

THE ENIGMATIC SOSPESES

By RONALD SYME

Inscriptions found at Pisidian Antioch disclose the careers of several senators. They afford various instruction, the prime specimen being '] P.f. Stel. Sospes '. The stone was discovered by Hamilton, and it will be a suitable tribute to epigraphists if one reproduces the copy made by the careful and exemplary Sterrett.¹

P·F·STEL·SOS
TI·FETIALI·LEG·AVG
PRO·PR·PROVINC·GAL
PISID·PHRYG·LVC·ISAVR·
PAPHLAG·PONTI·GALA
PONTI·POLEMONIANI
ARM·LEG·LEG·XIII·GEM
DONAT·DON·MILITARIB
EXPEDIT·SVEBIC·ET·SARM
COR·MVR·COR·VALL·COR
AVR·HAST·PVR·TRIB·VE
XILL·TRIB·CVRAT·COLO
NIOR·ET·MVNICIPIOR·PRAE
FRVM·DAND·EX·S·C·PRAETOR
AED·CVRVL·Q·CRET·ET·C
TRIB·LEG·XXIII·PRIMIGEN
IIIVIR·A·A·A·FF·
THIASVS·LIB

The document touches large fields of imperial history, not mere dates and detail in the record of a single senator. Hence abundant debate, and it goes on. Economy and clarity counsel a direct approach to the text. The last two posts held by Sospes offer some prospect of precision.

1. First, the command of XIII Gemina, a legion stationed in Pannonia until it went away for Trajan's wars, staying in Dacia after the conquest. Sospes received the decorations appropriate to a legate of praetorian rank, ' expedit(ione) Suebic(a) et Sarm(atica) '. The emperor who made the award is not named. Who but Domitian?

Early in the year 92 an incursion of the Sarmatae Jazyges destroyed one of the Pannonian legions (XXI Rapax). The Suebi, the Germans of Bohemia and Moravia, were drawn in, as is likewise shown by another inscription. Detachments from five legions fought in a ' bellum Suebicum item Sarmaticum. ' That is, drafted from the two Moesian armies.² Domitian himself went to Pannonia, waged a war, and after an absence of eight months returned to Rome in January of 93. The poet Martial has copious references, and the chronology is clear.³ Mommsen and Dessau assigned Sospes' command to the campaign of Domitian.⁴ Nor was hesitation conceived or expressed by a number of writers who dealt with the Danubian Wars.⁵

¹ J. R. S. Sterrett, *An Epigraphical Journey in Asia Minor* (1888), 125, no. 98; then *CIL* III. 6818 = *ILS* 1017. The first two lines of the photograph of a squeeze are reproduced in *JRS* xv (1925), pl. xxxvi.

² *ILS* 2719, cf. E. Ritterling, *RE* XII, 1444; R. Syme, *JRS* xviii (1928), 47 f. Note also the ' bellum Germa. et Sarmatic. ' of *CIL* XI. 5992: the ' priores principes ' who decorated this centurion, once only, are a euphemism for Domitian.

³ For the full evidence, S. Gsell, *Essai sur le règne de l'empereur Domitien* (1894), 224 f. The year

93 was advocated by R. Hanslik, *Wiener Studien* LXXXIII (1948), 126, also ' 93/4 ' in *RE* VIII A, 603 f.; and ' either 92 or 93 ' occurs in A. Mócsy, *Pannonia and Upper Moesia* (1974), 85. An aberration.

⁴ Mommsen, *Hermes* III (1869), 115 = *Ges. Schr.* IV, 447; Dessau, *ILS* 1017 and *PIR*¹, S 567.

⁵ S. Gsell, *op. cit.*, 227; E. Köstlin, *Die Donaukriege Domitians* (Diss. Tübingen, 1910), 20 f.; E. Ritterling, *RE* XII, 1716; C. Patsch, *Wiener S-B* 217, Abh. I, 40; R. Syme, in *CAH* XI (1936), 177, in *Danubian Papers* (1971), 109, and elsewhere.

The full name and precise identity of the legate engaged little attention. Everything spoke for a Caesennius. The unusual cognomen recurs two generations later with A. Junius Pastor L. Caesennius Sospes, the *ordinarius* of 163. It was therefore felicitous when L. Caesennius Sospes turned up as consul suffect not so long ago on a diploma issued to the army in Thrace. He stands as the colleague of C. Clodius Nummus in 114, on July 19.⁶

That revelation had a double consequence (identity being assumed with the legate of XIII Gemina). It at once abolished a pair of divergent datings of Sospes' career that had been advocated only a few years previously.⁷ At the same time, however, a fresh perplexity. If this man was a legionary legate in 92, why did he have to wait more than twenty years for a consulship?

The objection has point and weight. Yet it may evaporate on closer inspection. Anything can happen in the life of a Roman senator. The consulate of L. Caesennius Sospes, so it will emerge, was a product of time and chance, even perhaps of caprice. Parallels offer for retardation—and a reason is not far to seek.

II. The next and last post, in Galatia. Its nature is not at all clear. Prolegomena, however summary, cannot be avoided. For action in Armenia, or for the threat of action, Rome required an army in Cappadocia. At the beginning of Nero's reign a consular command was set up, which included Galatia. Domitius Corbulo held it, then Caesennius Paetus (for a brief spell, and to no good result), then Corbulo again. In the winter of 66/7 the command lapsed, Corbulo being recalled and the legions taken away to deal with the rebellion in Judaea.

Vespasian restored the command, and Armenia Minor quickly accrued.⁸ The garrison comprised two legions. XII Fulminata had been sent to Melitene after the fall of Jerusalem (in the autumn of 70); and XVI Flavia was stationed at Satala, in Armenia Minor.⁹

The first governor of Cappadocia-Galatia has escaped notice. Perhaps M. Ulpius Traianus (*suff.* 70) who held Syria from 73/4 until 78.¹⁰ In the sequel ten are on direct attestation, from Cn. Pompeius Collega (*suff. c.* 72) to M. Junius Homullus (*suff.* 102).¹¹

Homullus finds mention as governor of Cappadocia when Trajan appeared on the scene early in 114: his son was sent on a mission to the ruler of Armenia.¹² That country being annexed, the Cappadocian command forfeited most of the hinterland, and Galatia reverted to the rank of a praetorian province. Left with the frontier zone (Cappadocia and Armenia Minor), L. Catilius Severus (*suff.* 110) held Armenia Maior until it was abandoned three years later.¹³

As for Galatia, the first governor after the severance is probably the *Ignotus* of an acephalous inscription at Antioch.¹⁴ The next is the polyonymous 'Junius Gallus', likewise at Antioch: clearly to be identified with the governor L. Cossonius Gallus and with Gallus, consul suffect in 119.¹⁵ Then comes A. Larcus Macedo, on attestation in 120 and in 122 (*suff.* ?123).¹⁶

In the period of its existence as a consular province, Cappadocia-Galatia embraced a

⁶ Noted in *Hermes* LXXXV (1957), 493 = *Roman Papers* (1977), 351 f. The diploma still lurks unpublished in the Museum at Sofia.

