

## PROMOTION AND PATRONAGE IN EQUESTRIAN CAREERS

By R. P. SALLER

In general histories of the Principate a prominent place is often given to the growth of bureaucracy, characterized especially by the equestrian procuratorial service. Along with a growth in size, it is said, came the development of an organization regulated by guidelines—the ‘formation of the rigid framework of a civil service, one that was to a certain extent more and more impersonal’. Thus, with regard to promotion, ‘the procurator’s career had a precise promotion ladder, on which the scale of remuneration conferred a surprisingly modern character’.<sup>1</sup> This view carries with it wide-ranging general and specific implications. It suggests that Roman government of the early empire reached a fairly sophisticated level of rational organization in which friendship and patronage, so vital to the workings of Republican politics, declined in importance, as bureaucratic rules played an increasingly decisive role in the appointment and promotion of procurators. More specifically, it has been thought that once the rules have been discovered, missing steps in individual careers can be interpolated with confidence.

The emperors, of course, were ultimately responsible for the appointment of procurators.<sup>2</sup> In the absence of useful literary evidence, historians have relied largely upon the epigraphic evidence, especially *cursum* inscriptions, for a reconstruction of emperors’ intentions and policies in making appointments. The most influential and thorough work in this field is that done by Professor H.-G. Pflaum, who has stressed the structured nature of the equestrian administration. In the fourth chapter of the second part of his *Procurateurs équestres sous le Haut-Empire romain* (1950), he explained the hierarchy of procuratorships in the following way: the rank of procurators depended on the level of pay; the salary was in turn attached to the official, not to the office; but particular offices were regularly held by men at a particular salary level; so despite some irregularities procuratorships can be classified in a hierarchy according to several main salary levels with subdivisions. In addition, Pflaum concluded that a man’s ‘rang’ and ‘ancienneté’ were, despite occasional exercise of the emperor’s discretionary power, the decisive factors in his movement through the hierarchy, this being ‘la grande règle de la hiérarchie romaine’.<sup>3</sup> Some years later the catalogue of procurators, an invaluable work of reference on which Pflaum based his arguments, appeared.<sup>4</sup> There has been some reaction against Pflaum’s stress on structure: among the reviewers Professor Fergus Millar expressed serious reservations about the dating of the development of the hierarchy and the ‘règles’ governing promotion.<sup>5</sup> Despite Millar’s comments, which were necessarily brief, Pflaum’s assumptions about equestrian careers have nevertheless been influential in recent work. Additional doubts, especially concerning the likelihood of specialized careers for procurators, have been raised more recently by Professor P. A. Brunt.<sup>6</sup>

Obviously there will be no simple, demonstrable answer to the questions of how and why emperors promoted their equestrian officials: the answers will vary from reign to reign. But there may still be profit to be gained by consideration of the general issue of how structured equestrian careers were, and the related issue of how much was left to personal factors. In considering the first issue, I shall focus on several questions: to what extent did any seniority principle regulate procuratorial promotions through the ranks; how predictable were careers (that is, were promising men picked out early in their careers); was there an attempt to make appointments in such a way as to encourage specialization? If career structure is found to be less important than usually thought, then it must finally be asked: what other factors influenced the emperor’s appointments of equestrians?

### SENIORITY

Through an examination of equestrian career inscriptions, Professor Pflaum was able to offer a description of the way in which equestrian procuratorships were organized. In the first

<sup>1</sup> A. Garzetti, *From Tiberius to the Antonines*, transl. by J. R. Foster (1974), 403 f.

<sup>2</sup> F. Millar, *The Emperor in the Roman World* (1977), 286 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Pflaum, *Proc.*, 295 f.

<sup>4</sup> *Les carrières procuratoriennes équestres sous le Haut-Empire romain* (1960–1), 3 vols.

<sup>5</sup> *JRS* 53 (1963), 194 ff.

<sup>6</sup> ‘The administrators of Roman Egypt’, *JRS* 65 (1975), 124 ff.

and early second centuries they were categorized according to the three salary levels of their occupants: 60,000 HS, 100,000 HS and 200,000 HS.<sup>7</sup> From the reign of Marcus Aurelius another more senior level, 300,000 HS, was added. In addition, Pflaum believed that the 100,000 and 200,000 levels were further subdivided into two and four echelons respectively (for which there are no ancient names or testimony). Though the salary labels may have become formalized later than Pflaum believed, the evidence does seem to prove that there was a relatively stable hierarchy of procuratorships from the early second century. Most procurators are said to have served in at least one office at each salary level from the point of entry and to have moved through this hierarchy in accordance with guidelines with such regularity that it is possible to distinguish the 'normal career'.<sup>8</sup> Indeed, during the second century the *forma* became so decisive that the office of *praefectus fabrum* declined and disappeared because young *equites* no longer valued the patronal support to be secured by working under an important official.<sup>9</sup> Moreover, movement through the hierarchy was so carefully regulated that the intrusion of an imperial favourite into the system might interfere with the *cursus* of other procurators.<sup>10</sup>

To avoid confusion in the analysis, two possible meanings of *ancienneté* or seniority must be distinguished at the outset: there was the seniority attached to the office and that which attached to the procurator. The seniority of an office was defined by where it stood in the hierarchy (so the consulship was senior to the praetorship), while the seniority of an official depended on how long or in how many offices he had served. Promotion in accordance with *ancienneté* should mean that the level of the procurator's next appointment was based on the number of offices in which he had already served. The distinction is important because, while promotion according to seniority presumes a hierarchy of offices, the latter does not imply the former as an important consideration in promotion.

If a hierarchy of procuratorships seems proven, the evidence for *ancienneté* as a principle for promotion through the ranks is less clear. Though in analyses of procuratorial *cursus* certain ones are labelled 'normal', the normal career in accordance with a seniority principle is never explicitly defined.<sup>11</sup> In Pflaum's catalogue, for instance, an early-second-century procurator, L. Baebius Iuncinus (no. 121), served in the *tres militiae* and then, after holding the *praefectura vehicularum* at the centenariate level, was promoted to a ducenariate post as *iuridicus Aegypti*—a *cursus* in which there is nothing 'anormal'. L. Egnatuleius Sabinus (no. 217) also passed through a 'normal' career, but for him this entailed two sexagenariate posts after his *militiae*, and with his third post (*procurator XXXX Galliarum*) he reached only the centenariate level at which Iuncinus started. What evidence is there to prove the existence of the concept of a 'normal career' governed by seniority principles?

The literary testimony bearing on this question is extremely scarce, but one passage has been found to support the idea that advancement through procuratorial offices was governed by some seniority principle. In the corpus of Fronto's letters is preserved a *commendatio* to Marcus Aurelius on behalf of the imperial freedman Aridelus. Fronto recommended Aridelus as a 'homo frugi et sobrius et acer et diligens'. Fronto requested Marcus' support as the freedman 'petit nunc procurationem ex forma suo loco ac iusto tempore'.<sup>12</sup> These last seven words were translated by Pflaum 'selon le texte du règlement, conformément à son rang et à son ancienneté', and Pflaum concluded his remarks about procuratorial promotion: 'le passage de Fronto *ex forma suo loco ac iusto tempore* s'est avéré comme la grande règle de la hiérarchie romaine'.<sup>13</sup> The value of this passage may, however, be questioned on two grounds. E. J. Champlin has recently challenged the translation, suggesting that the *ex forma* phrase may qualify not the procuratorship, but the subject of the verb, Aridelus, in the act of petitioning. So he translates: 'Aridelus is now petitioning in the proper manner, on his own behalf, and at the proper time'.<sup>14</sup> According to this interpretation the emperor's patronal role is stressed—a role thoroughly documented by Professor Millar.<sup>15</sup> Both translations seem plausible and so this passage is of little value as substantiation for the existence of bureaucratic guidelines regulating the promotion of procurators. Furthermore, Aridelus was a freedman, and it is by no means

<sup>7</sup> *Proc.*, Pt. 2 Ch. 4.

<sup>8</sup> e.g., *Proc.*, 251, refers to 'le cours normal de son avancement'.

<sup>9</sup> *Proc.*, 206.

<sup>10</sup> *Carr.*, 395.

<sup>11</sup> *Carr.*, nos. 121, 217, 249, 327, 331 *bis*. The early stages of P. Cominius Clemens' (no. 184) career

were so regular that it could be said 'jusqu'ici pas trace de favoritisme'.

<sup>12</sup> *Ad M. Caes.* 5. 37.

<sup>13</sup> *Proc.*, 210 and 295 f.

<sup>14</sup> *Fronto and Antonine Rome* (1980), 102-3, with notes 52 and 53.

