

LEGIONARY LEGATES IN BRITAIN  
(WITH SOME REMARKS ON THE DIVISION OF THE PROVINCE)  
THE *CURSUS HONORUM* OF SENATORS AT THE TURN OF THE THIRD  
CENTURY AD IN THE LIGHT OF MODERN RESEARCH

by

DANUTA OKOŃ

**ABSTRACT:** At the turn of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century AD, there were three legions in Britain, commanded by senators. Their service in this position lasted for 2–3 years. Ten senators of the Severan period whose *cursus* featured the command of a legion in Britain have been identified. Five of them were *homines novi*, while five belonged to *gentes senatoriae*. They originated from Italy, Africa and the East (there were no representatives from the West). There is no clear single model for the career of a legionary legate in Britain, but we can say that it was an important function in the *cursus honorum*, giving people who held it good prospects for promotions (9 out of the 10 legates later became consuls). There were two provinces of Britain under the Severans: inferior (praetorian) with Legio VI victrix and superior (consular) with Legio II Augusta and XX Valeria victrix; the legate of Britannia inferior was not the legate of Legio VI victrix at the same time.

Professor Anthony Richard BIRLEY (1937–2020) devoted many years of his scholarly life to issues regarding the military and administrative history of Roman Britain<sup>1</sup>. Many of his works contain sections and even entire chapters devoted to prosopographical matters, including those relating to the commanders of legions in Britain<sup>2</sup>. During the period of the last Antonines and the Severan dynasty, this was the case with the following legions: II Augusta, VI victrix and XX Valeria victrix. His findings regarding the division of Britain into superior and inferior were also fundamental<sup>3</sup>. In this paper, I would like to present the results of my research, while emphasising the contribution of the Late Professor A.R. BIRLEY in the development of Roman prosopography.

---

<sup>1</sup> A list of his major works can be found e.g. at: <https://www.dur.ac.uk/research/directory/staff/?id=7643>; <https://followinghadrian.com/2020/12/22/in-memoriam-anthony-birley-1937-2020/>; <https://independent.academia.edu/anthonybirley>.

<sup>2</sup> See, for instance: A.R. BIRLEY 1964; 1971; 1980; 1981; 1982; 2002; 2005 and his numerous publications on Hadrian's Wall and Vindolanda.

<sup>3</sup> A.R. BIRLEY 2005: 333–336.

The basis for the analyses will be the classification of senatorial careers proposed by the present author in 2017<sup>4</sup>. It was based on the following factors: a given senator's initial social status (*ordo*), the moment of his adlection to the senatorial order (in the case of people from lower orders) and the number of praetorian offices held; they show the mechanisms behind the administrative promotion of the elite of the Roman Empire. A three-stage division of *cursus honorum* has been adopted: until the praetorship, after the praetorship, and after the consulship. Thus, knowing one stage of a senator's career, we can (given the knowledge about his social background) reconstruct the others and shed light on his prospects for promotion. Such a modern approach gives us a chance for further, successive development of prosopographical research.

The command of a legion was an office of the praetorian rank, therefore the above classification is most appropriate for the purposes of this study. Senators who commanded a legion had equestrian offices, senatorial offices, or both in their *cursus*. Some of them ended their careers with the consulship, and some with post-consular offices.

#### SENATORIAL CAREERS – CLASSIFICATION

The following classification of careers may be presented:

##### A. Senatorial:

- shortened (without offices of the praetorian rank),
- short (one office of the praetorian rank),
- standard (two to four offices of the praetorian rank),
- long (five and more offices of the praetorian rank).

##### B. Mixed (equestrian and senatorial offices).

##### C. Atypical (senatorial advancement at the consular level):

- *ornamenta consularia*,
- *adlectio inter consulares*.

Type A (senatorial) careers were characteristic of senators by birth and those who were adlected to the senatorial order prior to commencing an official senatorial career. Careers of type B (mixed) applied to equestrians promoted to the senate in the course of their *cursus*, while those of type C (atypical) characterised praetorian prefects and people of orders lower than the equestrian who were promoted to the senatorial order for special merits (specifically to the group of consulars).

In particular among senatorial careers without offices of the praetorian rank (shortened) or with one such office (short), we find many distinguishing features of prestige (*candidati Augusti*, *consules ordinarii*, members of prestigious religious colleges). These types of careers were typical of patricians and

---

<sup>4</sup> Polish version: Okoń 2017: 48; English version: Okoń 2018: 51.

representatives of influential *gentes senatoriae*. It should be noted that people who had shortened careers did not have to hold any offices of the praetorian rank before the consulship, while the *cursus* of those with short careers included one such office, of those with standard careers two to four offices, and of those with long careers five and more offices (the latter were primarily *homines novi*).

Holders of other types of careers (mixed and atypical), who were without exception *homines novi*, had to merit their promotion by having done long service, which made them experienced officials. For these categories, the very promotion to the senatorial order was a significant success. For the purposes of this paper, it is worth adding that receiving *dona militaria* at the stage of the military tribunate did not have a decisive effect on a further senatorial career<sup>5</sup>.

### THE LEGATESHIP OF A LEGION – GENERAL CONDITIONS

The senatorial legateship of a legion was a function of the praetorian rank and it was generally assumed before the age of 40<sup>6</sup>. In the preserved honorific inscriptions, it is rarely found immediately after the praetorship. A certain regularity can be noticed – as a rule, it was preceded by strictly administrative offices (e.g. curatorships of roads, town curatorships or juridicates), preparing senators for more responsible tasks. The legateship of a legion itself, in turn, was often an introduction to the position of legate of a (praetorian) province with military troops. The *cursus honorum* of a Roman senator was orderly in nature; the command of legions and the governorships of praetorian provinces offered good prospects for attaining the consulship – the most prestigious office of the republican origin.

It is worth paying attention to the preparation and military experience of legion commanders<sup>7</sup>. Those born in the senatorial order could previously serve in the army as *tribuni laticlavii*, while those born in the equestrian order could hold

---

<sup>5</sup> See OKOŃ 2020: 127–152. For more on the careers of the tribunes of this period, see the series of articles by OKOŃ 2019; 2020; 2021.

<sup>6</sup> The praetorship could be held at the age of 30 at the earliest (in the case of patricians and descendants of consuls) or later (in the case of senators of more modest origins).

<sup>7</sup> The question of whether the Roman army was commanded by dilettantes remains unresolved. Some researchers give a positive answer to this question (JONES 1970: 115; GAGÉ 1971: 87; SYME 1988: 31; DOBSON 1993: 113–128; CAMPBELL 1975: 17–24 and 2002: 152; ZIÓLKOWSKI 2009: 827–828, with reservations voiced by HANDY 2009: 194–195), depreciating the importance of the military tribunate in the preparation of legionary commanders and underlining the lack of military training, the appointment of people without military experience to senior command posts and the lack of a strictly military path of promotion in the Empire.

Their opponents, providing a negative answer to the question above (E. BIRLEY 1988; A.R. BIRLEY 2003: 1–18; LE BOHEC 2002: 37–38 and 2018: 53–65; FRÉZOULS 1995: 157–166), assume that every Roman from the social elite was best prepared to take up commanding functions by the mere fact of upbringing and home training, being taught by private teachers (e.g. former legionnaires as teachers of fencing) and adequate books (military treaties and diaries of commanders).

the following posts: *praefectus cohortis*, *tribunus angusticlavius*<sup>8</sup>, *praefectus alae quingenariae*, *praefectus alae milliariae* (as part of *tres/quattuor militiae*)<sup>9</sup>. Military service as a junior officer was optional for future legion commanders<sup>10</sup>. However, they had theoretical military knowledge taken from home, because learning tactics and strategy was part of the standard education of the Roman elites.

When appointing legionary legates, the following factors were taken into account: the reputation of the candidate, his origin (*gens*<sup>11</sup> and *origo*) and experience (*cursus honorum*). The following rules were followed: a legate was not sent to his home province<sup>12</sup>, nor was he entrusted with the command of a legion in which he had served as a tribune<sup>13</sup> and in which he would be remembered as an inexperienced junior officer<sup>14</sup>. The patronage of influential people played an

---

In my opinion, the problem should be viewed from a different perspective. When a threat emerged at the borders, the emperor sent *vexillationes* or *exercitus* to help the legions and their commanders. The *duces* and *praepositi* who commanded them were chosen from among the most talented members of the elite (of the praetorian or consular rank). It is also worth noting that the governors of the provinces on the Limes (often of the consular rank) were experienced officials, most of whom had held legionary commands in their earlier careers. As a matter of fact, the army was commanded by the best of the best with the widest possible competence and experience. This was enough to defend the borders of the Roman Empire in the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> century.

<sup>8</sup> Although this term is commonly used in the literature on the subject as a convenient designation of the status of an equestrian tribune, it should be emphasised that it appears only once in the sources from the period and that is in a literary text (Suet. *Otho* 10, about his father: “interfuit huic bello pater meus Suetonius Laetus, tertiae decimae legionis tribunus angusticlavius”). In inscriptions, the title of *tribunus militum angusticlavius* was simplified to *tribunus militum*, which causes significant problems of interpretation, since senatorial *tribuni militum laticlavii* often used the shortened version, namely also *tribunus militum*.

<sup>9</sup> See e.g. DEVIJVER 1992: 67.

<sup>10</sup> Out of 123 known tribunes of the Severan period, only 46 (39 *laticlavii* and 7 *angusticlavii*) later held higher military commands. See OKOŃ 2021.