⁷ See below, Epilogue.

⁸ After the deposition of Aristobulus (*PIR*², A 1024) in 72—or perhaps in 71.

⁹ For Satala see now T. B. Mitford, *JRS* LIV (1974), 160 f.

¹⁰ As conjectured in *Tacitus* (1958), 31. See further G. W. Bowersock, *JRS* LXIII (1973), 134 f. For doubts, B. Kreiler, *Die Statthalter Kleinasien unter den Flaviern* (Diss. München, 1975), 35 f.

¹¹ For the list, R. K. Sherck, *The Legates of Galatia from Augustus to Diocletian* (1951), 39 f.; W. Eck, *Senatoren von Vespasian bis Hadrian* (1970), 239. There is a gap between A. Caesennius Gallus (probably 80–3) and Ti. Julius Candidus Marius Celsus (*suff.* 86). P. Valerius Patruinus (*suff.* 82) is suggested by B. Kreiler, *op. cit.*, 88 f.; *Chiron* IV (1974), 451 f. He went on to Syria, where he is attested in November of 88 (*CIL* XVI. 35). There is

a chance that an *Ignotus* intervenes between Patruinus and Julius Candidus, who may not have been appointed until 89.

¹² Dio LXVIII. 19. 1.

¹³ *ILS* 1041.

¹⁴ *ILS* 1039. Governor after being praetor and legate of a legion, therefore on the straight path to the consulate.

¹⁵ *ILS* 1038 (Antioch); L. Cossonius Gallus is revealed by *AE* 1928, 101 (Iconium). Identity is doubted in *PIR*², C 1541—and denied for Gallus, the *suffectus* of 119, in E 71. See, however, *Historia* XIV (1965), 345 = *Danubian Papers* (1971), 229; XVIII (1969), 359 = *RP* (1977), 781. In *CIL* VI. 32374 the consul suffect can stand as 'C]o[ssoni]o Gallo'. Accepted by W. Eck, *Senatoren von Vespasian bis Hadrian* (1970), 185.

¹⁶ *PIR*², L 98. It is there suggested that Larcus Macedo might be identical with the *Ignotus* of *ILS* 1039.

wide area, taking in a congeries of minor territories. In fact, no fewer than eight of them, though the enumeration is not uniform on the inscriptions.

The governor would need an assistant. Inscriptions reveal three praetorian legates who cover, so it appears, the years 78–84. In rank and function they are comparable to the *iuridici* in Tarraconensis and in Britain, and that term need not be disallowed for the Cappadocian complex.

For Ti. Julius Celsus Polemaeanus (*suff.* 92), the post is the first to be held after the praetorship.¹⁷ Likewise for L. Julius Proculeianus.¹⁸ The third, A. Julius Quadratus (*suff.* 94), had previous employment, but of a minor grade: one year as a proconsul's legate in Bithynia-Pontus, two years in Asia.¹⁹ Celsus, it will be observed, went on to command a legion during the reign of Titus. That fact is sharply relevant to the case of Caesennius Sospes, employed in Galatia after being legate of XIII Gemina. Sospes looks like something better than a *iuridicus*.

III. To proceed. The document carries a pair of items that have caused much trouble. First, Sospes is styled 'leg. Aug. pro pr.' If correct, that denotes the governor of a province: the *iuridicus* is only 'leg. Aug.'²⁰ Second, Cappadocia is absent from the list of the territories. It leads off with Galatia.

What then is to be done? Cappadocia, it might be assumed, was left out by accident, whereas the titlature of the governor is correct. Therefore one theory takes Sospes for a praetorian legate governing the whole of the consular province.²¹ On a similar assumption, a careful and succinct statement has Sospes a praetorian legate in Cappadocia-Galatia, c. 95, succeeding a consular who died in office (i.e. Antistius Rusticus).²² At the same time, however, an alternative explanation was added: 'it is possible that the province was split for a short while after Rusticus' death into its two main component parts.'

IV. The alternative is to be preferred, for several reasons. It deserves to be prosecuted and exploited, with close scrutiny of the 'component parts' of the Cappadocian complex.

On the inscriptions that register the careers of governors and *iuridici* Cappadocia stands at the head, followed by Galatia. There are enough of them, without the plethora honouring A. Julius Quadratus.²³ Now the dedication in honour of Sospes was set up by his freedman Thiasus. This person in loyal assiduity enumerated eight subsidiary regions under the authority of his patron. No other document comes anywhere near that total.²⁴ It strains belief that great Cappadocia, the head and front of the consular province, was omitted by Thiasus through sheer inadvertence. That province, it follows, was divided, albeit for a short interval of time.

Antioch exhibits the *cursus* of L. Antistius Rusticus (*suff.* 90), also his edict denouncing food hoarders and profiteers in a season of dearth.²⁵ Famine all too often engenders disease or the pestilence. A poem of Martial condoles with Nigrina, who brought back to Italy the urn containing the ashes of her husband: 'Cappadocum saevis Antistius occidit oris/Rusticus.'²⁶

The poem comes in Martial's ninth book. The seventh was published in December of 92. It anticipates Domitian's return from Pannonia (VII. 6). Book VIII refers to his victorious presence (e.g. VIII, 11). It was not published before 94, for it carries a dated item, namely

¹⁷ *ILS* 8971.

¹⁸ *AE* 1964, 4 (Comana of Cappadocia). The inscription happens to show no post between quaestor and praetor. He is therefore described as 'certe patricius' in *PIR*², J 489a. Not likely.

¹⁹ *ILS* 8819, cf. the numerous inscriptions listed in *PIR*², J 507. The only exception is furnished by three milestones of Caesennius Gallus, which in fact were set up in Galatian territory (*ILS* 263; 268; *CIL* III. 14184⁴⁸).

²⁰ W. M. Ramsay, however, assumed him a *iuridicus*, *JRS* XIV (1924), 192; and by inadvertence he was included with Julius Quadratus and Julius Celsus in *Tacitus* (1958), 68, n. 5.

²¹ Thus D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* (1950), 1437.

²² B. Levick, *Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor* (1967), 230.

²³ Add now *AE* 1968, 145 (Saepinum): the *cursus* of the legate M. Hirrius Fronto Neratius Pansa (*suff.* c. 75), showing 'pro]vinciae Ca[.] Furthermore, the whole complex is sometimes styled 'the Cappadocian province' (e.g. *ILS* 8819).

²⁴ Only *ILS* 1017 includes Pontus Galaticus; and Isauria is elsewhere registered only on *Pergamon* VIII. 3, no. 21, the inscription of C. Julius Quadratus Bassus (*suff.* 105), governor from 108 to 111.