<sup>15</sup> *Emperor*, *passim*.

clear that whatever rules (if any) governed careers in the *familia Caesaris* would have applied to equestrian procurators.<sup>16</sup>

The absence of any other literary testimony stating or implying bureaucratic guidelines should be noted (for example, there are no remarks or complaints that a procurator was promoted before his turn), though the silence may have little meaning in view of the lack of Roman authors' interest in the mechanics of administration. But one particular omission may be significant. Cassius Dio inserted into his account of the reign of Augustus a debate between Agrippa and Maecenas about the vices and virtues of monarchy. Though the debate is set in 29 B.C., nearly all of the details and suggestions in Maecenas' speech are related to Dio's own time.<sup>17</sup> 'The most important part of the speech concerns the recruitment, training, functions, and status of the two leading orders of the State.'<sup>18</sup> For senators Dio gives precise details of the *cursus*: enrolment as an *equus* at age eighteen, as a senator not younger than twenty-five, appointment as a praetor from age thirty.<sup>19</sup> With regard to *equites*, by contrast, in the two chapters concerning the organization and selection of the prefects and procurators there is not a hint of a formal *cursus* or 'la grande règle de la hiérarchie romaine'.<sup>20</sup> The omission cannot be ascribed to neglect by Dio of the criteria for appointment. He tells us that Praetorian Prefects should be the most excellent (*hoi aristoi*) of the order, men who had served in the military often and had a variety of other experience as well; procuratorships should be given as prizes for *aretē*.<sup>21</sup> The silence here of a third-century senator about the supposedly dominant guidelines for the selection of equestrian officials may not be compelling proof one way or the other, but perhaps it should encourage disbelief in the 'grande règle' in the absence of clear norms in the *cursus* inscriptions.<sup>22</sup>

In an effort to discover the normal career and seniority principles in the epigraphic evidence, we must not be content with a few examples; rather, all useful data should be collected and presented in a way that will permit the patterns to emerge. This is done in Table 1 on pages 60 ff. with the invaluable aid of Pflaum's catalogue, from which the career numbers are taken. Much of the evidence in the catalogue is not relevant to the argument here. First, careers before the reign of Trajan (group A in Pflaum's tables) are not included, since they began before the full development of the hierarchy and so should not be used as evidence of irregularity.<sup>23</sup> Secondly, only those officials from equestrian military and civilian backgrounds (as opposed to *primipilares*) are listed. The promotion patterns of those rising from centurionates are linked to the procuratorial hierarchy in a regular way (*primipilares* enter at the centenariate level and *primipilares bis* at the ducenariate level)<sup>24</sup> but too few clearly complete careers of this type of procurator survive to make possible statements about their 'normal' progress through the procuratorial hierarchy.<sup>25</sup> Finally, fragmented careers are excluded; the table includes only those which are complete or complete up to a point. Strict selection is necessary to prevent circularity of argument (using a presumed pattern to fill in or order fragmented careers, and then adducing the same careers as evidence for the pattern).

<sup>16</sup> It has been argued that the age of an imperial slave or freedman may have had an influence on the level of office for which he was eligible (P. R. C. Weaver, *Familia Caesaris* (1972), 224 ff.). Though the evidence cited shows more of a pattern than any similar evidence for equestrian procurators, it is still less than compelling (G. Burton, 'Slaves, Freedmen and Monarchy' (review of G. Boulvert, *Esclaves et affranchis impériaux sous le Haut-Empire romain, rôle politique et administratif* and *Domestique et fonctionnaire sous le Haut-Empire romain: la condition de l'affranchi et de l'esclave du prince*), *JRS* 67 (1977), 162 f.).

<sup>17</sup> Fergus Millar, *A Study of Cassius Dio* (1964), 104.

<sup>18</sup> *ibid.*, 111.

<sup>19</sup> 52. 20. 1-2.

<sup>20</sup> 52. 24-25.

<sup>21</sup> 52. 24. 1-2 and 52. 25. 5.

<sup>22</sup> It may also be worth pointing out that in the codicil of appointment sent by Marcus Aurelius to Q. Domitius Marsianus (*AE* 1962, 183) there is no hint of a seniority principle. Marsianus' appointment to the ducenariate procuratorship is said to have been due to Marcus' *favor*, and he is told to maintain the

*diligentia, innocentia* and *experientia* which he had previously displayed.

<sup>23</sup> A. Sherwin-White, 'Procurator Augusti', *PBSR* 15 (1939), 11 ff. After showing the slow development of the procuratorial service from disparate elements in the first century, Sherwin-White concluded that the system became increasingly 'mechanical and regular . . . in the highly developed bureaucracy of the second century'.

<sup>24</sup> Pflaum, *Proc.*, 227.

<sup>25</sup> Out of the dozens of second- and third-century careers of ex-centurions, only a few give evidence of a complete career which progressed beyond the level of entry (among the *primipilares*, nos. 167, 225, 330; and of the *primipilares bis*, nos. 94, 109, 162, 234 in Pflaum's catalogue). Professor E. Birley has pointed out the diverse social origins of *primipilares*, some of whom would have been of municipal aristocratic origins, while many others rose from the ranks of the legions (*Roman Britain and the Roman Army* (1953), 118 ff.). To judge by a statement of Cassius Dio (52. 25. 7), the common birth of the latter group was not forgotten and may have influenced their advancement, so it is best to keep them separated from the other careers, as Pflaum did.

An initial search through Table I indicates that nearly all procurators met the minimal requirement of serving in at least one post at each salary level from the point of entry, but there seems to have been no close relationship between promotion patterns and the subdivisions within the salary levels. No procurator moved up step by step through all six echelons within the centenariate and ducenariate levels despite the fact that some held enough offices to have been able to do so. The irregularity seems more noticeable than the regularity: some equestrians skipped some echelons and then held three or more appointments in another echelon (see nos. 168, 183, 193, 295 and 331 *bis* for the clearest cases). Some ducenariate procuratorships (e.g., of *Lugdunensis et Aquitania*) were regularly held later than others (e.g., of Baetica), but one may be entitled to question the value to the modern scholar of subdividing the centenariate category, in which the majority of procuratorships of both echelons were held as the first and only office in the category.<sup>26</sup>

With the subdivisions set aside, is it possible to discover any normal pattern of promotion from salary level to salary level? A glance at just the first ten careers in the table would not offer much hope. M. Aemilius Bassus (no. 103) had to pass through four sexagenariate procuratorships before promotion to the next level; three others (nos. 110, 112, 116), by contrast, held none; and the remaining six procurators held one, two or three posts. At the centenariate level there is less variation with all ten men holding one or two posts. Among the *cursus* of the five men who reached the Palatine *officia* from this group of ten, it is possible to find examples of two, three, four and six ducenariate posts held before promotion. Indeed, no two of these five careers present the same pattern of promotion, much less a normal pattern. Some of the careers moved more rapidly than the average and some more slowly, but that does not prove that the average represented a norm in the minds of the emperors and their *amici* according to which careers moved in accordance with universal guidelines.

Though there may not have been a fixed number of posts to be held at each level before promotion, it is possible that another, more sophisticated seniority principle was in effect: it has been suggested that those *equites* who served in more than the usual number of lower posts would be advanced more quickly at later stages by the seniority principle. Several examples of this can be discovered in Pflaum's catalogue.<sup>27</sup> L. Domitius Rogatus (no. 140) held four *militiae*, and then passed through the procuratorships *ab epistulis* (60,000 HS) and *moneta* (100,000 HS) to reach the ducenariate post in Dalmatia. The rapidity of this allegedly normal career is attributed in part to Rogatus' prolonged military service. Madame Pavis-D'Escurac in her discussion of careers associated with the *annona* finds the same principle applicable at a higher level. Ti. Claudius Xenophon (no. 222), after holding two sexagenariate posts in Rome and Egypt and four centenariate posts in the provinces and Rome, was promoted to the relatively important ducenariate procuratorship of Asia: 'cas exceptionnel, compensation peut-être à un séjour particulièrement long dans l'échelon centenaire'.<sup>28</sup> To be convincing, however, such explanations must be shown to have a more general validity. If there was a seniority principle, why did T. Statilius Optatus (no. 119), after holding four *militiae* like Rogatus, have to serve in two sexagenariate posts (one more than the average number of sexagenariate posts held in the second century), while men such as Valerius Eudaemon (no. 110) and Sex. Caecilius Crescens Volusianus (no. 142) skipped this level altogether despite their lack of military service?

In the final analysis, little progress is to be achieved through the citation of examples and counter-examples, none of which may be typical. The issue may be settled only by a somewhat more sophisticated statistical technique. If a seniority principle did in fact exercise an in-

<sup>26</sup> It would be a mistake to draw too many conclusions from the concept of four discrete subdivisions at the ducenariate level. In the case of C. Iulius Rufus (no. 129) who is known to have been *procurator patrimonii* and *procurator provinciae Raetiae* (each attested by a different inscription), Pflaum supposed that he probably held another procuratorship between the two, since the Raetia post belonged to the third echelon. In fact, the only concrete evidence from the second century relevant to the question consists of two complete *cursus* inscriptions: in one (no. 167) the Raetia post appears as the second ducenariate office, and in the other (no. 156) it

appears as the third. The evidence is indecisive, leaving only the weight of argument based on confidence in the system of sub-divisions. But confidence may wane when it is noticed that only a minority (seven) of the seventeen third echelon posts known from sufficiently complete second-century careers were actually held as the third ducenariate post.

<sup>27</sup> For comments about variation, Carr., nos. 106 *bis*, 132; for the seniority principle, nos. 310, 312.

<sup>28</sup> H. Pavis-D'Escurac, *La préfecture de l'annone: service administratif impérial d'Auguste à Constantin* (1976), 392.

fluence over the promotion of procurators, there should be a correlation between the length of past service and prospects for promotion. Or, to put the question in a form which can be tested, one may ask if there is a negative correlation between the number of offices a procurator had held in the past and the number of offices required at the man's current salary before promotion. Pflaum's thesis requires that the correlation coefficient be closer to  $-1.0$  than to  $0.0$ . A coefficient near to zero would indicate that no significant relationship exists between the two. The coefficient can be easily calculated for each level from the data in Table 1. Separate calculations have been made for the second century and the Severan period onwards, because the average number of lower posts held by each procurator grew as more sexagenariate and centenariate offices were created at the end of the second century. Unfortunately, the sample of third-century careers is small and frequently insufficient for any useful calculation.

To begin, then, is it true that lengthy service in the *militiae* led to rapid promotion in later procuratorial service? Even without the statistician's formula this might seem doubtful, since in the second century the average number of sexagenariate posts held before promotion to a centenariate post was approximately one, regardless of whether zero, one, two, three or four *militiae* had been held previously ( $N = 56$ ). Indeed, the correlation coefficient between *militiae* and sexagenariate posts held before promotion is  $-0.23$ , or close enough to zero to be insignificant. The corresponding coefficient for the third century is somewhat higher ( $-0.31$ ), but the sample is so small ( $N = 29$ ) that it is of questionable significance.<sup>29</sup> An examination of the individual cases from the third century suggests that, to the extent that the emperor took service in the *militiae* into consideration, he distinguished not between those who had held three and those who had held fewer than three *militiae*, but between those holding some *militiae* and those with none. This last group might hold from zero to four sexagenariate posts, while those with some military service normally held one. At most, the number of military posts held was a minor consideration and did not determine future promotions.