<sup>11</sup> For the most important *gentes senatoriae* of this period and the careers of their representatives, see SETTIPANI 2000; MENNEN 2011.

<sup>12</sup> This rule applied to senators by birth. Promoted equestrians were sometimes appointed as legates in their homeland. In the Severan period these were: Ti. Claudius Subatianus Proculus (Numidia), M. Valerius Maximianus (Pannonia superior) and probably C. Iulius Avitus (Syria). For biographical entries with references to other works, see OKOŃ 2017, nos. 342, 1578, 563.

<sup>13</sup> Among the senators of the Severan period, the following were tribunes in Britain: C. Memmius Fidus Iulius Albius, [Rubrenus], P. Septimius Geta, Tib. Claudius Candidus, Ti. Claudius Subatianus Proculus. None came from Britain and neither did any of them return to Britain as a legionary legate. For biographical entries with references to other works see OKOŃ 2017, nos. 718, 876, 914, 291, 342.

<sup>14</sup> However, we know the names of commanders who took over an adjacent legion in the same province. In the Severan period these were: M. Fabius Magnus Valerianus (Moesia inferior), L. Iulius Apronius Maenius Pius Salamallianus (Pannonia inferior), L. Marius Perpetuus, *cos. suff. ante a.* 203 (Syria Coele), Q. Petronius Melior (Germania inferior). For biographical entries with references to other works see OKOŃ 2017, nos. 428, 557, 700, 796.

important role, but the final decision on the appointment, obviously, belonged to the emperor.

#### LEGIONARY LEGATES IN BRITAIN – RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND EVIDENCE

The research questions that I want to answer in this paper are as follows:

1. How many senators living in the Severan period with the legateship of a legion in Britain in their *cursus* do we know?
2. What was the initial *ordo* and *origo* of these legates?
3. What offices preceded their taking command of a legion?
4. What were the prospects of commanders of legions regarding further careers?

Answers to these questions will help to determine the number of legates, their status and the *cursus* from the legateship of a legion in Britain onwards. They will also shed light on the importance of this office in the senatorial *cursus honorum*.

We now know of 1,682 senators (certain and probable) of the Severan period, of whom approx. 10% have an attested full *cursus*. In the source material, we find 10 senators who were legates of legions in Britain at the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> and the beginning of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century (three with a full *cursus*, three with a *cursus* known from the praetorship and four with a fragmentary one – see tables 5, 6 and 7). These were: T. Marcus [C]le[mens?]<sup>15</sup>, [I]unius [...] [...]cus Gar[gilius] [Qui]ntil[i]an[us]<sup>16</sup>, L. Cestius Gallus Cerrinius Iustus Lutatius Natalis<sup>17</sup>, Q. Aurelius Polus Terentianus<sup>18</sup>, Ti. Claudius Paulinus<sup>19</sup>, L. Iulius Iulianus<sup>20</sup>,

---

<sup>15</sup> *PIR*<sup>2</sup> M 225; BARBIERI 1952, no. 791; A.R. BIRLEY 1981: 263 and 2005: 264; FITZ 1993–1995: 638, 644, 647, 652, 677–678; LEUNISSEN 1989: 329, 349; OKOŃ 2017, no. 1458.

<sup>16</sup> A.R. BIRLEY 2005: 261–262; GREGORI 1995: 269–279; OKOŃ 2017, no. 1434. A.R. BIRLEY doubted that this legate could be identified with Priscus, noting that the lacuna [...]cus could be supplemented with [Atti]cus, [Flac]cus, [Fus]cus, [Tus]cus, or [Urbi]cus. I fully agree with this opinion. He was the legate of Legio VI victrix, if the inscription *CIL* VI 41127 is supplemented with “leg(ato) leg(ionis) [VI victr(icis) pi]ae fidel(is)”. An important indication for such a supplement is that he later assumed the function of *praepositus vexillationum Britannicarum*.

<sup>17</sup> *PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 692; A.R. BIRLEY 1981, 258–259 and 2005: 259–260; CORBIER 1974: 280–283, no. 56; NAVARO 2004: 379–402; OKOŃ 2017, no. 1298.

<sup>18</sup> *PIR*<sup>2</sup> P 422; BARBIERI 1952, no. 415; A.R. BIRLEY 1981: 261–263 and 2005: 262–263; CHRISTOL, DREW-BEAR 1995 and 1998; OKOŃ 2017, no. 162.

<sup>19</sup> *PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 955; BARBIERI 1952, no. 164 and 999; A.R. BIRLEY 1981: 266 and 2005: 338, 342–344; KOVÁCS, PROHÁSZKA 2014: 131–137; LEUNISSEN 1984: 54–55, 271, 288, 304, 338, 396; PFLAUM 1948 (*passim*); OKOŃ 2017, no. 323.

<sup>20</sup> *PIR*<sup>2</sup> I 367; BARBIERI 1952, no. 297 and 1296; A.R. BIRLEY 1981, 265–266 and 2005: 266–267; OKOŃ 2017, no. 580.

L. Iunius Victorinus Fl. Caelianus<sup>21</sup>, Q. Antonius Isauricus<sup>22</sup>, L. Claudius Hieronymianus<sup>23</sup> and Priscus<sup>24</sup>.

The following legates are unquestionably attested: during the reign of the last Antonines, Q. Aurelius Polus Terentianus, Q. Antonius Isauricus, [I]unius [...] [...]cus Gar[gilius] [Qui]ntil[i]an[us] and Priscus; during the Severan period, Ti. Claudius Paulinus, L. Iulius Iulianus and L. Claudius Hieronymianus. It can be assumed that the latter group also included T. Marcius [C]le[mens?], L. Iunius Victorinus Fl. Caelianus and L. Cestius Gallus Cerrinius Iustus Lutatius Natalis.

Models of senatorial careers under the last Antonines and under the Severans do not show any significant differences; the dating of a given legateship does not affect my analysis. What is important is that all these legates belonged to the Severan senate.

Information about them can be found in various sources: inscriptions (from Britain or other provinces), historiographical and other literary works (Cassius Dio, Tertullian) and legal texts (Ulpianus, *Digesta*). Inscriptions of the following legates have survived in Britain (from the period of their service in this province): Ti. Claudius Paulinus<sup>25</sup>, L. Iulius Iulianus<sup>26</sup>, L. Iunius Victorinus Fl. Caelianus<sup>27</sup>, L. Claudius Hieronymianus<sup>28</sup> and Q. Antonius Isauricus<sup>29</sup>. In other

<sup>21</sup> *PIR*<sup>2</sup> I 848; BARBIERI 1952, no. 778; A.R. BIRLEY 1981, 253–254 and 2005: 263–264; OKOŃ 2017, no. 1440. In 1981 he was recognised by the British scholar as a legate from the time of the Antonines, and in 2005 he was already known as a legate from the time of the Antonines or the Severans. In my opinion, the later dating is determined by the typeface of the letters of the inscription indicating the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century, the mention of *vallum* (which points to the times after Hadrian and Antoninus Pius) and the probability that he is identical to Iunius Victorinus, *legatus pro praetore Germaniae inferioris* from the second half of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century. These premises allow me to assign Victorinus to the times of the Severans, or at least to assume that he remained in the senate during their reign.

<sup>22</sup> *PIR*<sup>2</sup> A 841; BARBIERI 1952, no. 646; A.R. BIRLEY 1981: 247 and 2005: 250–251; OKOŃ 2017, no. 1245. A.R. BIRLEY dated him to the times of Hadrian in 1981 and in 2005 he maintained his dating by consistently recognising the legate as Q. Antonius I[sa]u[ricus], *cos. suff. a. 143*. In my opinion, we are dealing with a descendant of this consul, and the typeface of his inscriptions, which is characteristic of the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century, convinces me of this.

<sup>23</sup> *PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 888; BARBIERI 1952, no. 157; A.R. BIRLEY 1981: 263–265 and 2005: 265; LEUNISSEN 1989: 159, 234, 340, 367; OKOŃ 2017, no. 308.

<sup>24</sup> *PIR*<sup>2</sup> P 958; BARBIERI 1952, no. 830; A.R. BIRLEY 1981: 260–261 and 2005: 260–261; LEUNISSEN 1989: 142, 203, 230, 273–274, 338, 346; OKOŃ 2017, no. 1508. A.R. BIRLEY (1981: 260), considered it possible to identify him with T. Caunius Priscus (*homo novus*), *legatus Augusti pro praetore (exercitus Africani)* and *cos. suff.* of the year 185 [P]riscus. His standpoint was accepted by LEUNISSEN (1989: 42). I reject the identification with Caunius due to the source information clearly indicating the origin of Priscus from an old *gens*.

<sup>25</sup> *EE* IX 1012 = *AE* 1903, 232 = *RIB* 311.

<sup>26</sup> *CIL* VII 480 = *RIB* 1138.

<sup>27</sup> *CIL* VII 940 = *RIB* 2034.

<sup>28</sup> *CIL* VII 240 = *ILS* 4384 = *RIB* 658.

<sup>29</sup> *CIL* VII 233 = *RIB* 644.

provinces, inscriptions attesting their service in Britain refer to: Q. Aurelius Polus Terentianus<sup>30</sup>, T. Marcius [C]le[mens?]<sup>31</sup>, L. Iulius Iulianus<sup>32</sup>, [I]unius [...] [...]cus Gar[gilius] [Qui]ntil[i]an[us]<sup>33</sup> and L. Cestius Gallus Cerrinius Iustus Lutatius Natalis<sup>34</sup>. Historiographical and other literary sources mention L. Claudius Hieronymianus<sup>35</sup> and Priscus<sup>36</sup>, while in legal texts we find L. Iulius Iulianus<sup>37</sup> and L. Claudius Hieronymianus<sup>38</sup>.