²⁵ *AE* 1925, 126.

²⁶ Martial IX. 30. 1 f. In 91 the 'impia Cappadocum tellus' had carried off Camonius Rufus of Bononia, aged twenty (VI. 85).

the consulate of the elder son of Silius Italicus (VIII. 66): L. Silius Decianus assumed the *fasces* with T. Pomponius Bassus for colleague on 1 September of the year 94. The poem paying tribute to the widow of Antistius Rusticus in the next book (IX. 30) is consonant with his decease in 93 or in 94. Perhaps the latter year.

v. If a consular quits his post or his life, a problem arises for the government—and a topic of genuine concern for erudite enquiry in later ages. Various parallels offer instruction.

Tiberius Caesar kept the governors of Syria and of Tarraconensis at Rome, for a decade. In Syria a legionary legate was put in charge, the same person for quite a long time, so it happens to be known.²⁷ The situation in Tarraconensis was complex and peculiar. The consular had three legions and three *legati*.²⁸ Two of the legions were brigaded together in the north-west, under a single commander (the camp lay a little to the south of Asturica), while the legate of the third faced the Cantabrian mountains. The remaining legate had administrative tasks in the more civilized parts of the province.

During the decennium in question a 'praetor provinciae' is attested, namely L. Piso, who was assassinated by a native in the year 25.²⁹ Clearly a governor of praetorian rank.³⁰ Furthermore, commander of the two legions, be it assumed. It would be awkward or anomalous to make him subordinate to the civilian legate. The latter might be a person of small consequence, not yet having commanded a legion—and Piso was a *nobilis*.³¹

Next, a season of civil war. In the course of 69 Trebellius Maximus ran away, and the commanders of the three legions in Britain divided the authority.³² Tarraconensis was also vacated by its consular, and there were no legions there in 70.³³ Further, in that year Syria was left with only one legion for garrison, IV Scythica. The legate, Cn. Pompeius Collega, took charge of the province, until a consular arrived.³⁴

Finally, the political emergency under Nerva, after the adoption of Trajan (in October of 97). Two heterogeneous items combine with advantage. First, the attitude of the consular in Syria had given rise to disturbing rumours.³⁵ Second, Larcus Priscus, after being quaestor in Asia, is discovered as legate of IV Scythica, bearing the title of governor of Syria.³⁶

The consular had died, had departed—or had been removed. Death in office was not infrequent. In the space of some fifty years (*c.* 34 to 84) at least four of the governors perished in that insalubrious country.³⁷ This time mere mortality is not the explanation, since the governor was not succeeded by one of the three legionary legates in the province. The nature of the crisis and the identity of the consular is an entertaining problem. M. Cornelius Nigrinus (*suff.* 83) now comes out as the potent candidate, legate of Moesia and then of Moesia Inferior during the Dacian War of Domitian (86–9), and subsequently legate of Syria.³⁸

VI. An attempt can be made to define and circumscribe the office to which Sospes acceded after the decease of Antistius Rusticus. Since Sospes had commanded a legion in Pannonia, it is not likely that he passed on to a post of inferior rank. Nor would it be suitable to set the *iuridicus* in authority over either or both of the legionary commanders on the eastern frontier.

²⁷ Seneca, *Epp.* 12, 8: 'Pacuvius, qui Syriam usu suam fecit.' Attested already in 19 as legate of VI Ferrata (*Ann.* II. 79. 2).

²⁸ Strabo III, p. 166 f.

²⁹ *Ann.* IV. 45. 1.

³⁰ As argued in *JRS* XLVI (1956), 20 f. = *Ten Studies in Tacitus* (1970), 56 f.

³¹ Thus C. Caetronius Miccio (*CIL* II. 2423; Bracara), as restored and interpreted by G. Alföldy, *Fasti Hispanienses* (1969), 67 f. His next post was the command of II Augusta. That scholar puts L. Piso in the same category (*ibid.* 67).

³² Tacitus, *Hist.* II. 60.

³³ Hence perhaps a brief tenure by a praetorian legate. That is Fulvus (*AE* 1952, 122), identified as T. Aurelius Fulvus (*cos.* II 85): previously legate of III Gallica in the East and in Moesia. For this conjecture, *JRS* XLVIII (1958), 8 = *RP* (1977), 389.

³⁴ Josephus, *B^J* VII. 58, mentioning L. Caesennius Paetus (*cos.* 61).

³⁵ Pliny, *Epp.* IX. 13. 11.

³⁶ *ILS* 1055. At the same time C. Julius Proculus, having been 'q. Augustorum', turns up anomalously as *lati-clavius* of IV Scythica (*ILS* 1040): clearly acting commander. For this reconstruction see *Tacitus* (1958), 16; 631 f.

³⁷ And perhaps one, or two, more. L. Caesennius Paetus (*cos.* 61) is not heard of after 72; and Marius Celsus (*suff.* 69), attested in 73 (*ILS* 8903), cannot have had a long tenure.

³⁸ G. Alföldy and H. Halfmann, *Chiron* III (1973), 331 f., interpreting a fragmentary inscription from Liria in Tarraconensis (*AE* 1973, 283). There is a chance, however, that Nigrinus was governor for a brief tenure from 89 to 90/1.

Now the inscription omits Cappadocia. Not by oversight, as some have believed. Therefore a division of the province. The measure adopted by Trajan in 114 segregated the frontier zone. That is, Cappadocia and Armenia Minor, along with the legions in garrison at Melitene and Satala. The solution was rational, and it subsisted after Armenia was given up in 117.

So far so good. A further item now comes in, not always allowed for in the many discussions which the document has provoked. The list of the regions governed by Sospes terminates with 'Arm.': that is, Armenia Minor. Apart from Galatia, eight are registered, more than on any other inscription of a governor or *iuridicus*.³⁹ The freedman of Sospes was zealous. Perhaps over-zealous—and in error when including Armenia Minor. It goes logically with Cappadocia.

On that assumption, the two legionary legates divided authority: compare what happened in Britain in 69. However, the inscription is correct when according Sospes the title of 'leg. Aug. pro pr.' and when omitting Cappadocia. If it is correct in this instance also, a solution could be produced, albeit most peculiar at first sight. That is to say, the frontier army was divided. Sospes, the legate of Galatia, kept all the miscellaneous territories, including Armenia Minor and the legion at Satala, while the legate commanding XII Fulminata at Melitene acted as governor of Cappadocia.

That arrangement would make no sense in terms of geography or of military policy. It might be safer to assume that 'Arm.,' in any case a faulty term, was added by mistake at the end of the list. However it be, a division of Cappadocia-Galatia occurred, it arose from an emergency, it was not designed to last for long. One reason for the choice of a praetorian might be sought in a shortage of suitable consulars, despite a recent surge of promotions (eleven *suffecti* in 90). Dalmatia, it may be observed, was assigned a praetorian governor in 92 or 93.⁴⁰

And there is a further factor: a sequence of unhealthy seasons at Rome, or even a pestilence.⁴¹ The pale horse of the Apocalypse was ranging through the lands.