Though the number of *militiae* held seems to have exercised little or no influence on the pace of the subsequent procuratorial career, perhaps a stronger correlation can be detected within the procuratorial *cursus* itself. If it is asked whether an *equus* holding more than the usual number of sexagenariate posts received special consideration at the centenariate level, the answer would again seem to be no. The correlation coefficient is  $-0.07$  for the second century, indicating no relationship at all (the third-century sample is too small for a useful calculation).<sup>30</sup> Similarly, despite Mme Pavis-D'Escurac's example of Ti. Claudius Xenophon, there is no clear evidence that the rapidity of promotion through the ducenariate level to the Palatine *officia* was related to the number of posts held in the lower procuratorial ranks: the coefficient is  $-0.17$  for the second century, but the sample is too small to justify firm conclusions.<sup>31</sup>

An objection might be raised against this argument on the grounds that the calculations have been based on numbers of posts rather than length of service. The objection cannot be fully satisfactorily answered. There can be little doubt that the length of tenure of office varied.<sup>32</sup> It is conceivable that behind what appears to be almost random variation in the numbers of posts lies a regular seniority system with years of service as the main criterion for

<sup>29</sup> In the third-century sample, in the case of procurators whose *cursus* inscriptions mention no *militiae*, I have counted them as having held no *militiae*. There are indications that in this period *equites* became less concerned about giving full details about their military service, and it is possible that they held *militiae* without including any hint of them on their *cursus* inscription. If the *cursus* without *militiae* were excluded from the sample as uncertain, the coefficient would again be changed little:  $R = -0.26$  ( $N = 21$ ).

One further calculation may add meaning to the correlation coefficient. The determination coefficient (i.e., the degree to which the length of service in sexagenariate posts is influenced by the number of *militiae*) is calculated by squaring the correlation coefficient ( $R$ ). Thus, even in the case of the strongest relationship ( $R = -0.31$  in the third century), the length of service in *militiae* can at best be said to explain only ten per cent of the variation in the number

of sexagenariate posts held. For an explanation of these statistical techniques, R. Floud, *An Introduction to Quantitative Methods for Historians* (1973), chapter 7.

I have also tested the possibility that the number of *militiae* influenced the pace of the career over a longer period by calculating the correlation coefficient for the number of *militiae* against the number of sexagenariate and centenariate posts held before promotion:  $R = -0.21$  for the second century ( $N = 26$ ) and  $R = 0.0$  for the third century ( $N = 14$ ). In other words, there was no relationship between the factors during either period.

<sup>30</sup> Based on thirty second-century careers.

<sup>31</sup> Based on twelve careers. (The number of relevant third-century careers is even smaller.)

<sup>32</sup> Brunt, art. cit. (n. 6), 137, n. 58, found it impossible to draw conclusions from the limited data available.

promotion.<sup>33</sup> Only in a very few *cursus* are the appointments to, or tenure of, several offices datable; and these do not support the hypothesis of regularity. In the Trajanic period T. Haterius Nepos (no. 95) held a mere four procuratorships before taking up his Palatine post as a *libellis*: despite the fact that he held fewer posts than the average (five in the second century) before promotion to a Palatine bureau, he spent only a year or so in each procuratorship. By contrast, it took M. Vettius Latro (no. 104) twenty-two years to pass through three *militiae* and three procuratorships to reach the governorship of Mauretania Caesariensis in 128 (his service, however, may not have been continuous). Both M. Iulius Maximianus (no. 114) and Calvisius Faustianus (no. 177) were appointed *Idiologi* in Egypt during the second century, the former some twenty-one years after a sexagenariate Egyptian post and the latter only thirteen years (and perhaps only ten) after serving in his third *militia*.<sup>34</sup> Though too scanty to be conclusive, this information does not suggest a system with a seniority principle based on years of service rather than number of offices.

What general conclusions may be drawn about *ancienneté* from patterns in office-holding? Clearly, a development in organization took place as procuratorships were sorted out into a hierarchy, and equestrian officials were usually required to hold one post at each level from the point of entry before advancing to the next level. Moreover, this hierarchy was integrated with the hierarchy of top centurionate posts, so that the *primipilares* and *primipilares bis* who were promoted into the equestrian administration regularly entered at certain levels.<sup>35</sup> Though this represented a considerable advance in bureaucratic organization, it must be stressed that it provided only a minimal structure for procuratorial careers. The pace of advancement through the hierarchy varied greatly, and in a way which cannot be explained by any seniority principle so far suggested. Nothing in the available evidence warrants the belief that a procurator's promotions were governed by impersonal guidelines instead of the emperor's discretion. It is easy to understand why it would not necessarily have been in the emperor's interest to develop such an impersonal system. In the Maecenas speech Dio emphasized that equestrian offices were to be bestowed as rewards for and encouragements to loyalty.<sup>36</sup> To the extent that *equites* grew accustomed to think that at certain points in their careers they deserved promotions on the basis of bureaucratic guidelines, they would have viewed the appointments less as *beneficia* and have felt correspondingly less in the debt of the emperor.<sup>37</sup> Despite the comments of some modern scholars, I know of no evidence from the Principate which suggests that the special imperial favour enjoyed by some procurators upset any system or was regarded with annoyance by other procurators on the grounds that it interfered with their regular promotion based on past service.<sup>38</sup>

#### THE PROMISING CAREER

If the emperors favoured certain men with more rapid advancement than others, then it should be asked whether any pattern of favouritism can be found which might suggest what criteria the emperors used in their decisions. Interpreters of equestrian careers have pointed out several indicators of promising futures in the same way as III *virī monetales* are said to have

<sup>33</sup> Pflaum's comments seem to suggest that he believed in such a hypothesis. E.g., with regard to P. Magnus Rufus Magonianus (no. 236), it is concluded: 'Les postes se succèdent de telle sorte que chaque catégorie n'est représentée que par un seul emploi, prouvant la longue durée des fonctions, puisque rien ne nous permet de supposer une suite de promotions particulièrement rapide et brillante.' But the hypothesis about longer tenure of fewer offices is never argued in detail, much less proven.

<sup>34</sup> Faustianus is attested in the ducenariate office in 173, but Pflaum plausibly suggests that he may have gone out to Egypt with his father, the prefect in 170.

<sup>35</sup> B. Dobson, 'The Significance of the Centurion and "Primipilaris" in the Roman Army and Administration', *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II. 1, ed. H. Temporini (1974), 402. The article includes a discussion of the development of a career structure for centurions.

<sup>36</sup> 52. 25. 5.

<sup>37</sup> J. Boissevain, 'When the Saints go marching out: Reflections on the decline of patronage in Malta', in *Patrons and Clients*, ed. by E. Gellner and J. Waterbury (1977), 88, describes such an evolution of attitudes in modern Malta, where the people increasingly demand services from the government as their rights in accordance with rules, rather than petitioning the services as favours. The lack of expectation about appointment to procuratorships can be contrasted with the expectations which ex-consuls held about appointment to the proconsulships of Africa and Asia (Tacitus, *Agricola* 42).

<sup>38</sup> Pflaum's comments about the career of L. Aurelius Nicomedes (no. 163) imply the existence of such attitudes. T. F. Carney, *Bureaucracy in Traditional Society* (1971), 18, suggests much the same (without argument or evidence).

been marked by their office for rapid promotion in senatorial careers.<sup>39</sup> For instance, Professor Pflaum believed that 'c'est dès leur jeunesse, dès le début de leur carrière que les sujets intéressants sont sélectionnés par les services compétents'. The indicators most often cited are *praefecturae fabrum* (reflecting patronage), military decorations (reflecting talent), and the tenure of certain lower procuratorships in Rome. To what extent are these indicators genuinely reliable guides to the emperors' thinking about appointments?

The discussion of *praefecti fabrum* is closely related to the argument concerning the development of 'la grande règle' in Pflaum's *Les Procurateurs Équestres*. In the early Principate, it is suggested, the *suffragium* of leading senators and *equites* could be useful to an ambitious young man in pursuit of an equestrian career. A good means of securing this patronage was through service as an assistant to a leading official, who would then exercise helpful influence in the future.<sup>40</sup> In his discussion of several careers Pflaum noted that the *praefectura fabrum* indicated that a young man was enjoying special favour.<sup>41</sup> But as the second century progressed, the impersonal guidelines regulating promotion became increasingly powerful, and the *praefectura fabrum* became decreasingly popular until it disappeared during the reign of Septimius Severus. 'On comprend donc aisément les raisons qui ont amené les jeunes chevaliers à ne plus rechercher les places d'auxiliaires aux côtés des grands fonctionnaires. L'influence de ces derniers ne l'emportait pas sur la *forma* toute-puissante.'<sup>42</sup> Pflaum further noted that 'toute-puissante' is perhaps too strong a term (coteries monopolized offices under certain emperors such as Claudius and Nero) but 'les *suffragia* ont rarement faussé le jeu de la libre concurrence'.

This explanation for the disappearance of the *praefectura fabrum* would have important implications for an understanding of the political milieu of the second century, were it not for its dubious factual basis. There were, to be sure, *praefecti fabrum* who went on to enjoy notably successful careers: for instance, Sex. Caecilius Crescens Volusianus (no. 142) held only one centenariate and one ducenariate position before his appointment as *ab epistulis*. But other procurators who had also served in these prefectures during the second century were not so fortunate. On average they were no more successful than other procurators of the period: they held the same number of sexagenariate posts before promotion (an average of one), and the same proportion of them are known to have reached ducenariate procuratorships as are known from the whole group of second-century procurators (about forty-five per cent).<sup>43</sup> These figures are not meant to show that the *praefecti* did not build patronage relationships with their superiors. Rather, the point is that they were hardly unique in this respect. The letters of Pliny prove that equestrian military officers also required patronal support for their appointments and then continued to enjoy the patronage of their former commanders in their future careers.<sup>44</sup> Thus, the disappearance of the *praefectura fabrum* should not be thought a reflection of a decline in the influence which patrons could exert to manipulate some *forma*.<sup>45</sup>

If the emperor was interested in appointing candidates of demonstrated merit to procuratorships, it would seem plausible to suggest that he would have looked to the group of men who had won military decorations during their *militiae*. 'Le courage devant l'ennemi a ainsi été récompensé ultérieurement par un avancement prioritaire.'<sup>46</sup> This view was supported by the finding that among the twelve procurators promoted to the ducenariate level after

<sup>39</sup> E. Birley, 'Senators in the Emperor's Service', *PBA* 1953, 202.