In a comparable period and from a similar province (limes, the western part of the Empire, three legions), namely Pannonia superior, we also know of 10 legionary legates during the Severan period<sup>39</sup>. The degree of identification is therefore the same. The rank of the office is important for the representativeness of the material; the higher the rank, the more numerous the sources (especially epigraphic ones). Thus, it is not surprising that the level of identification is lower in the group of legates, and higher, for example, in the group of ordinary consuls or proconsuls from Asia or Africa.

#### THE *ORDO* AND *ORIGO* OF KNOWN LEGATES – THE TABLES<sup>40</sup>

The list of known legionary legates in Britain, taking into account their territorial and social origin and the dating of their future consulship, is as follows<sup>41</sup>:

<sup>30</sup> *AE* 1965, 240.

<sup>31</sup> *CIL* XIV 3595 = *Inscr. It.* IV 1, 110 and add. p. 210.

<sup>32</sup> *CIL* XI 14182 = *SupplIt* XIX 2002, pp. 53–54.

<sup>33</sup> *AE* 1995, 231 = *CIL* VI 41127.

<sup>34</sup> *CIL* X 3722.

<sup>35</sup> Tert. *Ad Scapulam* 3.

<sup>36</sup> Cass. Dio LXXII 9, 2a.

<sup>37</sup> *Dig.* XLVIII 21, 2; fr. Vat. 119 (*Ulpiani lib. 2 de officio proconsulis*).

<sup>38</sup> *Dig.* XXXIII 7, 12.

<sup>39</sup> Legio X gemina: P. Iulius Geminus Marcianus, *cos. suff. ca a.* 165–167 (senator under Septimius Severus), P. Claudius Pallas Honorat(us vel -ianus) Repentinus, M. Gavius Crispus Num[isi]us Junior, *cos. suff. ante a.* 200, C. Luxilius Sabinus Egnatius Proculus, Anonymus, *proconsul Cypri, cos. suff. sub Severis?* Legio I adiutrix: L. Aurelius Gallus, *cos. ord. a.* 198, Cl(audius) Piso, L. Iulius Apronius Maenius Pius Salamallianus, *cos. suff. a.* 226 aut 227, P. Flavianus Paulinus, M. Valerius Maximianus, *cos. suff. ca a.* 185. Legio XIV gemina: no data. Six out of the ten legates (60%) subsequently became consuls. For biographical entries with references to other works, see OKOŃ 2017, nos. 1415, 320, 522, 657, 1630, 158, 324, 557, 1386, 1578.

<sup>40</sup> The abbreviations HN and GS used in the tables mean, respectively: HN – *homo novus*, GS – a representative of *gens senatoria*. When written with question marks, these abbreviations indicate that affiliation to a given category is likely but not certain. My doubts are presented in the text.

<sup>41</sup> An older listing of the legates of Britain can be found in the Legio entry by E. RITTERLING in *RE* (XII 1924, coll. 1464, 1610–1611, 1778). More recent listings reflecting the current state of research are best taken from A.R. BIRLEY 2005: 231–268 and 337–371.

Table 1: II Augusta (Caerleon, Isca Silurum)

Nomen	Ordo	Origo
Q. Aurelius Polus Terentianus, cos. suff. ante a. 192	HN?	Africa
Ti. Claudius Paulinus, cos. suff. post a. 220	GS	East
T. Marcus [C]le[mens?]	GS?	Italy
L. Iulius Iulianus, cos. suff. sub Antonino ( <i>Caracalla</i> )	HN?	Italy

Table 2: VI victrix (Eboracum)

Nomen	Ordo	Origo
L. Iunius Victorinus Fl. Caelianus / Iunius Victorinus, cos. suff. in parte posteriore saec. II	HN?	?
L. Claudius Hieronymianus, cos. suff. saec. II/III.	HN?	?
[I]unius [...] [...]cus Gar[gilius] [Qui]ntil[i]an[us], cos. suff. sub Commodo?	HN?	Africa
Q. Antonius Isauricus, cos?	GS?	?

Table 3: XX Valeria victrix (Deva)

Nomen	Ordo	Origo
L. Cestius Gallus Cerrinius Iustus Lutatius Natalis, cos. suff. saec. II/III	GS?	Italy

Table 4: No legionary designation specified

Nomen	Ordo	Origo
Priscus, cos. sub Commodo?	GS?	?

Out of the above-mentioned legates, nine were assigned to a specific legion: four each to the legions of II Augusta and VI victrix and one to the legion of XX Valeria victrix. In the case of Priscus, we do not know which legion he commanded.

The lists of their *ordo* and *origo* tentatively make it possible to note that the legates do not share a common denominator – they neither came from one social group (five representatives of *gentes senatoriae* and five *homines novi*) nor from one region (but from three: Italy, Africa and the East, excluding the West). Representatives of *gentes senatoriae* from Italy appear twice in the entire group, and *homines novi* from Africa also appear twice. There is also no appointment

scheme in one legion. However, there is a noticeably high number of future consuls.

***Ordo: gentes senatoriae***

The basis for the assignment of legionary legates to this group is as follows: descent from a senatorial family (known ancestors), offices characteristic of the old *gentes* (*tribunus laticlavus*, *ab actis senatus*, *aedilis curulis*) and *commendatio Augusti* to the office. In doubtful cases, a step-by-step analysis and the determination of the number of praetorian offices may help.

Descent from senatorial families may be assumed in the case of five legates:

1. Ti. Claudius Paulinus, the grandson of a homonymous consul from Kibyra<sup>42</sup>. His known *cursus* contains four praetorian functions (*legatus legionis II Augustae*, *proconsul provinciae Narbonensis*, *legatus Augusti pro praetore provinciae Lugdunensis*, *legatus Augusti pro praetore Britanniae*)<sup>43</sup>. This is the standard career for representatives of *gentes senatoriae*. None of the inscriptions explicitly state in which province of Britain he was a legate. The one mention of Legio VI (*ad legionem sext[am] adsedit*)<sup>44</sup> suggests that he administered Britannia inferior. The lack of the term *consularis* allows us to assume that this province was praetorian.
2. T. Marcius [C]le[mens?], in my opinion a member of *gens senatoria*, as indicated by characteristic elements of his *cursus*, typical of descendants of senatorial families: *sacerdos fetialis*, *ab actis senatus*, *aedilis curulis*, *praetor candidatus*<sup>45</sup>. The Marcii had many representatives in the senate of the Severan period<sup>46</sup>, but it is difficult to determine which branch of the family Clemens belonged to.
3. Q. Antonius Isauricus, a senator by descent, probably the son of a homonymous consul from the time of Hadrian<sup>47</sup>.
4. L. Cestius Gallus Cerrinius Iustus Lutatius Natalis, in my opinion a member of *gens senatoria*, as indicated by the offices he held, namely *III vir viarum curandarum*, *tribunus laticlavus legionis VIII Augustae*, *quaestor urbanus*, *ab actis senatus*, *aedilis curulis*. He was also *patronus coloniae*

---

<sup>42</sup> On Paulinus' grandfather, see Groag, *PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 954; BARBIERI 1952, no. 163; HALFMANN 1979: 193–194, no. 122 and 1982: 635; LEUNISSEN 1989: 196; OKOŃ 2017, no. 322; RAEPSAET-CHARLIER 1989, no. 245 and stemma no. XV.

<sup>43</sup> *CIL* XIII 3162; *RIB* 311 and 1280.

<sup>44</sup> *CIL* XIII 3162.

<sup>45</sup> *CIL* XIV 3595 = *Inscr. It.* IV 1, 110 and add. p. 210.

<sup>46</sup> For instance Marcius, a son of M. Marcius Bietis Glaucus, and numerous representatives of the family of Marcii Faustianiani Maximilliani.

<sup>47</sup> For problems with the identification and temporal location of Q. Antonius Isauricus, see note 22 above.

*Volturni, patronus rei publice Superaequanorum*<sup>48</sup>, which proves his high position in local Italian communities. A cousin of L. Cestius L. f. Pomptin. Gallus Varenianus Lutatius Natalis Aemilianus, a patron of the island of Gaulus. It is possible that he was a distant descendant of *cos. suff.* of the year 42, L. Cestius Gallus<sup>49</sup>.

5. Priscus, in my opinion, came from a senatorial family, as evidenced by being proclaimed an emperor against Commodus, the son of Marcus Aurelius<sup>50</sup>. It must be assumed that the Priscus family was equally prestigious, as imperial proclamations of *homines novi* (P. Helvius Pertinax) or of people of lower orders (M. Opellius Macrinus, C. Iulius Maximinus) are characteristic of a period of dynastic crisis that followed the extinction of the ruling dynasty.

His *nomen* could have had the following wording: Iulius Rufinus Laberius Fabianus Pomponius Triarius Erucius Clarus Sosius Priscus, Neratius Priscus, Pompeius Falco Sosius (Priscus), Virius Egnatius Sulpicius Priscus, Valerius Priscus or Iulius Scapula Priscus. We cannot reject any of the proposals for identification, although in my opinion the events following the death of Commodus indicate that Pompeius Falco Sosius Priscus, coming from the family of Emperor Verus (through his mother), had imperial ambitions<sup>51</sup>.