In the course of 95 T. Pomponius Bassus assumed the governorship of the reunited province. He had been consul *suffect* during the last four months of 94. The emperor and his counsellors may have been waiting for this man to qualify. The previous employments of Pomponius Bassus would be worth knowing: presumably the command of a legion, followed by one of the eight praetorian provinces in the portion of Caesar.

VII. Sospes' governorship of Galatia thus acquires a meaning and a date, with a duration of perhaps not much more than a year, terminating early in 95. It lends support (not that support was needed) for the date of the legionary command. Brief remarks may now go to his career.

The beginning augured well. Sospes was one of the *tresviri monetales*, the select and stylish post in the vigintivirate. It normally connotes extraction from a consular family. Sospes was also a *fetialis*. Membership of that confraternity was no high distinction—but it may well have come to him in early years.

The praetorship may be put about 88. Sospes then became *praefectus frumenti dandi*. Something of a surprise. This minor post is not a sign of bright prospects in the advancement of a senator, and it is seldom found in the careers of men who achieve eminence in war or peace. For example, it is a paradox that L. Catilius Severus (*suff.* 110, *cos.* 1120), who held that post, should have reached the charge of the *aerarium Saturni*, which led straight to the consulship.⁴² An advantageous marriage contracted about the year 107 is the plausible explanation, linking him to a potent dynastic group: he is described as the 'proavus' of the emperor Marcus Aurelius. That terms solicits and baffles interpretation.⁴³

³⁹ above, p. 40 n. 24.

⁴⁰ viz. Q. Pomponius Rufus (*suff.* 95), cf. *CIL* xvi. 38.

⁴¹ As deduced from Dio LXVII 11. 6, cf. *Tacitus* (1958), 69.

⁴² *ILS* 1041.

⁴³ cf. hesitant remarks of Groag, *PIR*², C 558. If Catilius married the widow of Cn. Domitius Tullus

(II *suff.* 98), who is mentioned in Pliny, *Epp.* VIII. 18. 8, he would become the stepfather of Domitia Lucilla (D 182), the grandmother of Marcus. For that conjecture, *Historia* XVII (1968), 95 = *RP* (1977), 683. A previous conjecture suggested that Catilius might have become a 'substitute grandfather' to Marcus by marrying Lucilla herself, cf. *Tacitus* (1958), 793.

Next, a *curator* of 'coloniae et municipia'. This is a fact of great value: the earliest of such officials on record, and unique for the time of the Flavian emperors. There has been a strange disinclination among scholars to admit the innovation earlier than the reign of Trajan. Hence sundry efforts to disallow the plain and patent dating of Caesennius Sospes.⁴⁴

After military laurels in Pannonia and the governorship of Galatia, Sospes could look forward with rational confidence to a consulship in 97 or 98. Fortune turned against, with Domitian assassinated in September of 96 and Trajan adopted by Nerva eleven months later. Sospes was dropped from the list for 97, or debarred in the sequel. Others in the company of his coevals had better luck, or protection. Thus the eloquent *novus homo* Cornelius Tacitus, praetor in 88—and already xv *vir sacris faciundis*.⁴⁵

Loyal service to Domitian in the recent years was no impediment, as is shown by Trajan and by Pliny, in their different fashions. The Caesennii, however, were in a bad way, being connected with the dynasty now abolished. A Caesennius Paetus married a Flavia Sabina.⁴⁶ That is, the consul of 61, it is generally held, and a daughter of T. Flavius Sabinus (*suff.* ?44). Sabinus was *praefectus urbi*, acceding to the high dignity in that year, so it appears.⁴⁷

The match brought conspicuous benefit, more than once. Paetus is the first known consul of his family—but also *consul ordinarius*, a distinction without parallel since the year 49.⁴⁸ He went out quickly, in 62, to take up the Cappadocian command, but his invasion of Armenia ended in disaster and a shameful capitulation to the Parthians.⁴⁹ None the less, Caesennius Paetus was able to come up again early in the reign of Vespasian. As governor of Syria he carried out the annexation of Commagene in 72.⁵⁰

Court favour or mere survival can rehabilitate a veteran politician, and younger men recover from indiscretion or a mishap. It may take some time. In the year 105 a certain Licinius Nepos, while praetor, thrust himself forward with untimely zeal, and he did not abate his activities the year after, earning thereby the unfriendly label of 'emendator senatus'. It is Pliny's habit to treat fellow members of the high assembly with bland indulgence. His recurrent comments on the behaviour of Nepos therefore call for notice—and appear ominous.⁵¹ A *novus homo* lacking special favour or merit may reach the consulship a dozen years after being praetor. Licinius Nepos in fact turns up as consul suffect—in 127.⁵²

Better, and variously instructive, is the case of C. Bruttius Praesens (*suff.* 118 or 119). As military tribune he earned military decorations on the Danube in 89.⁵³ But retardation occurred once if not twice in his career. About the year 107 Pliny urged him to renounce the ease of retirement and return to public life.⁵⁴ There is no further trace of Praesens until the winter of 114, when he emerges as legate conducting his legion in deep snow across the Armenian Taurus.⁵⁵ Praesens was now about forty-five. Certain of his coevals had been ex-consuls for a number of years.

Praesens, as the language of Pliny declares, adhered to the doctrines of Epicurus. His subsequent honours show him high in favour with Hadrian. And in fact several friends of Hadrian failed to find consular employment in the armed provinces until the time of the Parthian War.⁵⁶ The consulship of L. Caesennius Sospes in 114 may accord with this pattern.

Something else attracts a surmise. When Trajan in pride and majesty marched into Armenia, the first place he occupied was Arsamosata.⁵⁷ It lay close to Rhandaia, where

⁴⁴ cf. below, Epilogue.

⁴⁵ One of the superior priesthoods often accrued about the time of a man's consulship.

⁴⁶ *ILS* 995, cf. *PIR*², F 440.

⁴⁷ As argued now by M. Griffin, *Seneca. A Philosopher in Politics* (1976), 230; 456 (reverting to Borghesi, against Stein in *PIR*², F 352).

⁴⁸ The year of Q. Veranius and Pompeius Longinus Gallus.

⁴⁹ Paetus arrived in 62, not in 61 (as argued by Groag in *PIR*², C 173).

⁵⁰ Josephus, *Bj* vii. 220. He reached Syria late in 70 (*ibid.* 59).

⁵¹ Pliny, *Epp.* iv. 29; v. 4; 9; 12; vi. 5.

⁵² Identity is doubted by Sherwin-White in his commentary on *Epp.* iv. 29, denied in *PIR*², L 220. But the son of a *novus homo* (praetor in 105) is not likely to have reached the consulate as early as 127.