<sup>40</sup> *Proc.*, 195 ff.; also M. Jarrett, 'The African contribution to the Imperial civil service', *Historia* 12 (1963), 222, and B. Dobson, 'Praefectus fabrum in the early Principate', in *Britain and Rome: Essays presented to E. Birley*, ed. by M. Jarrett and B. Dobson (1965), 77 f.

<sup>41</sup> Nos. 121, 145, 187, 209, 264.

<sup>42</sup> *Proc.*, 206. The circularity of the argument for the abolition of the post under Septimius Severus should perhaps be noted: Pflaum's evidence lies in the fact that no *praefectus fabrum* appears after the reign of Commodus; on the other hand, the reign of Septimius Severus is given in the catalogue as the *terminus ante quem* for the prefectures of M. Veserius Iucundianus (no. 209) and M. Porcius Aper (no. 187) because Severus abolished the post. Dobson, art. cit., 78, discards the Severan date for abolition without argument.

<sup>43</sup> Though Jarrett makes similar remarks about the special favour enjoyed by African *praefecti fabrum* (n. 40 above), his African evidence shows the opposite: only seven of sixteen African *praefecti* became equestrian officers and four reached procuratorships, while half of all African equestrian officers of the same period (nine of eighteen) succeeded to procuratorships. With such a small sample, conclusions cannot be firm, but the sample hardly proves that *praefecti* were unusually successful.

<sup>44</sup> e.g., *Epist.* 4.4, 7.22, 10. 87; Millar, *Emperor*, 284 ff.

<sup>45</sup> See below, p. 56 f.

<sup>46</sup> Pflaum, *Proc.*, 218. The slow ascent of M. Aemilius Bassus (no. 103) through the ranks is attributed to lack of military distinction, while two cases of rapid promotions (nos. 116 and 136) are ascribed to outstanding military service.

beginning their careers in a centenariate post during the Flavian era, three had won decorations during their military service. However, the theory that the military decoration was the important factor in the promotion is undermined when it is noticed that among the other eight less successful *equites* who began their careers in the same way, but are not known to have been promoted, the same number had also won military decorations.<sup>47</sup> It is difficult to find any direct connection between military decorations and rapid promotion. The distinction displayed by P. Cominius Clemens (no. 184) during the Parthian campaign under Lucius Verus does not seem to have given a marked impetus to his career, which included two sexagenariate offices (in charge of the *vicesima hereditatum* in Hispania Citerior and the *familia gladiatorum per Italiam*) and two centenariate posts (as *subpraefectus annonae* and procurator of Dacia Apulensis) before appointment to his first ducenariate post as procurator of Lusitania.<sup>48</sup> Those who had won military honours did enjoy an unusually high rate of success in securing adlection to the senate, but, perhaps surprisingly, the careers of the majority who remained *equites* display the same variety of pace of promotion found in the bulk of equestrian careers.<sup>49</sup> Though it is difficult to believe that the emperor did not take note of an equestrian's military distinction when deciding whether to promote him, such distinctions were clearly not a primary consideration.

The procuratorial offices stressed by Pflaum as signals for brilliant careers were held in Rome and reflect the emperor's need for trusted companions as administrators: 'certains posts centenaires qui sont ceux où les intéressés ne quittent pas la capitale, surtout la procuratèle de la monnaie ou la préfecture des véhicules, peuvent servir d'indice que le titulaire est promis à une brillante carrière, d'où la place privilégiée que ces emplois tiennent à l'intérieur de la catégorie centenaire. Ce choix précoce permettait à l'Empereur de former lui-même ses collaborateurs, de les habituer à ses exigences, tout en sauvegardant en même temps la tradition des bureaux.'<sup>50</sup> This remark appears in the commentary on the career of L. Volusius Maecianus (no. 141) and may help to make sense of his distinguished appointments which never took him far from Rome. It is, however, hardly applicable to the other seven procurators who are known to have managed the *vehicula* as a centenariate post in the second century. For four of the seven this prefecture was their last known appointment; another two are only known to have held an additional ducenariate post; and T. Appalius Alfinus Secundus (no. 144) was appointed to another centenariate post before holding one other ducenariate office.<sup>51</sup> In short, this group was no more successful than average in moving beyond the centenariate level. None of the seven is known to have risen to Palatine *officia* or the great prefectures, nor is there any reason to believe that appointment as *praefectus vehiculorum* was used as a means to keep these procurators in Rome (with the possible exception of L. Aurelius Nicomedes (no. 163), who had been Lucius Verus' *cubicularius*). The careers of the six *procuratores monetae* known from the second century present stronger evidence for Pflaum's statement: five are known to have been promoted to the ducenariate level and two to Palatine *officia*.<sup>52</sup> This represents an unusual rate of success, but with a sample of only six it would be dangerous to draw firm conclusions. Moreover, of the five who were promoted, the careers of only two show evidence of the emperor's wish to keep them in Rome.<sup>53</sup>

There is no need to doubt that for a variety of reasons certain young *equites* had greater promise for brilliant careers than others. What seems doubtful is that the reasons can be detected from bare *cursus* inscriptions. However plausible the explanations for using as indicators *praefecturae fabrum*, military decorations and certain offices at Rome, the fact is that the groups of men who were honoured with them were no more successful than the remainder of their colleagues. They cannot offer any very helpful guide to the emperors' thinking about appointments.

<sup>47</sup> The group referred to appears in *Carr.*, Table A2: nos. 51, 72 and 74 won decorations, but are not known to have reached ducenariate procuratorships.

<sup>48</sup> M. Vettius Latro (no. 104) and C. Annius Flavianus (no. 202) present similar cases: both won military decorations, but were nevertheless appointed to a total of three sexagenariate and centenariate posts instead of the more usual two.

<sup>49</sup> Nos. 136, 181 *bis* and 188 won military decorations and later reached the senate.

<sup>50</sup> *Carr.*, 336.

<sup>51</sup> Nos. 151, 152, 174, 178 *bis* are not known to have

been promoted; nos. 121 and 163 are known to have held one more post. Slightly more than half of all centenariate procurators of the second century are known to have been promoted to ducenariate posts.

<sup>52</sup> Nos. 66, 73, 117, 140 and 168 are known to have been promoted, and nos. 66 and 117 reached Palatine *officia*, while the *moneta* was the last recorded post for no. 206.

<sup>53</sup> Nos. 66, 73, 117 and 140 all spent much of their time at the ducenariate level in provincial posts rather than at the emperor's side in Rome (no. 140 had previously been Lucius Verus' *ab epistulis Caesaris*).



## SPECIALIZATION

Emperors, though not strongly influenced in their appointments by the length of a procurator's previous career, must have considered the kind of prior experience possessed by each candidate. The question is: what shape did this consideration take? Was a general distinction made between civilian and military backgrounds and/or were specialists favoured for particular types of posts (finance, *annona*, etc.)? Nearly a century ago in his *Die kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten*, Hirschfeld concluded that Hadrian first undertook to create a civil service in the modern sense with professional knowledge and routine, in part by introducing a civilian administrative career independent of military service.<sup>54</sup> This view was refined by Pflaum, who identified three types of *cursus* at the ducenariate level.<sup>55</sup> The first type was characteristic of those promoted from the centurionate (praetorians and *primipilares bis*), as well as a few *equites* who had served in equestrian *militiae*. These careers are almost entirely provincial: they are marked by many equestrian governorships and legionary prefectures, and few urban posts. *Equites* who had filled *militiae* make up the second group: in this type of career there appear no equestrian governorships and few urban offices. Hirschfeld's civilian career is the third type, which is characterized by the tenure of urban offices. This division between military and civilian paths through the hierarchy is sometimes taken to have been very rigid: in a recent commentary on the career of M. Pomponius Vitellianus it has been suggested that he retired after only one sexagenariate and one centenariate post because 'the procuratorial service provided far more opportunity for civilian than for military employment, and Vitellianus was a military man'.<sup>56</sup> This may seem a reasonable interpretation of Vitellianus' career, but does the overall distribution of offices in fact indicate that the emperor made his appointments in accordance with three types of backgrounds which rigidly divided the candidates?

As with seniority, the difficulty with reaching some conclusion about the validity of career types arises from the dearth of explicit literary testimony. In Dio's remarks in the Maecenas speech about the selection of equestrian officials there is no hint of a division between military and civilian careers, and it is recommended that the Praetorian Prefects be selected 'from those who have served often in the military and in many other administrative positions'.<sup>57</sup> Furthermore, Dio's recommendations about the education of potential imperial officials are revealing. After growing into youth and leaving the schools, both potential senators and *equites* should be trained in horse-riding and the use of arms by paid public instructors. In this way the emperor will provide himself with men who are 'suitable for every job', for such training instils loyalty.<sup>58</sup> Apparently Dio saw no need to have young men educated for specialized service in civilian administration: in the third century the traditional aristocratic training in the martial arts was still thought good preparation for all types of careers. The emperor's prime concern, according to Dio, was to find men who would display loyalty.

Dio's comments are too brief to be decisive and must be supplemented by the epigraphic evidence. The *cursus* inscriptions reveal a complexity in the distribution of offices which defies any simple answer to the question of career types. Tables II and III show how military, financial and other civilian procuratorships in Rome, Italy and the provinces were apportioned to men from various backgrounds during the second century. Table II is based on sexagenariate, centenariate and ducenariate posts, while Table III is devoted to the ducenariate level, at which Pflaum thinks the distinction between the three types of careers was most marked during the second century.<sup>59</sup> The tables are divided into four columns for four types of backgrounds: those who had served in equestrian *militiae*, ex-praetorians and *primipilares bis*, those of civilian background, and finally other ex-centurions.