An additional premise for the legates listed above to have belonged to *gentes senatoriae* is their *cursus honorum* (all of them following a type A, standard career) – none of them had more than four praetorian rank offices after the praetorship, a pattern which was characteristic of *homines novi* (see below). The number of praetorian offices in this group indicates that there were no patricians in it.

### ***Ordo: homines novi***

In the case of *homines novi* the situation is more complicated. Such people used to conceal their humble descent, not mentioning equestrian offices in inscriptions. Therefore, assignment to this group is based on the following premises: lack of known senatorial ancestors, absence of obligatory senatorial offices in their *cursus*, which suggests that they were adlected to the senate, and a large number of praetorian rank offices (five and more).

Bearing in mind the above-listed premises, I consider the next five legates to be *homines novi*:

---

<sup>48</sup> CIL X 3722.

<sup>49</sup> PIR<sup>2</sup> C 691.

<sup>50</sup> See note 24 above.

<sup>51</sup> See Okoń 2008 and 2014.

1. Q. Aurelius Polus Terentianus. According to A.R. BIRLEY, the office of *fetialis* held by Terentianus indicates his descent from the old senatorial aristocracy<sup>52</sup>. I do not agree with this statement, as in the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> centuries this office was also held by *homines novi*, e.g. [Catus Lepi]dus<sup>53</sup>, Ti. Claudius Gordianus<sup>54</sup>, L. Marius Maximus Perpetuus Aurelianus<sup>55</sup>, P. Septimius Geta<sup>56</sup>. Terentianus' senatorial career is well known to us, but only after the praetorship. The praetorship is not mentioned in his *cursus*, which suggests his earlier *adlectio inter praetorios*<sup>57</sup>. At the praetorian stage, he held two offices (two legionary legateships). The number of offices suggests a very good background, typical of representatives of *gentes senatoriae*. However, there are no representatives of his family in the senate of the Antonine/Severan period, which rules out such an option. Taking these data into account, I consider Terentianus to be a *homo novus*<sup>58</sup>, a senator promoted to the senatorial order after a long equestrian career, i.e. when he was older than the standard age, which explains the smaller number of offices at the praetorian level, before the consulship.
2. L. Iulius Iulianus. We only have information about his career from the praetorship, which, as in the case of the preceding senator, suggests adlection from a lower order (e.g. at the level of aedilate/tribunate). In addition, Iulianus held as many as five praetorian offices (a long career), which was characteristic of *homo novus*. As can be seen, he was promoted at a relatively young age (younger than Terentianus), hence his *cursus* featured many praetorian offices.  
Both his *gentilicum* and *cognomen* were popular throughout the Empire in various social classes, and therefore they are not helpful in the identification of the family.
3. L. Iunius Victorinus Fl. Caelianus. We only have fragmentary information about his career. I assume his identity to be that of the consular

---

<sup>52</sup> A.R. BIRLEY 1969: 252, 263, 267–268.

<sup>53</sup> BARBIERI 1952, no. 1990; DIETZ 1980: 122–123; LEUNISSEN 1989: 158–159, 374; MENNEN 2011: 93–95; OKOŃ 2017, no. 260; RÜPKE 2008: 399–436.

<sup>54</sup> *PIR*<sup>3</sup> C 880; BARBIERI 1952, no. 695; CORBIER 1974: 296–301, no. 59; LEUNISSEN 1989: 62, 70, 87, 144, n. 274, 302, 321, 342, 367, 391; RAEPSAET-CHARLIER 1989: 372; OKOŃ 2017, no. 304; RÜPKE 2008: 390–436.

<sup>55</sup> *PIR*<sup>3</sup> M 30; BARBIERI 1952, no. 356 and 1100; LEUNISSEN 1989: 13, 31, 48, 50–51, 93, 97, 105, 113–115, 136–137, 158–159, 162, 217–218, 224–225, 243, 245, 263, 284, 310, 327, 336, 347–348, 362, 374, 382; MENNEN 2011: 109–112; OKOŃ 2017, no. 699; RÜPKE 2008: 399–447, 1141.

<sup>56</sup> *PIR*<sup>3</sup> S 453; BARBIERI 1952, no. 469; LEUNISSEN 1989: 55, 57, 59, 65–66, 96, 113, 134, 143–144, 198, 211, 237, 250, 254, 270, 289, 305, 335, 361, 363, 387, 399; OKOŃ 2017, no. 914; RÜPKE 2008: 374–415.

<sup>57</sup> This topic was discussed previously by ALFÖLDY 1967, no. 53.

<sup>58</sup> Similarly CHRISTOL, DREW-BEAR 1995.

legate of Lower Germania Iunius Victorinus (*CIL* XIII 6638). In my opinion, this identification is determined by the same *nomen* and *cognomen*, the coincidence of the timing and his offices related to the military. Assuming this identification to be correct, we would know three posts held by Victorinus: the legateship of a legion in Britain, a suffect consulship, and a legateship in Germania. Since the governorship of a consular province with legions was assigned to experienced officials, we can suspect that Victorinus had a long career and demonstrated the appropriate level of skills.

Experience was acquired through many years of service; patricians and other representatives of the old *gentes senatoriae* had fewer offices in their *cursus* (which resulted in less experience), hence the suggestion that Victorinus belonged to the group of *homines novi*. As in the case of Iulius Iulianus, his *gentilicum* and *cognomen* were popular throughout the Empire, but in the Antonine/Severan senate neither the Iunii Victorini nor the Flavii Caeliani were attested.

If the above identification were to be rejected, we would only know Victorinus' one post, namely the legateship of a legion in Britain.

4. L. Claudius Hieronymianus. We only have fragmentary knowledge of his career; two of his offices included the legateship of a legion in Britain and, subsequently, the consular governorship of Cappadocia, which allows us to add a suffect consulship to his *cursus*. We know that he was hostile to Christians due to his wife's conversion, but this information is not a clue as to his social background<sup>59</sup>. What may be more important is the fact that Hieronymianus founded a temple to Sarapis in York. This shows his considerable wealth. The absence of senators with the distinctive *cognomen* Hieronymianus in previous generations allows us to assume that he was a *homo novus*. The second premise is the proconsular governorship he held. As in the case of Victorinus, we can suspect that he had a long career behind him, characteristic of *homines novi*.
5. [I]unius [...] [...]cus Gar[gilius] [Qui]ntil[i]an[us]. He started as *III vir capitalis* (at 18–20 years of age), and this office was usually held by newly promoted senators; moreover, on his way to the consulship, he held six praetorian posts, including four military ones (including *praepositus vexillationum* [*legionum trium Brita]nnicarum!*). Such a career was not characteristic of representatives of old *gentes senatoriae* and on this basis we can assume that we are dealing here with a new senator. He was probably the first representative of the Gargilii in the senate.

---

<sup>59</sup> Tert. *Ad Scapulam* 3 (Claudius Lucius Hieronymianus). In the *Digesta* (Ulpian. *Dig.* XXXIII 7, 12) he is featured as *clarissimus vir*, to whom Umbrius Primus left his house.

The above analyses have allowed us to determine the social origins of all the known legates of the legions. The identification was multi-factored, which provides a basis for drawing well-founded conclusions. It should again be emphasised that there is no discernible relationship between social origin (*homines novi*, *gentes senatoriae*) and holding the post of a legionary legate.

### *Origo*

When analysing the territorial origin of the legates, we find that they included: three representatives from Italy<sup>60</sup>, two representatives from Africa<sup>61</sup> and one from the East<sup>62</sup>, while the *origo* of the others is unknown.

It is worth noting that none of the legates came from the western provinces, which may be the result of the support offered by the western provinces to Clodius Albinus and the repression that these regions suffered after the victory of Septimius Severus. There are no senators from Britain in this group, although they could theoretically take office in a neighbouring province of Britain (from Britannia inferior in Britannia superior and vice versa).

After looking at the problems of the social and territorial origin of legionary legates in Britain, we can conclude that there is no characteristic type prevailing in this group. The phenomenon of mixing personnel both in terms of geography and social origin can be clearly observed.

### *CURSUS HONORUM*

We know the careers of legionary legates in Britain to varying degrees:

- fully in three instances: T. Marcius [C]le[mens?], [I]unius [...] [...]cus Gar[gilius] [Qui]ntil[i]an[us], L. Cestius Gallus Cerrinius Iustus Lutatius Natalis,
- partially in three instances: Q. Aurelius Polus Terentianus, Ti. Claudius Paulinus, L. Iulius Iulianus,
- fragmentarily in four instances: L. Iunius Victorinus Fl. Caelianus, Q. Antonius Isauricus, L. Claudius Hieronymianus, [P]riscus.

The available data are presented in the career tables below<sup>63</sup>:

---

<sup>60</sup> T. Marcius [C]le[mens?], L. Iulius Iulianus, L. Cestius Gallus Cerrinius Iustus Lutatius Natalis.

<sup>61</sup> Q. Aurelius Polus Terentianus, [I]unius [...] [...]cus Gar[gilius] [Qui]ntil[i]an[us].

<sup>62</sup> Ti. Claudius Paulinus.

<sup>63</sup> The names of people belonging to *gentes senatoriae* are marked with bold type. The tables contain religious offices which, although important, were not of an administrative nature and did not belong to the standard *cursus honorum*. For this reason, they were not included in my analyses.