⁵³ *AE* 1950, 66 (Mactar); *IRT* 545.

⁵⁴ Pliny, *Epp.* vii. 3.

⁵⁵ Arrian, fr. 85 (Roos). Cf. *Historia* xviii (1969), 352 = *RP* (1977), 774.

⁵⁶ *Tacitus* (1958), 243.

⁵⁷ Dio lxviii. 19. 2, with the reading of Gutschmid and Boissevain: to be accepted in the face of strong doubts expressed by Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* (1950), 1464 f.

Caesennius Paetus established his base in 62—and where, overcome by the Parthian attack, he made the capitulation.⁵⁸

The Romans were alert to anniversaries, to recurrence or paradox in the destiny of men and nations. Awarding the *fasces* to a Caesennius in the year when he invaded Armenia, the Emperor brought up the past, in the design to enhance and parade his own glory. That consulship was not unalloyed bliss for L. Caesennius Sospes.

VIII. A young son or kinsman commonly serves in the army commanded by a consular legate; and a son of Caesennius Paetus is on attestation as a military tribune.⁵⁹ Not, it is true, in the narration about Paetus. He is with Corbulo the year after, visiting the scene of the disaster (Corbulo had taken over the three legions of Paetus). This is patently L. Junius Caesennius Paetus, *consul ordinarius* in 79.

Those who augment the discussion about the inscription of Sospes have neglected to notice another son of Paetus. He was only a child, not earning a separate entry in the repertoria of names and facts, and generally passed over (that was pardonable) when warfare and strategy in Armenia are under scholarly debate.

Benefit can still accrue from reading the texts. When things began to go wrong, Paetus deposited his wife and son in a fortress called Arsamosata; and after a time the Parthians laid siege to that place, the ‘*castellum quo inbellis aetas defendebatur*’.⁶⁰

An easy assumption is to hand. The small boy preserved from dire peril was assigned a conspicuous cognomen. The word ‘*sospes*’ is elevated and poetical, not frequent in prose writers. Not in Cicero, not in Tacitus, but suitably employed by Pliny in devout reference to prayers for the safety of the emperor.⁶¹

The boy was aged about four at the time (since praetor *c.* 88, legionary legate in 92). An event in the life of a man or a family may be visibly commemorated by the choice of a cognomen. There was a certain Q. Servaeus, brought to ruin through his friendship with Seianus.⁶² The cognomen ‘*Innocens*’, adhering to his descendant (*suff.* 102), looks like a posthumous defence and protest.⁶³ Again, Suetonius Laetus should make one wonder, military tribune at the Battle of Bedriacum.⁶⁴ Perhaps born himself in the joyful year of Caligula’s accession, he called his son ‘*Tranquillus*’. The word conveys profound peace.⁶⁵ To posit 70 as the birth year of the biographer will not disturb.⁶⁶

As cognomen ‘*Sospes*’ is preternaturally rare. Apart from the two senatorial Caesennii only two specimens are on register. The one, so it happens, in Lycaonia, which belonged to the province of the Flavian senator; the other is Clodius Sospis, a soldier in the *Vigiles* under Septimius Severus.⁶⁷ But ‘*Sospitianus*’ should be added. It finds happy lodgement with L. Caesennius Sospitianus, member of the corporation of LX *haruspices*.⁶⁸ Etruria therefore beckons.

Of Caesennii on inscriptions at Rome, only one shows a tribe.⁶⁹ It is ‘*Stellatina*’, indicating Tarquinii. That city is patently the *patria* of the ancient and powerful *gens*; and the family tomb is extant.⁷⁰ Furthermore, two Caesennii gain entrance to a speech of Cicero concerning holders of property in Etruria, viz. the twice-married Caesennia, ‘*summo loco nata*’, and P. Caesennius, a fat man who excites derision: ‘*non tam auctoritate gravis quam*

⁵⁸ Rhandaia is supplied by Dio LXII. 21. 1. The name is unique. For the site, Kiessling, *RE* IA, 227 f.

⁵⁹ *Ann.* xv. 28. 2.

⁶⁰ *Ann.* xv. 10. 3; 13. 1.

⁶¹ Pliny, *Pan.* 67. 5: ‘*egit cum dis ipso te auctore, Caesar, res publica ut te sospitem incolumemque praestarent.*’

⁶² *Ann.* vi. 7. 2.

⁶³ Only one other specimen occurs, viz. L. Casperius Innocens (*CIL* xiv. 2337), cf. I. Kajanto, *The Latin Cognomina* (1965), 252.

⁶⁴ Suetonius, *Otho* 10. 1.

⁶⁵ Lucretius I. 31; Lucan I. 171. Observe ‘*domi res tranquillae*’ (*Ann.* I. 3. 7), the sole occurrence of the word in Tacitus.

⁶⁶ For an attempt to put his birth as early as 61 or 62, see B. Baldwin, *Acta Classica* xviii (1975), 67.

⁶⁷ *CIL* III. 6793 (territory of Lystra); VI. 1057. 7, l. 49. Cf. I. Kajanto, *op. cit.* (n. 63), 232.

⁶⁸ *CIL* VI. 2162.

⁶⁹ *CIL* VI. 13937.

⁷⁰ See *Historia* XIII (1964), 113 = *RP* (1977), 590 f., where the Antonian partisan Caesennius Lento is discussed, also a Caesennius proscribed for his wealth (Appian, *BC* IV. 115), the latter absent from *RE*. For the family tomb, M. Torelli, *Studi Etruschi* xxxvi (1968), 469.

corpore.⁷¹ Finally, the inscriptions of Tarquinii contribute two men called P. Caesennius, also Caesennia P. f.⁷²

The Flavian senator, it will be recalled, is styled 'P. f. Stel. Sospes.' An objection at once arises. How then could he be a son of L. Caesennius Paetus, the consul of 61? Only one way offers, to conjecture that the father was polyonymous. That is to say, by origin he was a Publius Caesennius, the praenomen 'Lucius' belonging to some other *gentilicium*.

A desperate expedient, some might say. By good fortune, there is no need now to have recourse to conjecture, however plausible or expedient. Two wax tablets from Pompeii declare the consul's full name: he is L. Junius Caesennius Paetus.⁷³ This Caesennius, it follows, had acquired the item 'L. Junius' through testamentary adoption or inheritance. And perhaps also the 'Paetus': senatorial Junii Paeti are on later record.⁷⁴ Therefore Sospes is the son of a P. Caesennius, keeping the father's praenomen in his filiation. Compare C. Plinius L. f. Caecilius Secundus, a Caecilius adopted by his maternal uncle C. Plinius.

Curiosity is whetted by a contemporary recurrence of the item 'L. Junius'. The notorious politician Q. Vibius Crispus from Vercellae was consul suffect, probably in the year 61.⁷⁵ His second consulate has recently come to light: 15 March, 74, with the nomenclature 'L. Junius Vibius Crispus'.⁷⁶ The link might be significant.