The tables seem to provide a mixed answer about career types. On the one hand, there was a group of procurators of purely civilian background, whom emperors did not think fit for the

<sup>54</sup> *op. cit.*, 428 ff.

<sup>55</sup> *Proc.*, 237 and 252.

<sup>56</sup> M. Jarrett, 'An album of the equestrians from North Africa in the emperor's service', *Epigraphische Studien* 9 (1972), 206.

<sup>57</sup> 52. 24. 2: ἐκ τῶν πολλακίς τε ἐστρατευμένων καὶ πολλὰ καὶ ἄλλα διοικήτων.

<sup>58</sup> 52. 26. 2: ἐπιτηδείτεροι πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον.

<sup>59</sup> The figures are based on the careers found in Pflaum's catalogue, together with a few additional second-century careers discovered since its publication (Q. Domitius Marsianus, *AE* 1962, 183; A. Scantius Larcianus, *AE* 1962, 312; Q. Petronius Novatus, *AE* 1967, 644).

command of troops. This group (type III) are not known to have provided any prefects of fleets during the second century, and there is only one known case of an emperor sending out such a man to command a province with troops: some time during the second century Q. Calpurnius Modestus (no. 208) was appointed to govern one of the equestrian Alpine provinces despite having previously served only in civilian posts in Lucania and in the *annona* at Ostia.

If the tables do suggest the simple rule that civilians of no military experience were not to be assigned to military procuratorships, they do not support the idea that the *cursus* can be neatly categorized into three types, each of which was thought suited to certain, mutually exclusive types of offices. In Pflaum's scheme the ex-praetorian guardsmen and *primipilares bis* (type I) are the military men for whom 'les gouvernements équestres et les préfetures légionnaires y sont aussi fréquents que les postes urbains rares'.<sup>60</sup> The justification for this characterization is not clear: representatives of this group are known to have held six military governorships and two legionary prefectures during the second century—eight provincial military posts compared with precisely the same number of urban civilian offices. The only office for which they may have been thought especially suited was the legionary prefecture, which played a minor part in a few careers. With this exception, *primipilares bis* are found in most of the same jobs held by *equites* who had served as equestrian officers.<sup>61</sup> Altogether, it would be something of a misnomer to label procurators of type I 'military men' since they were appointed to twice as many civilian jobs (urban and provincial) as military.

*Equites* promoted from the equestrian *militiae* (type II) were more numerous, holding exactly twice as many ducenariate procuratorships. Table III shows that these seventy-four posts were distributed in much the same way as the thirty-seven jobs found in type I careers: fourteen urban posts (as opposed to eight held by *primipilares bis*), seven prefectures of the great fleets (against four), and forty-four civilian provincial posts (against seventeen). On the basis of these figures there is little reason to believe that the emperor gave much thought to separating these two groups: an equestrian with any sort of military experience was eligible to hold the full range of civilian and military procuratorships. P. Aelius Crispinus (no. 182), who entered procuratorial service after serving a second time as *primus pilus*, was appointed first to a financial post in Spain, then to the military governorship of Mauretania Tingitana, followed by two urban financial posts and then another military governorship in Mauretania Caesariensis. His career is a good illustration of the fact that few procurators of Pflaum's first two types specialized in one kind of ducenariate post. In view of this, it makes little sense to speak of military specialists who were unqualified to fill financial procuratorships at Rome.

The justification for separating out procurators of civilian backgrounds and dealing with their careers as a different type appears much stronger. Aside from the absence of military posts, these careers contain a higher proportion of urban offices than the others. At the ducenariate level second-century procurators of civilian background seem to have spent most of their time in Rome, with well over half of their posts being urban; by contrast, other procurators held only a fraction of their posts in Rome (about one-fifth). The explanation for this difference is not obvious. It is difficult for several reasons to believe that emperors felt a strong need to have men with a civilian background in the urban financial offices (though the library and *ab epistulis* posts do seem to have required training in letters). First, if our sample is representative, the majority of urban procuratorships concerned with accounts and taxes at all levels were held by men with military experience. Secondly, at the sexagenariate and centenariate levels the difference in average proportion of time spent in urban jobs by procurators of each type is much less marked: in the early stages all groups held more or less similar proportions of the various kinds of civilian posts in Rome, Italy and the provinces.<sup>62</sup>

Altogether, the concept of general career types which determined the kinds of jobs which a procurator might hold seems to be of limited value. The emperor did not think civilians

<sup>60</sup> *Proc.*, 237.

<sup>61</sup> Dobson, *op. cit.* (n. 35), 423, lists four procuratorships not held (as far as we know) by *primipilares*, in part because of lack of expertise in letters. Dobson also outlines four possibilities for procuratorial careers for *primipilares*; it should be pointed out that only the second possibility, which includes a legionary prefecture, is unique to *primipilares*.

<sup>62</sup> *Equites* promoted from *militiae* held thirty-one per cent of their lower-level civilian procuratorships in Rome, eleven per cent in Italy and fifty-eight per cent in the provinces (N = 113); the comparable figures for second-century civilians are forty per cent in Rome, eight per cent in Italy and fifty-two per cent in the provinces (N = 50).

suitable for military command, and at the ducenariate level tended to appoint them to jobs at Rome. Beyond these two straightforward principles, the patterns of distribution suggest that all types of procurators were equally likely to be appointed to all kinds of jobs.

These general figures may, however, hide the fact that certain men were appointed by the emperor for their special expertise in certain regions or tasks. Certainly in times of armed threat to the empire emperors must have tried to select commanders and officers of experience and competence. L. Iulius Vehilius Gratus Iulianus (no. 180), after serving in four *militiae*, was called on no fewer than three times to command *vexillationes* in time of war during the mid-second century; in addition, he was appointed to command the fleets stationed at Pontus, Ravenna and Misenum. Iulianus probably deserves the label 'military man', but it should be noted that very few *equites* possessed such a concentration of military experience.<sup>63</sup> Another type of expertise recognized by emperors was in the field of law. Many of the great jurists of the Antonine and Severan periods were given posts in the equestrian administration; in particular, places on the emperors' and praetorian prefects' *consilia*, as well as posts related to imperial correspondence and petitions. Though these legal experts often played an important part in imperial administration, they, like the military specialists, constitute only a small fraction of the procurators known to us (Schulz, for example, has fewer than a half dozen in his list of 'bureaucratic jurists').<sup>64</sup> So it must still be asked whether emperors were influenced by more generally applicable ideas of specialization.

Professor Brunt has sought to provide an answer to this question in a study which focuses on Egypt as a test case. It is argued that specialists would have been more appropriate to Egypt than to any other region of the empire owing to the greater complexity of Egypt's bureaucracy. Yet no evidence of specialization, either in task or in region, could be found, leading Brunt to the conclusion that 'most Equites served a military apprenticeship, and many alternated between posts that were civilian and others which were partly or entirely military . . . They had little resemblance to modern civil servants, who are so often experts in the special problems of a single department in which they spend their whole working lives. Such specialism was alien to Roman traditions'.<sup>65</sup>

Further arguments and evidence can be adduced in support of this conclusion. With regard to regional specialization, it is true that as *equites* from the Greek-speaking East entered procuratorial service in increasing numbers there was a tendency to appoint them to posts in the East rather than in the Latin-speaking West, for obvious reasons.<sup>66</sup> Beyond this general language distinction, the overall patterns of distribution do not indicate an attempt to develop regional expertise. As Brunt noted, most Egyptian prefects had no previous experience in Egypt.<sup>67</sup> It can be added that the great majority of procurators served in several regions rather than concentrating on one.<sup>68</sup>

In interpretations of equestrian careers it is not uncommon to find references to financial expertise as a consideration in imperial appointments. Since so many of the procuratorships involved financial responsibilities, it would be reasonable to expect the development of a concept of such expertise, if the idea of specialization had progressed very far. Despite scattered examples to the contrary, the weight of the evidence indicates that the highest financial offices were not reserved for men of more than usual financial experience. For example, despite modern views about the expertise required of the ducenariate *procurator vicesimae hereditatum*, three ex-centurions who had previously served only in military offices are known to have been

<sup>63</sup> Pflaum comments that 'nous ne nous étonnons pas que Julius Julianus, ancien préfet de la flotte pontique, ait été appelé à redevenir un chef naval' (*Carr.*, 464). Out of thirteen prefects of Italian fleets whose careers are known, only Iulianus and Q. Baienus Blassianus (no. 126) had previously commanded provincial fleets.

<sup>64</sup> F. Schulz, *History of Roman Legal Science* (1946), 103 ff.

<sup>65</sup> art. cit. (n. 6), 141.

<sup>66</sup> Pflaum, *Proc.*, 225 ff., 260 ff. (Pflaum's figures show that this was only a tendency, not a rigid rule.)

<sup>67</sup> art. cit., 128 f.

<sup>68</sup> R. MacMullen, *Roman Government's Response*

*to Crisis* (1976), 54 f. talks of equestrian officials being stationed 'more often than not' near their homes, and of the reliance on regional expertise. A handful of examples are offered out of the three hundred and fifty careers available in Pflaum's catalogue: for each example it is possible to discover numerous counter-examples of officials who served in different regions during their careers (they are too numerous to list, but it may be noted that in the third century alone the following procurators were moved from one end of the empire to the other: nos. 222, 229, 262, 264, 268, 277, 280, 295, 317). Clearly there was no general attempt at regional specialization.

promoted to this post (compared with four civilians).<sup>69</sup> It has also been suggested that secretaries *a rationibus* were appointed for their financial experience—a logical suggestion if emperors were interested in profiting from special expertise of their administrators. Yet, of the nine second-century secretaries whose careers are known, only four had previously held an urban financial procuratorship, and none of these had served in more than one such post at the ducenariate level.<sup>70</sup> Though emperors were not prepared to entrust procuratorships with military responsibilities to men of exclusively civilian experience, they appointed men of predominantly military experience to the empire's highest financial office. Iulius Iulianus, the 'military man' discussed above, after serving in four *militiae*, leading three *vexillationes* into war, commanding three fleets and holding the procuratorship of one province, was promoted to be secretary *a rationibus*.<sup>71</sup> A similar lack of specialization can be found in other areas of civilian service: Mme. Pavis-D'Escurac has shown that tenure of sexagenariate and centenariate posts associated with the *annona* does not seem to have been a consideration in the selection of the prefect.<sup>72</sup> In sum, there is nothing in the epigraphic evidence which would suggest that the emperor's notion of specialization was more sophisticated than Dio leads us to believe, when he distinguishes between military experience on the one hand, and experience in 'administering many other things' on the other.