Table 5: Full careers

No	Nomen	Cursus up until the praetorship	Cursus after the praetorship	Cursus after the consulship
1)	<b>T. Marcius</b> [C]le[mens?]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• sacerdos fetialis</li> <li>• tribunus militum legionis XIV</li> <li>• quaestor pro praetore provinciae Achaiae</li> <li>• ab actis senatus</li> <li>• aedilis curulis</li> <li>• praetor candidatus</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• curator viae Latinae</li> <li>• <u>legatus legionis II Augustae</u></li> </ul>	
2)	[I]unius [...] [...]cus Gar[gilius] [Qui]ntil[i]an[us]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• triumvir capitalis</li> <li>• quaestor</li> <li>• [tribunus plebis?]</li> <li>• praetor</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• iuridicus per Aemiliam [et Liguri?]am</li> <li>• curator rei publicae Cirtensium</li> <li>• <u>legatus legionis [VI pi]ae fidelis</u></li> <li>• legatus legionis V Macedoniae</li> <li>• praepositus vexillationum [legionum trium Brita?]nnicarum</li> <li>• legatus Augusti pro praetore legionis II I[talicae]</li> <li>• sodalis Titialis Flavialis</li> <li>• cos. suff. sub Commodo?</li> </ul>	
3)	<b>L. Cestius Gallus Cerrinius Iustus Lutatius Natalis</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IIII vir viarum curandarum</li> <li>• tribunus militum laticlavus legionis VIII Augustae</li> <li>• quaestor urbanus</li> <li>• ab actis senatus</li> <li>• aedilis curulis</li> <li>• praetor</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>legatus Augustorum legionis XX Valeriae victricis</u></li> <li>• proconsul provinciae Narbonensis</li> <li>• praefectus aerarii Saturni</li> <li>• cos. suff. saec. II/III</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• patronus coloniae Volturini</li> <li>• patronus rei publicae Superaequantorum</li> </ul>

Table 6: Partially known careers

No	Nomen	Cursus up until the praetorship	Cursus after the praetorship	Cursus after the consulship
1)	Q. Aurelius Polus Terentianus		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• fetialis</li> <li>• legatus legionis XXII primigeniae p. f.</li> <li>• <u>legatus legionis II Augustae</u></li> <li>• cos. suff. ante a. 192</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• consularis III Daciarum</li> <li>• proconsul Asiae</li> </ul>

2)	<b>Ti. Claudius Paulinus</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>legatus legionis II Augustae</u></li> <li>• proconsul provinciae Narbonensis</li> <li>• legatus Augusti pro praetore provinciae Lugdunensis</li> <li>• legatus Augusti pro praetore Britanniae (inferioris?)</li> <li>• cos. suff. post a. 220</li> </ul>	
3)	L. Iulius Iulianus	• praetor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• curator civitatis Interamnatium Nartium</li> <li>• praefectus Miniciae</li> <li>• proconsul provinciae Achaiae</li> <li>• <u>legatus legionis II Augustae</u></li> <li>• legatus Augusti pro praetore provinciae Aquitaniae</li> <li>• cos. suff. sub Antonino (Caracalla)</li> </ul>	

Table 7: Fragmentarily known careers

No	Nomen	Cursus up until the praetorship	Cursus after the praetorship	Cursus after the consulship
1)	L. Iunius Victorinus Fl(avius) Caelianus		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>legatus Augusti legionis VI victricis piae fidelis</u></li> <li>• cos. suff. sub Commodus?</li> </ul>	• legatus pro praetore Germaniae inferioris
2)	<b>Q. Antonius Isauricus</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>legatus Augusti legionis VI victricis</u></li> <li>• cos. sub Commodus?</li> </ul>	
3)	Claudius Hieronymianus		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>legatus legionis VI victricis</u></li> <li>• cos. suff. saec. II/III</li> </ul>	• praeses Cappadociae
4)	<b>Priscus</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>legatus legionis in Britannia</u></li> <li>• cos. suff. sub Commodus?</li> </ul>	

Legionary legates in Britain descending from *gentes senatoriae* held non-obligatory offices such as *tribunus militum*, *vigintivir*, *ab actis senatus* and religious functions (*sacerdos fetialis*) until they reached the stage of the praetorship. This approach probably translated into their appointment to obligatory offices (*quaestor*, *tribunus plebis/aedilis*, *praetor*), including those of a particularly honorary nature – *aedilis curulis*, *praetor candidatus*. After the praetorship, they held two to four offices, after which they assumed the suffect consulship (except for T. Marcius Clemens, who probably died earlier). Apart from legionary commands, the following were among the offices of the praetorian rank: curatorship of roads, prefecture of the treasury and governorships of provinces (which followed the legateship of a legion). Legates from this group can be classified as

senatorial type A (according to my classification outlined at the beginning of this paper) with a standard career (two to four praetorian rank offices). This type (due to the experience gained) offered a chance for a further proconsular career; although much depended, obviously, on the will of the person concerned. In the case of the aforementioned legates, we know that after the consulship they were patrons of cities and legates of provinces with legionary troops. Thus, they constituted both a local and a general imperial elite.

In the case of legionary legates who were *homines novi*, the important factor was the moment of their adlection to the senatorial order. Up until their praetorship, people promoted before the age of 18 had held strictly senatorial offices, both compulsory (*quaestor, tribunus plebis/aedilis plebis, praetor*) and non-obligatory, less prestigious ones (*triumvir capitalis*). Their careers after the praetorship were characterised by a large number of offices of this rank (five to six), so in the career classification they can be classified as senatorial type A with a long career.

Those promoted to the senatorial order at a later age had shorter or longer equestrian careers. This is type B (according to my classification), with equestrian and senatorial offices. In this group, we observe a certain pattern – that people with a longer equestrian career held fewer praetorian rank offices, as opposed to those with a shorter career. In the tables above, this pattern is illustrated by the careers of two senators who were *homines novi*: Q. Aurelius Polus Terentianus held only two offices of the praetorian rank (so we can assume that he had a long equestrian career), while L. Iulius Iulianus held as many as five offices of this rank (so his equestrian career was probably shorter). Thus, the length of the praetorian career of *homines novi* was affected by the moment of their adlection and the length of their earlier equestrian *cursus*.

After the praetorship, legates from the group of *homines novi* held various offices: legionary commands, juridicates, town curatorships, *praepositio vexillationum*, governorships of provinces, prefectures of the treasury and religious offices (*sodalis Titialis Flavialis, fetialis*). It sometimes happened that the legionary legateship was preceded by a legateship of a senatorial province without legions (L. Iulius Iulianus)<sup>64</sup>.

Careers of *homines novi*, regardless of the type (A or B), owing to the experience gained from holding many functions, offered a chance for consulship and proconsular offices. Among the latter we find provincial governorships with or without legions (the prestigious proconsulship of Asia in the case of Q. Aurelius Polus Terentianus). However, there are no patrons of cities among this group.

---

<sup>64</sup> As a rule, the legateship of a legion preceded provincial legateships, but in the case of a senatorial province without legionary troops its governorship could be held before the legateship of a legion.

It is worth noting the position of the legionary legateship in Britain in the senatorial *cursus honorum* (both among the representatives of *gentes senatoriae* and *homines novi*). This office occurs twice immediately after the praetorship. In other cases, it is preceded by the curatorship of roads, town curatorship, the legateship of another legion and the provincial proconsulship. Provincial governorships immediately follow the legateship of a legion in Britain in three instances, consulship follows once and the legateship of another legion also once. Thus, the legionary command occurs in these people's *cursus honorum* at various positions (from the first one after the praetorship to the fourth one), which corresponds to the diversity of their careers.

Regardless of the model and duration of their careers, the legates of legions in Britain finally reached the (suffect) consulship. It was awarded to 9 out of 10 legates (90%).

T. Marcius Clemens, the only one who did not become a consul, is known from a commemorative inscription issued by his wife, so probably the lack of consular promotion was related to the premature death of this senator. It should be mentioned that in the Severan period, due to the growth of the senate, only about 25% of senators could count on a consulship<sup>65</sup>. The number of consuls among the known legionary legates in Britain was 90%, while for Pannonia superior this figure was 60% (see note 39 above). However, it must be taken into account that legionary legates most often received honorary inscriptions when there was a reason – that is, when they were awarded the consulship or were appointed to it. Some legates might have not obtained it, and in some cases inscriptions detailing the *cursus* might have not survived, hence these legates remain anonymous to us.

#### SUMMARY – ANSWERS TO RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Among the 10 legionary legates in Britain four held this office during the reign of the last Antonines, while six did so under the Severans. In this group, the representatives of *gentes senatoriae* and *homines novi* are equally represented (5: 5), while in terms of their home territory we lack legates from the western provinces when compared to other regions of the Empire.

The careers of legionary legates belonged to the senatorial type A (standard and long) and B (mixed). I also found that the legateship of a legion was held immediately after the praetorship only twice, while in other cases it was preceded by other offices. Offices held after the legateship were also quite varied.

Among the 10 legates known to us, there are no patricians, ordinary consuls or imperial *comites* and *amici*. Nobody was awarded *dona militaria* (as far as we know). Most legates of legions in Britain had no powerful relatives, so they

---

<sup>65</sup> See Okoń 2018: 95–96.

had to rely more on their own skills than on favouritism. By showing their merit, they achieved (suffect) consulship and post-consular offices, and the legateship in Britain seems to have been an important and likely office from this perspective.

### REJECTED CASES

In the sources and literature on the subject, there are two people who should be considered as potential legionary legates: T. Floridius Natalis<sup>66</sup> and Heraclitus<sup>67</sup>. Sources do not mention them as legion commanders explicitly, but they attribute to them certain military tasks, which causes disputes among scholars as to their actual function in Britain.

