSON, *Laterculi praesidum*, vol. I, Alröv 1984.
- 2009: B. THOMASSON, *Laterculi praesidum*, vol. I ex parte retractatum, Göteborg 2009.