#### PERSONAL CRITERIA

The *cursus* inscriptions, taken as a whole, have revealed a few simple principles in procuratorial appointments, but the analysis has suggested that the careers were not as highly structured as often suggested in the past. In view of the great variation found in the *cursus*, there is little reason to believe that imperial decisions about promotions were closely regulated by impersonal guidelines of universal applicability. When reasons for appointments are given in the sources, they concern personal factors which would not be expected to be reflected in the *cursus* inscriptions. The two most important criteria seem to have been the emperor's assessment of a candidate's worth and the efficacy of the candidate's patronal support. The relative importance of each of these is not easy to determine, in part because they were so closely related in the Roman system.

Ideally, as Cassius Dio indicates, emperors were to appoint men of excellence and experience to equestrian office.<sup>73</sup> We have seen that 'experience' was meant in a general, broad sense; what was meant by excellence (*aretē*)? Dio appears to be using the word in the traditional aristocratic sense handed down from the Republic: senators were to be selected from those in the front rank with respect to birth, *aretē* and wealth, while equestrians were to be drawn from those in the second rank.<sup>74</sup> Similarly, Pliny the Younger praised Trajan for distributing offices to the *boni*—that is, those characterized by *constantia*, *rectitudo*, *integritas* and *industria*.<sup>75</sup> These virtues found expression in the codicils of appointment sent out by the emperors to

<sup>69</sup> A. Scantius Larcianus (*AE* 1962, 312) was promoted directly from a centurionate to the urban office, while Ti. Claudius Secundinus L. Stadius Macedo (no. 109) and an anonymous *primipilaris* (no. 211) were promoted to it after holding the prefecture of Legio II Traiana. Another *primipilaris* (no. 182) also held the post. Nos. 106 *bis*, 142, 168 and 183 were the second-century civilian occupants of the office.

With regard to such urban offices, Pflaum developed the concept of 'un «arrêt de compensation», arguing that those who enjoyed the privilege of holding their offices at Rome paid for the privilege by serving in more posts. Thus, type I careers proceeded more rapidly than type III careers (*Proc.*, 245, 246, 287 and especially 252). In fact, among the second-century procurators who were promoted through the ducenariate level (to a Palatine *officium* or a top ducenariate post) there is no connection at all between the number of urban posts held and the rapidity of movement through this level (the correlation coefficient is precisely 0.0).

<sup>70</sup> Nos. 89, 113, 139, 162 and 180 held no urban ducenariate offices, and nos. 109, 110, 117, and 134 held one. Presumably it is because of the expectation of financial specialization that Pflaum commented: 'l'avancement à partir de ce dernier emploi (Lyonnaise et Aquitaine) conduit souvent au secrétariat *a rationibus*, tandis que le *praef. class. praet. Ravenatis* est promu ordinairement au commandement de la flotte de Misène, voire au poste d' *a censibus equitum Romanorum*' (Carr., 308). In fact, Pflaum's table (*Proc.*, 255 f.) shows three procurators of Lugdunensis (including no. 89) and two naval prefects promoted to be secretary *a rationibus* during the second century—hardly indicative of two different career paths in accordance with expertise.

<sup>71</sup> See above, p. 54.

<sup>72</sup> *L'annone*, 79.

<sup>73</sup> 52. 25. 5.

<sup>74</sup> 52. 19. 4. In 52. 25. 5 Dio talks of the offices as a 'prize for merit' ('athlon aretēs').

<sup>75</sup> *Paneg.* 44. 7 f. where Pliny also speaks of a 'prize' for virtue.

successful candidates. The North African Domitius Marsianus was promoted by Marcus Aurelius to a ducenariate position in Narbonensis; the imperial letter announcing the promotion suggested that Marsianus could hope for continued favour as long as he maintained his *innocentia*, *diligentia* and *experientia*.<sup>76</sup> At a higher level, in Domitian's codicil to Laberius Maximus, announcing his advancement to the praetorian prefecture, the qualities of *pietas* and *fides* were mentioned.<sup>77</sup> What should be noticed about these documents is the absence of any mention of special knowledge or skills related to particular jobs (the sort of 'merit' on which modern civil service appointments are based). The kind of merit which Pliny and Dio have in mind is moral rectitude which the emperor, in his role as patron, is called upon to reward with the *beneficium* of office.<sup>78</sup> Such merit was relevant to office-holding in a general way because the emperor needed officials who, more than anything else, were loyal (honesty and industry were also useful, but not so vital). In addition, eloquence and learning were considered marks of a well-bred man and worthy of reward. The procurator Lucilius was said to have enjoyed his worldly success by virtue of his 'vigor ingenii, scriptorum elegantia, clarae et nobiles amicitiae', and several Greek sophists are known to have received equestrian posts as rewards for their accomplishments (in the case of Heliodorus, his oratorical talent was naturally thought to be useful in his duties in court as *advocatus fisci*).<sup>79</sup>

*Innocentia*, *pietas*, *fides* and *industria* are not, of course, qualities which can be measured by civil service examinations or objective reports; learning might have been, but was not. How, then, was the emperor to find suitable equestrians? To a certain extent, the emperor could have depended on his personal contacts with *equites* around him. For instance, Tacitus reports that Claudius appointed his companion Iulius Paelignus procurator of Cappadocia (though Paelignus' *aretē* was questionable).<sup>80</sup> Of most candidates below the top levels of administration at Rome the emperors probably did not have much personal knowledge. In the absence of any formal mechanisms for application, such candidates relied on their patrons—perhaps the emperor's *amici* or members of his household—to bring them to the emperor's attention and praise them for their virtues. Lucilius had his *amicitiae*. Gessius Florus is said to have been made procurator of Judaea by Nero as a result of the friendship which Florus' wife enjoyed with Poppaea Sabina.<sup>81</sup> A century later, Fronto sent a *commendatio* to Antoninus Pius, requesting a procuratorship for the Greek historian Appian: the letter was unsuccessful, but in it Fronto recorded earlier successes on behalf of Sextius Calpurnius, who modestly declined the appointments.<sup>82</sup> Once in the emperor's service, *equites* could also hope to receive support for promotion from their senatorial or equestrian superiors. Several of Pliny's letters to the emperor about subordinates have survived: they do not constitute reports on the official's specific administrative capabilities, but in form and language are direct descendants of Republican patronal *commendationes*, with their comments on the subject's general moral excellence.<sup>83</sup> These few instances of procuratorial appointments and promotions are of only limited value as proof of the importance of *commendationes* and patronal connections. Perhaps more significant is the general assumption underlying the statement of Plutarch that most well-connected provincials used whatever influence they could muster from frequenting the great houses of Rome to secure governorships and procuratorships for themselves.<sup>84</sup>

In *Les Procurateurs Équestres* Professor Pflaum allowed for the importance of patronal support during the early Principate, stressing the *praefectura fabrum* as the means of securing it.<sup>85</sup> As pointed out above, he believed that this office disappeared as the procuratorial *cursus*

<sup>76</sup> *AE* 1962, 183; Pflaum, 'Une lettre de promotion de l'empereur Marc Aurèle', *Bonner Jahrb.* 171 (1971), 349 ff.

<sup>77</sup> *P. Berl.* 8334 (= *Corp. Pap. Lat.* 238).

<sup>78</sup> Millar, *Emperor*, 286 ff., emphasizes the emperor's patronal role.

<sup>79</sup> Seneca, *Ep. ad Luc.* 19. 3; Philostratus, *VS* 524, 626. That eloquence and learning were standard characteristics of worthy gentlemen is demonstrated by the fact that most *commendationes* written by Pliny attest to these qualities (*Ep.* 2. 9, 3. 2, 4. 15, 6. 6, 10. 4)—even when the post sought is a military tribunate (4. 4, 7. 22).

<sup>80</sup> *Ann.* 12. 49; close personal contact must also have been the source of success for Lucius Verus'

*educator* and *libertus* Nicomedes, who progressed rapidly to an important ducenariate post, despite his servile origin (Pflaum, *Carr.*, no. 163).

<sup>81</sup> *Jos.*, *AJ* 20. 11. 1; see Millar, *Emperor*, 286 ff. for the importance of patronal petitions.

<sup>82</sup> *Ad Pium* 9; the letter also indicates that Fronto had already failed twice on Appian's behalf.

<sup>83</sup> *Ep.* 10. 85, 86a–b. The qualities ascribed to the subordinates included *probitas*, *industria*, *diligentia*, *disciplina*, *integritas*, *iustitia* and *humanitas*. For a more detailed discussion of these letters, see my *Patronage and Bureaucracy in the Early Empire* (forthcoming).

<sup>84</sup> *Mor.* 814D.

<sup>85</sup> Pt. 2, Ch. 3.

became more structured and the need for *suffragium* declined during the second century. But the *praefectura fabrum* was never the sole means of forging patronal links to the emperor's court, as demonstrated by the fact that the *praefecti* were not unusually successful;<sup>86</sup> nor did the *cursus* become highly structured. Thus, the disappearance of the *praefectura fabrum* is not evidence for the decline of patronage: indeed, the clearest epigraphic evidence available for the influence of patrons on procuratorial appointments is dated to the period after its disappearance. Three stones have survived from the third century dedicated to patrons by whose *suffragia* sexagenariate and centenariate procuratorships were secured.<sup>87</sup>

In sum, the literary evidence points to fairly simple criteria for the selection of procurators: ideally the emperor was to appoint men of general experience and moral excellence. In practice, the former could be determined from a review of offices held; the latter involved a very subjective judgement, communicated verbally through a personal network of patrons and friends or in writing through *commendationes*. Thus, even when the system was working properly, patronage was always an integral part of it. This list of personal criteria considered by emperors is not meant to be exhaustive (the evaluation of various factors must have changed somewhat from emperor to emperor) but it has been possible to point to certain general considerations which appear consistently in the literature of the period.