#### T. Floridius Natalis

He is known from a dedicatory inscription in the temple in Ribchester (*Bremetennacum*)<sup>68</sup>. He was considered a legionary legate by, among others, BARBIERI (1952, no. 2027) and GROAG (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> F 455; both based on *CIL* VII 222) and as *praepositus legionis* by J. COWEY in *EDH*. A.R. BIRLEY<sup>69</sup> opposed their opinion, recognising Natalis as a centurion (according to the *RIB* reading), and a superior of a *numeri* at the same time, and not as a legionary legate. The inscription is severely damaged, which allows for various interpretations, as the mark considered to be the centurionate symbol may well be the result of a broken plate. In this inscription (from the time of Alexander Severus) Natalis appears together with the provincial legate Valerius Crescens Fulvianus; the inscription emphasises his high financial status: “templum a solo ex responsu [dei re]stituit et dedicavit d[e suo]”. The inscription lacks a reference to a legionary legate, and Natalis certainly did not hold this post (he is not referred to as a *le-*

<sup>66</sup> *PIR*<sup>2</sup> F 455; BARBIERI 1952, no. 2027; BIRLEY 2005: 351 (a note on Valerius Crescens Fulvianus); OKOŃ 2017, no. 493.

<sup>67</sup> *PIR*<sup>2</sup> H 88; BARBIERI 1952, no. 269; BIRLEY 1981: 295–296, 419; OKOŃ 2017, no. 541.

<sup>68</sup> Two readings of this inscription are most commonly accepted today:

1. *EDH* reading HD069856: [--- p]ro/[sa]l(ute) im[p(eratoris) Caes(aris)] [[[A]l]ex[andri]]] [Aug(usti) N(ostri) et]/[Iul(iae) Mamaeae ma]t[r]is D(omini) N(ostri) et castr(orum) su[b cura] Val(eri) Crescentis Fulviani leg(ati) eius pr[o prae(tore)]/T(itus) Florid(ius) Natalis leg(ionis) praep(ositus) n(umeri) et regi[onis]/templum a solo ex responsu [dei re]stituit et dedicavit d[e suo].

2. *RIB* 587 reading: [... p]ro [sa]l(ute) im[p(eratoris) Caes(aris)] [[[A]l]ex[andri]]] [Aug(usti) N(ostri) et]/[Iul(iae) Mamaeae ma]t[r]is D(omini) N(ostri) et castr(orum) su[b cura] Val(eri) Crescentis Fulviani leg(ati) eius pr[o prae(tore)] T(itus) Florid(ius) Natalis (centurio) leg(ionis) praep(ositus) n(umeri) et regi[onis]/templum a solo ex responsu [dei re]stituit et dedicavit d[e suo].

Both versions differ in terms of the rank of Natalis: in *EDH* he is *praepositus* (an *eques*), and in *RIB* he is a *centurio* (a person of an order lower than the equestrian one). So he is assigned a higher rank by *EDH*. In the older version of *CIL* VII 222, Floridius was considered a legionary legate (a senator), which in my opinion is not correct.

<sup>69</sup> BIRLEY 2005: 351. In his earlier *The Fasti of Roman Britain* (1981), Floridius is not found. See also FAURE 2013: 766–767: (centurio) leg(ionis) praep(ositus) n(umeri) et regi[onis].

*gatus legionis*); it should be assumed that if he had held this function he would not have failed to boast about it.

In my opinion, the words “leg. praep. n. et regi[...]” should be read as *leg(atus) praep(ositus) n(umeri) et regi[onis]*. It is an unusual titlature which, I think, describes someone with a status lower than that of a legionary legate. It should be emphasised that *numeri* troops were often commanded by *praepositi* (of the equestrian order)<sup>70</sup>. Perhaps the addition of *legatus* was to emphasise the special status of Natalis, sent to *numerus* from a legion and commanding combined units of a different ethnic character (remarkably, there is no indication of the ethnic composition of the *numerus* commanded by him). Natalis’ career, apart from this single function, is not known to us, so one has to be careful when making judgments. It should only be added that Ribchester was the headquarters of auxiliary troops, namely the Sarmatians and Iazyges, and it is highly probable that the rebuilt temple was intended for “non-Roman” subjects. In this situation, Natalis could have been an *eques* (a former centurion?), whose financial resources allowed for the reconstruction of the temple. It is worth adding that we do not find any members of the *gens Floridia* in the senate of imperial Rome; the *nomen* occurred especially in Gaul, but in lower social orders than the senatorial one.

### Heraclitus

The other controversial figure, Heraclitus, is known from the *Historia Augusta* as a man sent by Septimius Severus in 193 to take Britain (*HA Sept. Sev.* 6, 10)<sup>71</sup> or Bithynia (*HA Nigr.* 5, 2)<sup>72</sup> from the hands of his opponents. The first of these options is, in my opinion, correct, while the second is, from the historical point of view, unlikely<sup>73</sup>. For the purposes of this article, I will therefore only consider the issue of sending Heraclitus to Britain, and in particular the nature of his mission.

It is worth recalling that A.R. BIRLEY saw him as an equestrian of procuratorial rank who carried letters from Severus to Albinus, the governor of Britain (and back)<sup>74</sup>. I do not exclude this possibility. Taking into account the fact that three years later an inscription (*IGR* III 1107) attests Heraclitus, a senatorial

---

<sup>70</sup> Epigraphic texts also include: *tribunus numeri, praefectus numeri, curator numeri*.

<sup>71</sup> “...sed eos ipsos pertimescens de quibus recte iudicabat, Heraclitum ad obtinendas Britannias [...] misit”.

<sup>72</sup> “Sane Severus Heraclitum ad obtinendam Bithyniam misit”.

<sup>73</sup> The entire East was controlled by counter-emperor Niger, so it is unlikely that emperor Septimius Severus would send someone with a mission to take over one of the eastern provinces. In the year 193, Severus sent his troops to the East, led by Fabius Cilo and Claudius Candidus. Severus’ army seized Bithynia only after they were victorious at the battle of Kyzikos (end of 193).

<sup>74</sup> A.R. BIRLEY 1981: 295–296.

legate of Legio VI ferrata, we must consider the following options (if this was the same person):

1. The possibility of Heraclitus holding senatorial status at the time of his mission to Britain (which would raise the importance of this mission). If he was indeed a senator, his role was certainly not limited to transporting letters.
2. The possibility of his holding equestrian status and being granted, as a consequence of his successful mission to Britain (resulting in the appointment of Albinus as Caesar), the *adlectio inter praetorios* (which entailed his promotion from the equestrian to the senatorial order) and the assignment of the legionary command in the East.

In both cases, Heraclitus can ultimately be considered a senator, but not a legionary legate in Britain, for which there is no evidence.

#### SOME REMARKS ON THE DIVISION OF BRITAIN<sup>75</sup>

According to Herodian (III 8, 2), Britain was divided by Septimius Severus into two provinces right after the defeat of Clodius Albinus in the battle of Lugdunum. That would have been in the year 197. However, regarding the times of the *expeditio Britannica* under Severus, the same Herodian wrote about Britain as one province (III 14, 9), to which Geta was sent to sort out court cases and deal with state affairs. Another historian, Cassius Dio (LV 23, 2–3 and 6) states that under the Severans Britannia was divided into two provinces: inferior and superior, and lists the legions stationed there. According to his information, one legion was stationed in Britannia inferior (VI victrix), while two were stationed in Britannia superior (II Augusta and XX Valeria victrix)<sup>76</sup>. Both historians noted the division of Britain into two parts, but did not specify the rank of these provinces (consular?, praetorian?) and their borders<sup>77</sup>.

Dividing large provinces into smaller ones was not a new thing. This concerned the provinces on the Limes, threatened by attacks from outside, from places such as Germania, Moesia, Pannonia and Dacia. Such divisions organisationally supported the process of management and defence; they were also

---

<sup>75</sup> The issue of the division of Britain is important due to the status of the legate of Legio VI victrix, who could also have been a praetorian legate of Britannia inferior. Given this assumption, his position would be higher than the other two legionary legates. My position on this matter is presented below. Many authors have written about the division of Britain. See, for instance RITTERLING 1925: 1609; GRAHAM 1966: 92–107; MANN, JARRETT 1967: 61–64; KOTULA 1987: 142; A.R. BIRLEY 2005: 333–337; JANISZEWSKA 2010: 101–102; KRÓLCZYK 2014: 231–232.

<sup>76</sup> His list of legions with their seats was probably created after 214. For the dating, see, for example A.R. BIRLEY 2005: 333.

<sup>77</sup> Other historiographical sources barely mention the affairs of Britain, focusing attention on Severus' British expedition and his death. See Aur. Vict. *Caes.* 20, 18 and 27; Eutrop. VI 19; *HA Sept. Sev.* 18, 2–3 and 19, 1; *Dig.* XXVIII 6, 2, 4. Thus, the main historiographical pieces of evidence are works by Cassius Dio and Herodian, contemporary to the events described here.

a safeguard against excessive ambitions of governors. These provinces were governed mostly by consular officers with extensive administrative experience. It is possible that the situation in Britain was similar – its division took place after the suppression of the usurpation of the governor of Britain, Clodius Albinus. And although epigraphical sources confirm the existence of *Britannia inferior* and *superior*<sup>78</sup>, they do not answer several key questions: when did the division of the province take place, where was the border between *Britannia inferior* and *superior* and what was the administrative rank of both provinces. Irrespective of the type of evidence (historiographical or epigraphical), information gaps occur in the same fields.