Caesennius Paetus and his colleague Petronius Turpilianus were chosen to initiate changes of policy, in Armenia and in Britain; and about this time (Seneca's influence waning fast) new counsellors of Nero can be surmised from items that happen not to be disclosed in the narrative of Tacitus—Flavius Sabinus as Prefect of the City, and suffect consulates for Vibius Crispus (?61) and for Eprius Marcellus (62). The *ordinarii* of 62 are a pair of *novi homines*, of no interest to posterity.⁷⁷ But L. Verginius Rufus opens the next year, a knight's son from Mediolanum.⁷⁸

The consular historian could have gained various benefits from a glance at the *fasti* of those years.⁷⁹ Crispus and Marcellus are later on high show and in sharp portrayal, the ministers whom Vespasian honoured and cherished⁸⁰; and Caesennius Paetus was duly refurbished.

L. Caesennius P. f. Sospes is thus rescued and installed as the younger son of L. Caesennius Paetus. About fifteen years separate him from his brother, the consul of 79. Either one is the son of Flavia Sabina, perhaps both: Paetus might also have married a Junia. The elder brother shows the prefix 'L. Junius' on wax tablets, but the 'Junius' is omitted on inscriptions at Rome and at Puteoli.⁸¹ For all that can be known the item might have stood at the head of the dedication to Sospes set up at Antioch.

ix. Another member of the old Tarquinian family had employment in the eastern lands, namely A. Caesennius Gallus. Perhaps a *polyonymus*, like the consuls of 61 and 79, and, if so, perhaps linked to A. Didius Gallus (*suff.* 39). When the rebellion broke out in Judaea, Cestius Gallus the governor of Syria intervened, taking as the nucleus of his army the legion XII Fulminata. Its commander, Caesennius Gallus, stayed behind to establish order in Galilee, after which he went to Caesarea.⁸² Thus he did not share the disastrous retreat from Jerusalem, so it appears.⁸³ How long he retained his command, there is no sign. The legion

⁷¹ *Pro Caecina* 10; 27.

⁷² *CIL* XI. 3415 f.; 7569. Add now the dedication on a bronze altar at Graviscae: 'Isi et Serapi | Caesennia L.f. Prisca | Vitellia Sp. f. Ingenua | Caesennii Prisci | s.p.p.', *Not. Scavi* (1971), 210.

⁷³ *AE* 1973, 141 f.

⁷⁴ viz. Junius Paetus (*suff.* 127); (?Junius) Paetus (*suff.* 154); (?D.) Junius Paetus (*suff.* 145); *PIR*², J 790 f. The first of these, it is there suggested, might have been a 'D. Junius L. Caesennius Paetus' and related to L. Caesennius Antoninus (*suff.* 128).

⁷⁵ *ILS* 2927.

⁷⁶ For 61, U. Weidemann, *Acta Classica* XVIII (1975), 149 f.; for an earlier date in preference, W. Eck, *Historia* XXIV (1975), 343 f.

⁷⁷ viz. P. Marius and L. Afinius Gallus.

⁷⁸ *AE* 1968, 6 (*Fasti Ostienses*). Hence his governorship of Tarraconensis (*AE* 1939, 60) should probably run from 74 to 77.

⁷⁹ *Tacitus* (1958), 387; 743. In the *Annales* as extant Vibius Crispus only crops up in annotation on his equestrian brother (xiv. 28. 2).

⁸⁰ *Tacitus*, *Dial.* 8. 3: 'cum quadam reverentia diliguntur'.

⁸¹ *PIR*², C 174.

⁸² Josephus, *BJ* II. 510; 513; III. 31.

⁸³ At least on the showing of Josephus.

joined the army of Titus in 70—but no legate is named among the officers present at the ultimate council of war.⁸⁴ The ill fame of XII Fulminata was recalled when Titus sent it away to Melitene after the fall of the city.⁸⁵

Silence envelops Caesennius Gallus for a long space of time until he turns up as governor of Cappadocia-Galatia, probably holding office from 80 to 83. Four milestones attest him, three set up under Titus, the fourth under Domitian.⁸⁶ The year of his consulate (perhaps much retarded) is not on record.⁸⁷ He may have owed his provincial appointment to the especial favour of Titus.

Nothing is heard of Gallus in the sequel. In the year 84 a governor of Syria died (Atilius Rufus), and Domitian, when awarding the *ornamenta triumphalia* to Julius Agricola, let fall a hint that he might be in the running for that province.⁸⁸ As ever, the friends and counsellors of Caesar had their candidates, with claims of various validity. Merit and experience could not be ruled out. Funisulanus Vettonianus (*suff.* 78) had succeeded Atilius Rufus in Pannonia, where a diploma attests him in September of 84; and Vettulenus Civica Cerialis (*suff. c.* 76) stood in Moesia, since at least 82.⁸⁹

On one count, promotion from Cappadocia to Syria was convenient and highly suitable. Two recent governors offered, namely Caesennius Gallus and his predecessor M. Hirrius Fronto (*suff. c.* 75).⁹⁰ It would be worth knowing who got Syria: that is, the predecessor of P. Valerius Patruinus (*suff.* 82 or 83), who is attested in 88.

L. Junius Caesennius Paetus had no long survival after he managed the annexation of Commagene in 72. If he had deserved Syria, he deserved a second consulate. That honour fell to no fewer than four men in 74, among them L. Junius Vibius Crispus and T. Clodius Epirus Marcellus. The elder son of Paetus, however, became *consul ordinarius* in 79 and acceded in due course to Asia (?93/4).⁹¹

As has been shown, the catastrophe of the Flavian House annulled the prospects of Caesennius Sospes. He only reached the *fasces* in 114. The next consul is L. Caesennius Antoninus, suffect in 128. The short interval accords with the retardation of Sospes—if Sospes, as seems plausible, was his parent.⁹²

Then follows as *ordinarius* in 163 A. Junius P. f. Fab. Pastor L. Caesennius Sospes.⁹³ The nomenclature suggests a genuine adoption, not testamentary, or the assumption of a name from affinity, or from personal gratitude. This man carries the 'Fabia', the tribe of Brixia. One recalls the Junius Pastor whom the young Pliny defended with success 'contra potentissimos civitatis atque etiam Caesaris amicos'; and a fragment of the name can be discerned on an inscription of Brixia.⁹⁴

x. To resume. First of all, scrutiny of the last two praetorian posts held by Sospes yields a concordant result and dating. Sospes commanded a legion in Pannonia during Domitian's 'expeditio Suebica et Sarmatica'. That was in 92. He next held the governorship of Galatia (either with or without the adjunct of Armenia Minor). The appointment had a reason, namely the decease of Antistius Rusticus, the consular legate of Cappadocia-Galatia; it did not last for long (?94/5), but it ought to have led to a consulship.