#### CONCLUSION

The expansion of the imperial administration is a salient feature of the Principate, and one that is rarely discussed or explained in the ancient sources. It is tempting to assume that with the expansion came many other characteristics associated with modern bureaucracies, including promotion of administrators in accordance with the rational, impersonal criteria of seniority and expertise. The temptation, however, should be tempered by two considerations. First, though the procuratorial service doubled in size from the Trajanic to the Severan age (from 84 to 173 procuratorships according to Pflaum), it remained part of an administration which was very small in comparison with developed bureaucracies such as the Chinese: the number of senatorial and equestrian posts was not of a magnitude which would have necessitated elaborate organizational rules.<sup>88</sup> Secondly, literary evidence for the modern bureaucratic expectations is slender, and to find support for them in the epigraphic record one would have to focus on individual careers, ignore others, and explain away exceptions. This procedure is, needless to say, methodologically unsound. The internal evidence of individual *cursus* rarely provides proof of why the emperor chose to promote a procurator to a particular office. Sometimes an appointment may seem reasonable to us in view of certain elements of the appointee's past career, but it would be dangerous to assume that these elements were decisive in the mind of the emperor unless they can be shown to form a pattern running through other careers which included similar appointments. Procuratorial careers constitute one of the few bodies of data from the ancient world large enough to be susceptible to statistical analysis. When such an analysis is applied, many of the suggested patterns disappear, and only a few principles emerge: men with military experience were preferred for procuratorships with military duties, and legal expertise and experience in oratory were thought useful for certain procuratorships related to the law courts.

Perhaps the very bulk of inscriptions from the Principate has led historians to attempt to use them to interpret imperial appointments and promotions. But, since only a few patterns emerge clearly, the inscriptions are of limited use in this respect despite their bulk: seniority and specialization, factors which might be detected in bare lists of offices, explain only a few things about the direction which most equestrian careers took. This leaves us to seek explana-

<sup>86</sup> See above, p. 50.

<sup>87</sup> *ILS* 1191, 2941, 4928 (= *CIL* VI 1532, 1418, 2132).

<sup>88</sup> While senatorial and equestrian officials were numbered in the hundreds and their staffs perhaps in the thousands, Chinese bureaucrats were numbered in the hundreds of thousands. Though personal factors affected appointments in the Chinese bureaucracy,

there existed elaborate mechanisms for the appointment and promotion of officials in accordance with seniority and merit (as evaluated, for instance, by examinations). The contrast between the Chinese and Roman administrative structures in this respect is marked (see E. Reishauer and J. Fairbank, *East Asia: the Great Tradition* (1960), via index).

tions for appointments in the literary evidence, the systematic study of which suggests that personal factors, especially patronage, exercised a major influence on imperial decisions concerning the advancement of *equites* who in most cases bear little resemblance to modern bureaucrats.<sup>89</sup>

*Swarthmore College*

#### APPENDIX

Brunt's comments about lack of professionalism can be reinforced by an additional consideration. One of the primary characteristics associated with modern professional bureaucrats is the devotion of the official's 'full working capacity' to his duties.<sup>90</sup> It might be asked to what extent procurators were 'professionals' in this respect and to what extent they resembled senators who remained essentially amateurs.<sup>91</sup> In his review Millar noted that Pflaum's work gives a somewhat distorted picture of the procuratorial service by the exclusion from his catalogue of *equites* who held only one office.<sup>92</sup> This line of argument can be pursued further with the suggestion that most procurators probably held only a few procuratorships during their lives. Men such as L. Valerius Proculus (no. 113), who served in two *militiae*, seven procuratorships and the prefectures of the *anona* and Egypt, were quite exceptional.

Definitive proof of this proposition is unattainable, but two lines of analysis converge to indicate its likelihood. First, of the thirty-four clearly complete careers in Table 1, seventeen contain three or fewer offices. This sample of careers, however, is not representative: most of those included in it (two-thirds) reached the Palatine *officia* or the great prefectures because these offices are the most common indicators available to us that the procuratorial careers were complete. Thus this group was unusually successful, and the median of between three and four procuratorships per career must significantly overestimate the median for all procurators. This suggestion can be confirmed in a second way. By the reign of Hadrian the number of procuratorships in each of the three pay levels was roughly equal (thirty-four ducenariate, thirty-five centenariate, thirty-five sexagenariate).<sup>93</sup> The increase in offices at the bottom of the procuratorial hierarchy has been thought to be a development which permitted smooth promotion up through the ranks.<sup>94</sup> This would have been true, had procurators held roughly the same number of posts at each salary level. In fact, *equites* held an average of about one office at both the sexagenariate and centenariate levels, but at the ducenariate level the average number of posts held was significantly higher (at least 2.7). The obvious corollary of this fact is that, unless tenure of the ducenariate posts was significantly shorter than lower posts, there simply were not enough ducenariate posts to allow many *equites* to pursue their careers beyond the centenariate level.

An attempt can be made to quantify this phenomenon for the second and third centuries, if it is assumed that the tenure of office was the same length on average at each level. This seems reasonable: if the tenure of ducenariate posts tended to be longer than that of lesser posts, the conclusion is strengthened; only if the ducenariate posts were held for much shorter periods would the conclusion be vitiated.

First, the average number of posts at each level and in each period (98–192 A.D. and 193–249 A.D.) must be calculated. This is done by taking the number of posts at each level by reign and then averaging them after weighting each number according to the length of the reign. Thus the average number of ducenariate posts available during the second century is given by the following equation:

$$\sum_{\text{Trajan}}^{\text{Commodus}} \frac{(\text{no. of CC posts})_{\text{emperor}} \times (\text{length of reign})_{\text{emperor}}}{\text{total number of years in the period}}$$

or

$$\frac{(34 \text{ CC posts} \times 19 \text{ years Trajan's reign}) + (34 \times 21) + (35 \times 22) + (33 \times 19) + (36 \times 12)}{94} = 34$$

<sup>89</sup> Hirschfeld, *Verwaltungsbeamten*, 443 f., stressed *suffragia*, and R. Syme, 'Pliny the Procurator', *HSCP* 73 (1969), 208, wrote of the dominance of personal factors. That most procurators remained amateurs is perhaps most clearly indicated by the fact that the majority probably spent less than ten years in procuratorial service (see Appendix).

<sup>90</sup> M. Weber, *Economy and Society* (1968), 958 f.

<sup>91</sup> B. Campbell, 'Who were the "Viri Militares"?', *JRS* 65 (1975), 11 ff.

<sup>92</sup> *JRS* 53 (1963), 196.

<sup>93</sup> Pflaum's figures for the number of offices are

used throughout, with full knowledge that they are not exactly correct—in part, because of the methodological error of assigning the creation of a procuratorship to the reign of the emperor in which it first appears in the epigraphic record. Given the sporadic appearance of some offices in inscriptions, there is of course no reason to expect them to be recorded in extant inscriptions immediately after their creation. Millar (art. cit., 196) gives the example of the procuratorships of the *vicesimae hereditatum*.

<sup>94</sup> Pflaum, *Abrégé des procurateurs équestres* (1974), 8 and 23.

On average there were thirty-four ducenariate posts available during this period. The same equation yields thirty-eight and thirty-five as the average numbers of centenariate and sexagenariate jobs available.

The next step is to calculate the average number of offices held by each office-holder at a given level. During the second century thirty procurators whose careers are shown in Table I held eighty-one ducenariate posts, or an average of 2.7 posts per man. The averages for centenariate and sexagenariate posts are 1.2 and 1.4 posts per man respectively.

If the number of posts per man is then divided into the number of posts at a given level, it is possible to find the average number of posts available to new men at each level in a notional appointment period. Thus, in each notional appointment period some twenty-five sexagenariate posts opened up for men who had not held a sexagenariate post before; also some thirty-two centenariate posts, but only about thirteen ducenariate posts. The difference between the turnover rates of the sexagenariate and centenariate levels is not surprising, since in this period a significant group of *equites* went straight into the centenariate level without holding sexagenariate jobs. Quite clearly, however, there was a bottleneck between the centenariate and ducenariate levels. Well under half of the thirty-two men leaving the centenariate level every notional period could have found their way into the thirteen ducenariate posts available. These figures surely underestimate the bottleneck, for in addition to centenariate procurators, *primipilares bis* filled procuratorships at the ducenariate level. It seems reasonable to conclude that during the second century most procuratorial 'careers' stopped short of the ducenariate level and this usually meant holding only two or perhaps three procuratorships.

The comparable figures for the period 192-249 A.D. are as follows: thirty-six ducenariate, fifty-seven centenariate and seventy-five sexagenariate posts; an average of 1.8 ducenariate posts per holder, 1.8 centenariate posts, and 2.0 sexagenariate posts. The situation has changed from the second century: about the same number of offices is held by each man at each level. But since the number of offices at the lower levels has increased, there is still a bottleneck, with an average of twenty ducenariate, thirty-two centenariate and thirty-eight sexagenariate posts opening up in each notional appointment period. Once again, this underestimates the bottleneck, since *primipilares bis* were entering directly into high-level jobs.

These figures need not be taken to be exact, but they would have to be seriously and systematically wrong to alter the conclusion. In the earlier period ducenariate procurators held significantly more posts at this level than procurators at lower levels. There were not more ducenariate posts available and so, unless the tenure of ducenariate posts was much shorter than others, most procurators cannot have gone on from the centenariate to the ducenariate level.<sup>95</sup>

<sup>95</sup> I wish to thank Dr. P. D. A. Garnsey, Miss J. M. Reynolds, Professor F. Millar, Mr. D. Cohen, Dr. R. Duncan-Jones and the Editorial Committee of *JRS* for their help. Special thanks are due Professor G. Iversen for advice and reassurance concerning statistical methods.