For my part, I would like to make a few remarks:

(1) Rulers often made changes to the borders and statuses of provinces. Before Septimius Severus took over, Britain was a single province with consular status. Septimius Severus divided Britain in 197 into two administrative units (Hdn. III 8, 2), possibly still governed for practical reasons by one person (cf. the case of III *Daciae*). It could have been a necessity caused by a reduction in the number of troops in Britain ordered by Clodius Albinus and the constant attacks by barbarians who broke through Hadrian's Wall and entered the Roman province (*Britannia inferior*). The legates of Britain known to us from this period: Virius Lupus<sup>79</sup> (legate in 197–200?), C. Valerius Pudens<sup>80</sup> (legate in 205), L. Alfenus Senecio<sup>81</sup> (legate in 205–207) were governors of consular rank. In epigraphical sources, they were titled: *legatus Augusti pro praetore* (*CIL* VII 273 = *RIB* 730), *clarissimus consularis* (*RIB* 1163), *legatus eorum* [scil. *Augustorum*] *pro praetore* (*CIL* VII 279 = *RIB* 746), *amplissimus consularis* (*AE* 1962, 260; *CIL* VII 269 = *RIB* 722)<sup>82</sup>. Apart from them, we do not have any attested praetorian legates. This is perfectly understandable, since they were not yet in Britain at that time. In 209, after Severus began military operations in Britain, the ad-

---

<sup>78</sup> Stamps on poorly dated seals: “P(rocurator) B(ritanniae) I(nferioris)” – e.g. *AE* 1980, 604; *RIB* 2411, 36; *CIL* VII 1269, 29 = *RIB* 2411, 34 or “P(rocurator) B(ritanniae) S(uperioris)” – e.g. *AE* 1994, 1117; *RIB* 2411, 37. In addition: an inscription of a sevir Augustalis from 237 “Brit(annia) inf(erior)” – *AE* 1922, 116; an inscription in honour of a soldier who fought in “Britannia superior” and “inferior” – *CIL* III 6995 = *AE* 1991, 1472; an inscription of a soldier from Greta Bridge “[Britanniae] s[uperioris]” – *CIL* VII 498 = *RIB* 1051; an inscription of a British veteran “[Brit]tan(n)i(a)e s[u]pe(rioris)” – *ILAlg* II 3, 8806, an inscription of the prefect of the cohort I Asturum “prov(inciae) Brit{t}(anniae) inf(erioris)” – *CIL* VIII 2766 (p. 1739) = *CIL* VIII 18131 = *ILS* 2762. Unfortunately, there are no inscriptions relating to governors in which their province – *Britannia superior* or *inferior* – is specified. I explain the reasons for this state of affairs later.

<sup>79</sup> *PIR*<sup>2</sup> V 711; BARBIERI, no. 528; OKOŃ 2017, no. 1022.

<sup>80</sup> *PIR*<sup>2</sup> V 183; BARBIERI, no. 514; OKOŃ 2017, no. 989.

<sup>81</sup> *PIR*<sup>2</sup> A 521; BARBIERI, no. 25; OKOŃ 2017, no. 45.

<sup>82</sup> It is worth noting that the following titles do not appear: *legatus pro praetore provinciarum Britanniarum*, *legatus Britanniae superioris et inferioris*. It is possible that the appropriate epigraphic practice in this area did not develop in time.

ministration of this province had to adapt to the ongoing war (Hdn. III 14, 9). Geta's mission in this area was a harbinger of the planned changes<sup>83</sup>. Probably Septimius Severus, preparing the conquest of the north of the island, had a plan for the development of the conquered territories. The group that was supposed to help him to implement this plan consisted of experienced officials who were his *comites*<sup>84</sup>.

The peace made with the barbarians by Severus (Cass. Dio LXXVII 13, 4), and after his death again by Caracalla (Cass. Dio LXXVIII 1, 1; Hdn. III 15, 5–6), gave the Roman Empire small territorial acquisitions and became an impulse to introduce further changes (e.g. an enlargement of Britannia inferior)<sup>85</sup>. After the death of Severus and the departure of his sons (Caracalla and Geta), plans to conquer the entire island were put on hold. The speculations of modern historians who assume further organisational changes in Britain (in 213), contrary to the accounts of Herodian and Cassius Dio, are, in my opinion, incorrect.

The last governor known to us whose titulature contains a reference to the consulship was L. Alfenus Senecio. The next governors had the title of *legatus Augusti pro praetore*, indicating governorship of the praetorian rank<sup>86</sup>. However, as we remember, consular governors were referred to in the same way, which generates problems in distinguishing between legates of the praetorian and consular rank and makes it impossible to determine which province they administered – Britannia superior or inferior. Thus, in the absence of sources, the exact moment of the change in imperial policy and the appointment of governors for each of the provinces of Britain is currently undetermined.

We only have fragmentary additions to the lists of governors, bearing in mind that their number (one for two provinces or one for each of them) depended on the will of the emperor, who could freely manipulate the appointments. I cannot rule out that when Caracalla and Geta departed from Britain, they left behind two governors – a consular for the superior province and a praetorian for the inferior one. It is certain that during Cassius Dio's lifetime the division into two British provinces continued (LV 23, 2–3 and 6); the author does not mention any administrative changes in these provinces at all.

The route of the border between the two provinces remains hypothetical. There is no precise data. If we assume that Legio XX was based in Britannia

---

<sup>83</sup> By the way, Severus protected the life of the younger son, should the elder one die in a military expedition. Regardless of Caracalla's fate, dynastic continuity would then be preserved.

<sup>84</sup> The group of *comites* included, for example: a prefect of the City L. Fabius Cilo, Praetorian Prefects: Aemilius Papinianus and Q. Maecius Laetus, C. Iulius Avitus Alexianus, the husband of Iulia Maesa, and a consular C. Iunius Faustinus Placidus Postumianus.

<sup>85</sup> The British expedition was considered victorious, Severus and his sons were nicknamed *Britannicus Maximus*, and inscriptions carved throughout the Empire and legends on coins praised their victory.

<sup>86</sup> THOMASSON 1984: 73–75; A.R. BIRLEY 2005: 337–355.

superior, then the boundary must have been north of its camp at Deva and south of the camp of Legio VI victrix at Eboracum in Britannia inferior.

(2) It is generally assumed that Britannia superior was governed by legates with the title of *consularis*, and Britannia inferior by *legati Augusti pro praetore*. The premise for this assumption is the number of legions stationed in a given province (two in the consular province, one in the praetorian one).

In the matter of determining the status of the province of Britannia inferior, one must refer to the legate of Britannia in 220, Claudius Paulinus. A letter from his client Sennius Sollemnis mentions the legateship of Britannia and Legio VI<sup>87</sup>. We also know from this letter that Paulinus was not a consular at that time (or even a designated consul) and could only govern the praetorian province. So this was the province where Legio VI victrix was stationed. It follows that Britannia superior had a separate governor of consular rank, as two legions were stationed there.

On this occasion, the question arises as to whether the governor of Britannia inferior was also the legate of Legio VI victrix (cf. the case of Numidia). The analogy with Numidia seems to provide a clue; one legion was also stationed in that province and the governor of Numidia was at the same time the commander of this legion. However, in Numidia we have numerous inscriptions containing double titlature of legates<sup>88</sup>, which are not attested in Britannia (here, we have simple titlature: *legatus Britanniae*, *legatus provinciae Britanniae*). In Numidia, numerous governors were awarded the consulship immediately after holding this combined office (the province honoured them as *consules designati*<sup>89</sup>), but so far there is no such data for Britannia inferior (praetorian). Besides, Numidia was a province whose borderline run close to the headquarters of Legio III Augusta, so there was no need for dual administration; in Britannia inferior, on the other hand, the borders extended far beyond the camp of Legio VI victrix, and such a need existed. Thus, inscriptional and historiographical evidence does not support the analogy between Britannia and Numidia<sup>90</sup>.

In conclusion, we can say that under the Severans there were two provinces in Britain: Britannia inferior (praetorian) with Legio VI victrix and Britannia

---

<sup>87</sup> *CIL* XIII 3162.

<sup>88</sup> E.g. “leg. Aug. pro pr. leg. III Aug. Antoninus. et provincial. Numid. cos. des.” – *CIL* VIII 2754 = 18129; “leg. Aug. pr. pr. [...] leg. III Aug. Sever. et prov. Numid. [...] praeses rarissimus” – *AE* 1917/1918, 51; “legatus leg. III Severianae Alexandrianae praeses” – *ILS* 1177; “leg. Aug. pr. pr. c.v. praeses exempli rarissimus” – *CIL* VIII 8327.

<sup>89</sup> E.g. *ILS* 9488; *CIL* VIII 2619; *CIL* VIII 19131; *CIL* VIII 2392 = *ILS* 1178.

<sup>90</sup> It is worth paying attention to the work by MANN, JARRETT (1967), in which the researchers shift the border between the provinces and assume that only Legio II Augusta was stationed in Britannia superior, so this province was of the praetorian rank. At that time, the governorship of this province and the legateship of the legion could be held by the same person, but as in the case of Legio VI victrix, a comparison with Numidia leads us to reject this hypothesis.

superior (consular) with Legio II Augusta and XX Valeria victrix, and that the legate of Britannia inferior was not the legate of Legio VI victrix at the same time.