Second, identity. A forgotten child at Arsamosata rises up to confute any doubters, explain a cognomen and establish a family nexus. Sospes is the younger son of the consul of 61, whose full nomenclature is now certified, viz. L. Junius Caesennius Paetus: he began as a P. Caesennius, for so 'P. f.' in the filiation of Sospes declares.

Third, L. Caesennius Sospes, revealed as consul suffect in 114. He is here assumed to be the same man. A faint doubt calls for mention in passing. The *suffectus* of 114 might be

⁸⁴ *Bj* vi. 237 (the legates of V, X, and XV).

⁸⁵ *Bj* vii. 18 f.

⁸⁶ *PIR*³, A 170; R. K. Sherck, op. cit. (n. 11), 46 f. The fourth milestone shows that he has become XV *vir s.f.* (*CIL* III. 14184⁴⁸).

⁸⁷ Compare L. Funisulanus Vettonianus who commanded IV Scythica in the army of Caesennius Paetus (*Ann.* xv. 7. 1): not consul until 78.

⁸⁸ Tacitus, *Agr.* 40. 1.

⁸⁹ *CIL* xvi. 30; 28.

⁹⁰ For the *cursus* of M. Hirrius Fronto Neratius Pansa, see the new inscription from Saepinum,

published by M. Torelli in *JRS* LVIII (1968), 170 f., whence *AE* 1968, 145. Torelli suggested that Fronto might have been legate of VI Ferrata in 69. Which is attractive. But it is not certain, as he assumes (*ibid.* 174), that Caesennius Gallus was still legate of XII Fulminata.

⁹¹ W. Eck, op. cit. (n. 11), 144.

⁹² To be sure, this man might be a grandson of the consul of 79.

⁹³ *ILS* 1095.

⁹⁴ Pliny, *Epp.* I. 18. 3: *Not. Scav.* 1950, 70.

a youthful consul, the fruit of an early marriage. That notion lacks appeal: it entails obtruding another generation between a potential consul of 97 (i.e. Sospes) and a consul of 128 (i.e. Caesennus Antoninus).

However that may be, even if identity were denied or disproved (epigraphy often brings surprises), the conclusions presented about the career and parentage of the Flavian senator would not be in any way impaired. The only item to lapse would be the retarded consulate.

XI. While Tacitus was composing the *Annales*, he came upon the forebears of senators who enjoyed rank and repute in his own time. Their first entrances were often equivocal, or worse. The consular historian was not loath to consign their behaviour to firm record. No need to insist or annotate. The bare names were evocative for the contemporary reader. Specimens abound.⁹⁵

On one theory and assumption Cornelius Tacitus went to work not long after he returned from the proconsulate of Asia in the summer of 113. Trajan's war soon impinged. Without reverting to matters in notorious controversy, one may observe a negative sign. Reviewing provinces and armies in Book IV the historian alludes to the eastern frontier and the role of the vassal kingdoms. The formulation is kept studiously vague—and it eschews mention of Armenia.⁹⁶

Whatever view be held about the date of composition (and the rhythm), it will not be easy to maintain that Tacitus was writing the Neronian books earlier than the late years of Trajan. Personalities and politics acquired sharp relevance: Corbulo and Paetus, conquest or renunciation. It is permissible to look for some reflection in a subtle and subversive writer who had no call or desire to be explicit.

One instance affords entertainment. A general about to invade Armenia comes out with a proud pronouncement: 'se tributa ac leges et pro umbra regis Romanum ius impositurum victis.'⁹⁷ That recalls Trajan's proclamation.⁹⁸ The speaker, however, is not great Corbulo, only the inept Paetus.

The historian would be alert to the Caesennii and their vicissitudes.⁹⁹ He was careful to mention the civilians in the fortress at Arsamosata, not once but twice. The more a man reflects on transactions past and present, the more sharply stand out the 'ludibria rerum humanarum'.¹⁰⁰ Such is the comment elicited by a casual piece of business in the Senate: they forgot to include Claudius, the brother of Germanicus, in a public act of thanksgiving. L. Caesennius Sospes was the close coeval of Cornelius Tacitus (praetor 88).

XII. Epilogue. Sospes may impel to reflections of a different order. There has been a persistent reluctance to admit that Sospes was a legionary legate in 92, winning honours in Domitian's campaign against Suebi and Sarmatae. Various devices have been brought into play, with dates ranging from the first years of Vespasian to the time of Marcus Aurelius.¹⁰¹

Dismissing those extremes, brief comment may go to a pair of recent elucidations. First, trouble with Sarmatians at the beginning of Hadrian's reign was evoked, as registered in the *Historia Augusta*.¹⁰² But those Sarmatians are the Rhoxolani, who dwelt near the mouth of the Danube. No warfare with the Rhoxolani in fact ensued.¹⁰³ And none is on

⁹⁵ Tacitus (1958), 301 f.; 478 f.

⁹⁶ Ann. iv. 5. 2: 'dehinc initio ab Suria usque ad flumen Euphraten, quantum ingenti terrarum sinu ambitur, quattuor legionibus coercita, accolis Hiberno Albanoque et aliis regibus qui magnitudine nostra proteguntur adversum externa imperia'. See further 'How Tacitus wrote Annals I-III', *Publications de la Faculté de Lettres, Université de Louvain* (1977), forthcoming.

⁹⁷ Ann. xv. 6. 4.

⁹⁸ Dio LXVIII. 20. 3.

⁹⁹ Including Caesennius Gallus. But the 'Caesennius Maximus' in a long list of persons banished after Piso's conspiracy (Ann. xv. 71. 5) and registered as *PIR*³, C 172 is more safely to be regarded as a Caesoni (Martial VII. 44. 1): the historian himself,

not a scribe, may have made an error. Martial terms the man an ex-consul (VII. 44. 6).

¹⁰⁰ Ann. III. 18. 4.

¹⁰¹ Early Vespasianic, R. K. Sherck, op. cit. (n. 11), 90; for the time of Marcus, A. Mócsy, op. cit. (n. 3), 102. It may be recalled that Domaszewski long ago assigned *ILS* 1017 to the reign of Antoninus Pius.

¹⁰² *HA, Hadr.* 6. 6, adduced by H. G. Pflaum, *Historia* II (1954), 431 f. (at 435). He was followed by J. Dobiáš, *Omágu lui C. Daicoviciu* (1960), 147 f. For brief disagreement, *Danubian Papers* (1971), 109.