TABLE I

Career No.	Name	Militiae	LX	C		CC				Palatine Officia	Great Pref.
				Lower	Upper	1st	2nd	3rd	4th		
95	T. Haterius Nepos	3	X		X		XX			(X)	X
98	T. Flavius Macer	-	XX	X							
101	-- Rufus	3	X	X							
103	M. Aemilius Bassus	3	XX	X							
			XX								
104	M. Vettius Latro	3	X	X	X			X			
106B	C. Iulius Celsus	-	XXX		X		XX		X	X	
110	Valerius Eudaemon	-			X		XX XXX		X	X	X
112	A. Ofellius Maior Macedo	2		X			X			X	
113	L. Valerius Proculus	2	X		XX		XX X		X	(X)	X
116	Aemilius Iuncus	4			X		X X				
117	M. Petronius Honoratus	3			X		X		X	X	X
119	T. Statilius Optatus	4	XX	X			XX		X	X	X
120	M. Maenius Agrippa										
	L. Tusidius Campester	3			X		X				
121	L. Baebius Iuncinus	3		X			X				
125	P. Aelius Marcianus	3	XX								
128	C. Lepidius Secundus	2	X								
131	... A ...	3	X	X							
132	Annius Postumus	-	XXX	X							
134	C. Iunius Flavianus	1	X		X		X X		X	X	X
136	M. Staius Priscus										
	Licinius Italicus	5	X								
137	Sex. Cornelius Dexter	3	X		X		X X		X		
139	T. Furius Victorinus	3			X		X X	X	X	X	X
140	L. Domitius Rogatus	4	X		X		X				
141	L. Volusius Maecianus	1	XX		X		X		X		X
142	Sex. Caecilius										
	Crescens Volusianus	-			X		X		X		
144	T. Appalius Alfinus										
	Secundus	3	X	X	X		X				
145	P. Gavius Balbus	3	XX		X						
147	(Crepereius)	3	X								
150	M. Antonius Fabianus	-	X		X						
151	C. Antonius Rufus	-			X						
152	Q. Plotius Maximus										
	Trebellius Pelidianus	2	X		X						
153	L. Faesellius										
	Sabinianus	-	X		X						
156	T. Varius Clemens	4			X		X		XX X	X	
157	M. Arruntius Frugi	3	X		X		X				
158	M. Claudius Restitutus	2	XX		X						
160	P. Fulcinus										
	Vergilius Marcellus	2	XX								
160B	L. Vibius Apronianus	1	X		X						
163	L. Aurelius Nicomedes	-	X		X			X			
164B	Ti. Claudius										
	Proculus Cornelianus	3	X	XX	XX		X(?)				
168	L. Marius Perpetuus	-	X		X			XXX	X		
169	-----	?		X				XXX	X		
170	-----	4		XX	X						
171	M. Campanius Marcellus	3	X	X							
174	T. Iulius Saturninus	2		X							

TABLE I (CONTD.)

Career No.	Name	Militiae	LX	C		CC				Palatine Officia	Great Pref.
				Lower	Upper	1st	2nd	3rd	4th		
183(n.22)	Q. Domitius Marsianus	1	X	X			X				
178	- - ilius	-	X		X	XX	X	X		X	
180	T. Iulius Vehilius									X	
	Gratus Iulianus	4		X	XX	X	X	X	X	X	X
181	M. Aurelius										
	Papirius Dionysius	-	X	X		X				X	X
181B	M. Valerius										
	Maximianus	4		XX		Adlected into senate					
183	T. Flavius Germanus	-	XXX		X		XXX	X			
184	P. Cominius Clemens	3	XX	X	X	X	XX		X		
185	Sex. Iulius Possessor	2	XX								
186	C. Cominius Bo . . .										
	Agricola . . elius Aper	3	X								
187	M. Porcius Aper	1	X								
188	M. Macrinus Avitus										
	Catonius Vindex	4		X		Adlected into senate					
193	M. Aurelius Mindius										
	Matidianus Pollio	-				X	XXX				
198	Ti. Plautius Felix										
	Ferruntianus	?	X								
201	Q. Petronius Melior	1	XX								
202	C. Annius Flavianus	3	X		XX						
203	Ti. Claudius Candidus	2	X			Adlected into senate					
204	C. Sextius Martialis	1	XX			X					
206	M. Flavius Marcianus Ilisus	-	X			XX					
207	M. Bassaeus Axius	1	X								
208	Q. Calpurnius Modestus	-	X		X						
209	M. Veserius Iucundianus	-	X								
212	T. Petronius Priscus	3	X		X						
217	L. Egnatuleius Sabinus	2	XX	X							
218T	T. Antonius Claudius										
	Alfenus Arignotus	3		X (?)							
222	Ti. Claudius Xenophon	-	XX	X	XXX		X	X			
224	M. Rossius Vitulus	4	XXX	XX			X				
226	T. Cornasidius Sabinus	3	X		XX						
228	Ti. Claudius Zeno Ulpianus	3	XXX	XX							
231	P. Messius Saturninus	2		X			X			X	
235	L. Cominius Vipsianus										
	Salutaris	-	XX	X	X	X	X			X	
236	P. Magnus Rufus										
	Magonianus	4	X	X			X				
240	. . . ius Lollianus	2	XX								
			XX								
241	-----	2	X		X						
242	Ti. Claudius										
	Subatianus Proculus	3	X			Adlected into senate					
244	M. Iunius Punicus	-	X	X							
251	L. Baebius Aurelius										
	Iuncinus	-	XX	X			XX	X			X
257	Ulpus Victor	2	XX	XX	XX						
258	C. Iulius [Ale]xianus	3	X			Adlected into senate					
262	P. Aelius Sempronius										
	Lycinus	?	X		X	X	X				

TABLE I (CONTD.)

Career No.	Name	Militiae	LX	C		CC				Palatine Officia	Great Pref.
				Lower	Upper	1st	2nd	3rd	4th		
				264	Q. Cosconius Fronto	2	XX	X	X		
265	Q. Gabinius Barbarus	-			XXX		X	X			
268	T. Aurelius Calpurnianus Apollonides	2	X		XX	XX					
271	-----	?	XXX		X		X		X	X	
272	Ti. Antistius Marcianus	3	X								
274	M. Herennius Victor	-	XXX	X	X						
278	M. Pomponius Vitellianus	3	X		X						
280	C. Valerius Fuscus	-	XXX								
			XXX								
281	Sex. Cornelius Honoratus	?	X								
282	Q. Iulius Maximus Demetrianus	f.a.	XX								
291	Q. Acilius Fuscus	f.a.	XX								
295	L. Didius Marinus	1	XXX		XX			-- ? --	X	X	
			XX								
312	-----		XXX		X						
317	C. Furius Sabinius Aquila Timesitheus	1	X		X	XX	XX	X	X		X
318	P. Bassilius Crescens	1	XX								
319	L. Caecilius Athenaeus	?		X							
320	Pomponius L . . . Murianus	f.a.		X		X					
321	T. Caesius Anthianus	3	XXX								
327	C. Attius Alcimus Felicianus	f.a.	XX		XX		X	XX	X	X	
328	Q. Axius Aelianus	-	XX		X						
			XX								
329	P. Aelius Ammonius	3	X		X						
331	L. Iunius Septimius Verus Hermogenes	1	X								
331B	L. Titinius Clodianus	4		X	XXX		XX				
					XXX						
346	. . . milius Victorinus	?	XX								
349	L. Musius Aemilianus	4	X	X			X				X
352	M. Aurelius Hermogenes	2	X		X						
355	-----	2	X	X			X		X	(X)	

TABLE II: LX, C &amp; CC POSTS

Kind of Office	Procurators Promoted from Militiae	Primipilares II	Civilians	Primipilares
<i>Rome</i>				
Accounts and Taxes	14 (39%)	6 (17%)	16 (44%)	
Other Civilian	35 (60%)	2 (3%)	21 (36%)	
<i>Italy</i>				
Fleets	10 (71%)	4 (29%)		
Civilian	12 (75%)		4 (25%)	
<i>Provinces</i>				
Legionary Pref.		2 (100%)		
Governors w/Army	18 (67%)	6 (22%)	1 (4%)	2 (7%)
Governors w/o Army	6 (86%)		1 (14%)	
Proc. of Sen. Prov.	10 (62%)	2 (12%)	4 (25%)	
Proc. of Imp. Prov.	40 (58%)	14 (20%)	12 (17%)	3 (4%)
Egypt	17 (68%)	1 (4%)	7 (28%)	
Fleets	10 (100%)			
Other Civilian	37 (74%)		12 (24%)	1 (2%)
Total	209 (63%)	37 (11%)	78 (24%)	6 (2%)
Total Military	38 (72%)	12 (23%)	1 (2%)	2 (4%)
Total Civilian	171 (62%)	25 (9%)	77 (28%)	4 (1%)

TABLE III: CC POSTS

Kind of Office	Procurators Promoted from Militiae	Primipilares II	Civilians	Primipilares
<i>Rome</i>				
Accounts and Taxes	11 (35%)	6 (19%)	14 (45%)	
Other Civilian	3 (37%)	2 (25%)	3 (37%)	
<i>Italy</i>				
Fleets	7 (64%)	4 (36%)		
Civilian				
<i>Provinces</i>				
Legionary Pref.		2 (100%)		
Governors w/Army	9 (56%)	6 (37%)		1 (6%)
Governors w/o Army				
Proc. of Sen. Prov.	8 (62%)	2 (18%)	3 (27%)	
Proc. of Imp. Prov.	28 (58%)	14 (29%)	4 (8%)	2 (4%)
Egypt	7 (64%)	1 (9%)	3 (27%)	
Fleets				
Other Civilian	1 (100%)			
Total	74 (52%)	37 (26%)	27 (19%)	3 (2%)
Total Military	16 (53%)	12 (40%)	0	2 (6%)
Total Civilian	58 (52%)	25 (23%)	27 (24%)	1 (1%)