*University of Szczecin*

*danuta.okon@usz.edu.pl*

*ORCID: 0000-0003-1173-7043*

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ALFÖLDY 1967: G. ALFÖLDY, *Die Legionslegaten der römischen Rheinarmeen*, Köln–Graz 1967 (Epigraphische Studien 3).
- BARBIERI 1952: G. BARBIERI, *L'albo senatorio da Settimio Severo a Carino (193–285)*, Roma 1952.
- E. BIRLEY 1988: E. BIRLEY, *Promotions and Transfers in the Roman Army I: Senatorial and Equestrian Officers*, in: IDEM, *The Roman Army: Papers 1929–1986*, Amsterdam 1988, pp. 93–115.
- A.R. BIRLEY 1964: A.R. BIRLEY, *Life in Roman Britain*, Cambridge 1964.
- 1969: A.R. BIRLEY, *The Coups d'État of the Year 193*, BJ CLXIX 1969, pp. 247–280.
- 1971: A.R. BIRLEY, *Septimius Severus: The African Emperor*, London 1971.
- 1980: A.R. BIRLEY, *The People of Roman Britain*, Berkeley 1980.
- 1981: A.R. BIRLEY, *The Fasti of Roman Britain*, Oxford 1981.
- 1982: A.R. BIRLEY, *Senators from Britain?*, in: S. PANCIERA (ed.), *Epigrafia e ordine senatorio*, Roma 1982, vol. II (Tituli 5), p. 531–538.
- 2003: A.R. BIRLEY, *The Commissioning of Equestrian Officers*, in: J.J. WILKES (ed.), *Documenting the Roman Army. Essays in Honour of Margaret Roxan*, London 2003, pp. 1–18.
- 2002: A.R. BIRLEY, *Garrison Life at Vindolanda: A Band of Brothers*, Stroud 2002.
- 2005: A.R. BIRLEY, *The Roman Government of Britain*, Oxford 2005.
- CAMPBELL 1975: B. CAMPBELL, *Who Were the "Viri Militares"?*, JRS LXV 1975, pp. 11–31.
- 2002: B. CAMPBELL, *War and Society in Imperial Rome 31 B.C.–A.D. 284*, London–New York 2002.
- CHRISTOL, DREW-BEAR 1995: M. CHRISTOL, T. DREW-BEAR, *Aurelius Polus Terentianus et Q. Hedius Rufus Lollianus Gentianus, proconsuls d'Asie*, *Anatolia Antiqua* III 1995, pp. 67–93.
- 1998: M. CHRISTOL, T. DREW-BEAR, *Vétérans et soldats légionnaires à Antioche de Pisidie*, in: G. PACI (ed.), *Epigrafia romana in area adriatica. Actes de la IX<sup>e</sup> rencontre franco-italienne sur l'épigraphie du monde romain* (Macerata, 10–11 novembre 1995), Macerata 1998, pp. 303–332.
- CORBIER 1974: M. CORBIER, *L'aerarium Saturni et l'aerarium militare. Administration et prosopographie sénatoriale*, Paris–Roma 1974.
- DEVIJVER 1992: H. DEVIJVER, *Equestrian Officers in the East*, in: IDEM, *The Equestrian Officers of the Roman Imperial Army*, Stuttgart 1992 (Mavors IX), pp. 66–100.
- 1995: H. DEVIJVER, *Les milices équestres et la hiérarchie militaire*, in: Y. LE BOHEC (ed.), *La hiérarchie (Randordnung) de l'armée romaine sous le Haut-Empire. Actes du colloque de Lyon, 15–18 septembre 1994*, Paris 1995, pp. 175–191.
- DIETZ 1980: K. DIETZ, *Senatus contra principem. Untersuchungen zur senatorischen Opposition gegen Kaiser Maximinus Thrax*, München 1980.
- 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.
- FAURE 2013: P. FAURE, *L'aigle et le cep: les centurions légionnaires dans l'Empire des Sévères*, vols. I–II, Bordeaux 2013 (Scripta antiqua 54).

- FITZ 1993–1995: J. FITZ, *Die Verwaltung Pannoniens in der Römerzeit*, vols. I–IV, Budapest 1993–1995.
- FRÉZOULS 1995: E. FRÉZOULS, *Le commandement et ses problèmes*, in: Y. LE BOHEC (ed.), *La hiérarchie (Rangordnung) de l'armée romaine sous le Haut-Empire. Actes du Congrès de Lyon (15–18 septembre 1994)*, Paris 1995, pp. 157–166.
- GAGÉ 1971: J. GAGÉ, *Les classes sociales dans l'Empire romain*, Paris 1971.
- GRAHAM 1966: A.J. GRAHAM, *The Division of Britain*, JRS LVI 1966, pp. 92–107.
- GREGORI 1995: G.L. GREGORI, *Un nuovo senatore dell'età di Commodo?*, ZPE CVI 1995, pp. 269–279.
- HALFMANN 1979: H. HALFMANN, *Die Senatoren aus dem östlichen Teil des Imperium Romanum bis zum Ende des 2. Jh. n. Chr.*, Göttingen 1979.
- HANDY 2009: M. HANDY, *Die Severer und das Heer*, Berlin 2009.
- JANISZEWSKA 2010: D. JANISZEWSKA, *Wojna domowa w Rzymie w latach 193–197*, Poznań 2010.
- JONES 1970: A.H.M. JONES, *Augustus*, London 1970.
- KOTULA 1987: T. KOTULA, *Septymiusz Sewerus. Cesarz z Lepcis Magna*, Wrocław 1987.
- KRÓLCZYK 2014: K. KRÓLCZYK, *Propagatio Imperii. Cesarstwo Rzymskie a świat zewnętrzny w okresie rządów Septymiusza Sewera (193–211 r.)*, Poznań 2014.
- LE BOHEC 2002: Y. LE BOHEC, *L'armée romaine sous le Haut-Empire*, Paris 2002.
- 2018: Y. LE BOHEC, *Forces et faiblesses de l'armée romaine du Haut-Empire*, in: M. POPESCU, I. ACHIM, F. MATEI-POPESCU (eds.), *La Dacie et l'empire romain. Mélanges d'épigraphie et d'archéologie offerts à Constantin C. Petolescu*, Bucarest 2018, pp. 53–65.
- 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.
- MANN, JARRETT 1967: J.C. MANN, M.G. JARRETT, *The Division of Britain*, JRS LVII 1967, pp. 61–64.
- MENNEN 2011: I. MENNEN, *Power and Status in the Roman Empire AD 193–284*, Leiden–Boston 2011.
- NAVARO 2004: F.J. NAVARO, *El proconsulado de la Bética en el cursus honorum senatorial*, Gerion XXII 2004, p. 379–402.
- OKOŃ 2008: D. OKOŃ, *Der Konsul Q. Pompeius Sosius Falco – ein Nachfolger von Commodus?*, Eos XCV 2008, pp. 109–113.
- 2014: D. OKOŃ, *The Succession of the Power after the Death of Commodus*, Vestnik Sankt-Peterburskogo Universiteta (Seriâ 2) IV 2014, pp. 47–51.
- 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.
- 2019: D. OKOŃ, *Military Tribune in the Careers of Roman Senators of the Severan Period. Part 1: Introductory Issues*, Eos CVI 2019, pp. 59–76.
- 2020: D. OKOŃ 2020, *Military Tribune in the Careers of Roman Senators of the Severan Period. Part 2: Special Distinctions (dona militaria, adlectiones, commendatio Augusti)*, Eos CVII 2021, pp. 127–152.
- 2021: D. OKOŃ, *Military Tribune in the Careers of Roman Senators of the Severan Period. Part 3: Higher Military Command (legatus legionis, praepositus, dux)*, Eos CVIII 2021, pp. 91–114.
- PFLAUM 1948: H.-G. PFLAUM, *Le marbre de Thorigny*, Paris 1948.
- PIR<sup>2</sup>: E. GROAG *et al.* (eds.), *Prosopographia Imperii Romani saec. I, II, III*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn., vols. I–VIII, Berlin 1933–2015.
- RAEPSAET-CHARLIER 1989: M.-Th. RAEPSAET-CHARLIER, *Prosopographie des femmes de l'ordre sénatorial (I<sup>er</sup>–II<sup>e</sup> siècles)*, vols. I–II, Leuven 1987.
- RITTERLING 1924–1925: E. RITTERLING, *Legio. Bestand, Verteilung und kriegerische Betätigung der Legionen des stehenden Heeres von Augustus bis Diocletian*, RE XII 1 (1924), col. 1211–XII 2 (1925), col. 1829.

- RÜPKE 2008: J. RÜPKE, *Fasti sacerdotum: A Prosopography of Pagan, Jewish, and Christian Religious Officials in the City of Rome, 300 BC to AD 499*, Oxford 2008.
- SAXER 1967: R. SAXER, *Untersuchungen zu den Vexillationen des römischen Kaiserheeres von Augustus bis Diokletian*, Köln–Graz 1967.
- SETTIPANI 2000: C. SETTIPANI, *Continuité gentilice et continuité sénatoriale dans les familles sénatoriales romaines à l'époque impériale*, Oxford 2000.
- SYME 1988: R. SYME, *The Career of Arrian*, HSCPh LXXXVI 1982, pp. 171–211 [= IDEM, *Roman Papers*, vol. IV, Oxford 1988, pp. 21–49].
- THOMASSON 1984: B.E. THOMASSON, *Laterculi praesidum*, vol. I, Arlöv 1984.
- ZIÓLKOWSKI 2009: A. ZIÓLKOWSKI, *Historia powszechna. Starożytność*, Warszawa 2009.