¹⁰³ *HA, Hadr.* 6. 8: 'cum rege Roxolanorum, qui de imminutis subsidiis querebatur, cognito negotio pacem fecit'.

record with the Germans across the middle course of the river. Furthermore, the legion XIII Gemina was no longer in Pannonia. It belonged to the garrison of Dacia.¹⁰⁴

The corollary of that theory was to have Sospes governor of Galatia not long after. That will not do either. There is no room for him. Three legates of Galatia can be called up, to fill the years from 114 to 122.¹⁰⁵

The theory was arbitrary, and fragile in both members, even before the consular year of L. Caesennius Sospes became known. A restatement ensued after a time. Why not operations against the Sarmatae Jazyges in 107/8 when Hadrian (praetor 106) held the newly erected province of Pannonia Inferior?¹⁰⁶ Another passage from the *HA* was now summoned into service. It does not amount to much. To quote it in context may be enough: 'Sarmatas compressit, disciplinam militarem tenuit, procuratores latius evagantes coercuit' (*Hadr.* 3.9).

What the biography appears to present is a general and improving testimonial of virtues requisite in an exemplary governor, governor in this instance of Pannonia Inferior. The language fails to disclose a victorious campaign such as would confer decorations on a legionary legate; and, once again, no hint of Suebi.

The passage should perhaps be put to different employ, to illustrate the contrasting strands perceptible in the *Vita Hadriani*. That is, a favourable or neutral presentation of that person, with items of detraction or scandal put to the credit of Marius Maximus.¹⁰⁷

The restatement entailed shifting Sospes' governorship of Galatia for a second time. It was now allocated *c.* 111, which on a normal pattern of promotions concurred with the year of his consulate. That dating carried a further appeal. It demonstrated the division of the province Cappadocia-Galatia, well in advance of Trajan's war.

Trajan was avid and truculent, eager to seize the earliest pretext for settling affairs with the Parthians, as the 'dignitas imperii' enjoined. Signs were therefore sought, of premeditation and also of planning; and some even roped in the special mandate of Pliny, appointed to set in order the affairs of the cities in Bithynia and Pontus.

The severance of Galatia from Cappadocia promised something better, and solid. The notion was taken up, with no hesitations.¹⁰⁸ Indeed, it has found firm and sober endorsement.¹⁰⁹

The advocates of the new doctrine failed to explain in what ways the division of Cappadocia-Galatia contributed to preparations for a war of aggression. Other amateur students of geography and strategy might interpose the contrary thesis: Cappadocia still needed the hinterland for roads, transport and supplies. Junius Homullus, it follows, was the last of the consular legates. The annexation of Armenia abolished the complex. None too soon, some might maintain, for the monster extended from the bounds of Pamphylia and Cilicia to the Black Sea and the river Euphrates. But that is another question.

To conclude. Sospes is rescued a second time, from posthumous hazards. One reverts to Mommsen and Dessau, though not to take shelter behind the 'magna nomina'. Sound method (or better, common sense) prescribed immediate approach to the document.¹¹⁰ But the legionary command and the praetorian province alone held out some chance of precision, not any of the other posts.

For the career of Sospes, scholars were ready to admit and commend anything rather than a Domitianic date. Why then the effort and all the contortions? The answer is tranquil, but disturbing. Dogma had formed and propagated.

First, a *curator coloniarum et municipiorum*. Acceptable, so it was decreed, under Trajan,

¹⁰⁴ Warfare on the borders of Dacia in 117/8 happens to be attested by the inscription on Julius Quadratus Bassus (*Pergamon* VII. 3, no. 21); and there is the ensuing command of the knight Marcus Turbo, embracing Dacia and Pannonia Inferior. Not strictly relevant, however, to the interpretation of *HA*, *Hadr.* 6. 6 f.—and the date of *ILS* 1017 was subsequently modified by the author of the theory.

¹⁰⁵ cf. above, p. 39. For his dating of Sospes Pflaum was under constraint to deny that Gallus (*ILS* 1038) was Gallus the *suffectus* of 119, op. cit. (n. 102), 434.

¹⁰⁶ H. G. Pflaum, *Bonner HAC* 1968/9 (1970), 184 f. Endorsed by W. Eck, op. cit. (n. 3), 11.

¹⁰⁷ *Emperors and Biography* (1971), 126 f.

¹⁰⁸ R. Hanslik, *RE*, Supp. x, 1089: 'Tr. trennte, wahrscheinlich auch schon im Hinblick auf seinen geplanten Partherkrieg, im J. 110 die beiden Gebiete.'

¹⁰⁹ Thus, following Pflaum's revised dating, W. Eck, op. cit. (n. 3), 10 f.; *RE*, Supp. xiv, 81.

¹¹⁰ H. G. Pflaum, op. cit. (n. 102), 431: 'il vaut mieux nous reporter au document même.'

but dubious or denied for the time of Domitian.¹¹¹ Second, the post of *praefectus frumenti dandi*. Likewise subject to decree. The post was abolished by Claudius, restored by Nerva.¹¹² How do we know? Facts were adduced: none of these *praefecti* could be discovered on inscriptions between 54 and 96.¹¹³

Doubts about the dogma were not often expressed.¹¹⁴ The persistence of faith led to grave derelictions.¹¹⁵

A thought might have been given to the nature and incidence of the epigraphic evidence registering senatorial careers from Tiberius to Trajan. It exhibits men of birth or success in high proportion, which is welcome. The *praefecti frumenti dandi* tend to be new men, in scant prospect of a consulship at that stage. In fact, Caesennius Sospes is the first known member of a consular family to hold the office.

Some other minor posts of praetorian rank confirm. Between 54 and 96 it will not be easy to conjure up a *curator* of the Via Appia—or, for that matter, of the Aurelia, the Flaminia, the Latina.¹¹⁶ As Goethe in corroboration of the obvious had to say to Eckermann, more than once, ‘lieber Freund, es ist eben so.’

Wolfson College, Oxford

¹¹¹ e.g., E. Kornemann, *RE* iv, 1807.

¹¹² e.g., E. Kornemann, op. cit., 1780 (following Hirschfeld); M. P. Charlesworth in *CAH* x (1934), 468; A. Momigliano, *Claudius, the Emperor and his Achievement* (1934), 50, cf. 107; D. van Berchem, *Les distributions de blé* (1939), 72; 77.; H. G. Pflaum, op. cit. (n. 102), 441; 449. Also *PIR*², J 523 (M. Julius Romulus).

¹¹³ See the list appended to Pflaum's paper.

¹¹⁴ Vigorous dissent was raised by G. E. F. Chilver,

AJP Lxx (1949), 7 f. His interpretation of *AE* 1925, 85 (the career of M. Julius Romulus) was not noticed by Pflaum in 1954, op. cit. (n. 102), 446 f.

¹¹⁵ *ILS* 1017 was omitted by McCrum and Woodhead, *Select Documents of the Principates of the Flavian Emperors* (1961).

¹¹⁶ The earliest known *curator* of the Latina belongs c. 95 (Stadius, *Silvae* iv. 4. 60). For the full list, Pflaum, *Corolla Memoriae Erich Swoboda Dedicata* (1966), 188 f.