

*ADLECTUS AMICUS CONSILIARIUS AND A FREEDMAN
PROC. METALLORUM ET PRAEDIORUM: NEWS ON
ROMAN IMPERIAL ADMINISTRATION*

CHRISTER BRUUN

I. AN INSCRIPTION FROM FORUM TRAIANI IN SARDINIA

A RECENTLY PUBLISHED INSCRIPTION on a votive altar from Forum Traiani (Aquae Hypsitanae, modern Fordongianus) in central Sardinia reveals several aspects of Roman imperial administration that have hitherto been unknown or little considered. The text runs as follows:¹

*Nymphis votum pro salute
Q. Baebi Modesti, allecti
inter amicos consiliarios
ab Imp(eratoribus) Antonino et G[[-]]
5 Aug(ustis), proc(uratoris) Augg. (i.e., Augustorum duorum) praef(ecti) prov(inciae)
Sard(iniae), Servatus Augg. (i.e., Augustorum duorum) lib(ertus)
proc(urator) metallorum et
praediorum (hedera) adiut(or)
eius*

To the Nymphs. A vow for the well-being of Q. Baebius Modestus, adlected among the friends and members of the imperial council by the emperors Antoninus (= Caracalla) and G[eta - name deleted], procurator of the two Augusti and prefect of the province of Sardinia. Servatus, the freedman of the two Augusti, procurator of mines and domains, his assistant (recorded the fulfillment of the vow).

There are four features in this new text that merit some discussion: (1) the *adlectio* to the imperial *consilium* with the ensuing title *amicus consiliarius*; (2) the holding of the office of *procurator Augustorum et praefectus Sardiniae*; (3) the title *procurator metallorum et praediorum*; and (4) the fact that the freedman Servatus calls himself *adiutor* of the governor. Before examining these issues, it is important to establish the date of the inscription and that of Baebius Modestus' career; for this chronology will affect how certain stages of his life ought to be interpreted.

The author warmly thanks Jonathan Edmondson and the two anonymous referees for their helpful comments and suggestions from which this paper has benefited; the remaining errors and misconceptions are his own. He was also able to benefit from comments after presenting some of the ideas of this paper at the annual meeting of the Classical Association of Canada at the University of Waterloo in 2001. He is grateful to Richard Raiswell for working on his English.

¹ Serra and Bacco 1998: 1244 with Tav. XIX for a photograph. As pointed out by Sotgiu (1991) and Haensch (1997: 155), Forum Traiani was a cultic and administrative centre during the imperial period. To the inscriptions cited as evidence by Haensch (1997: 475–476) add those presented by Serra and Bacco 1998.

II. THE PURPOSE OF THE INSCRIPTION AND ITS CHRONOLOGY

The inscription was erected in the brief period when Septimius Severus' two sons were joint rulers, i.e., between the death of Septimius Severus on 4 February 211 and 26 December of the same year.² After Geta's death, his name suffered *damnatio memoriae* and was erased from the stone.

The text of the inscription explicitly and implicitly communicates several reasons for its erection. In the first place, it clearly has a religious function in that it records a vow to the Nymphs. Second, it honours the prefect (i.e., governor) of Sardinia, Baebius Modestus, and mentions two of his positions in the emperors' service. Third, it casts Servatus, the imperial freedman who erected the inscription, in a favourable light, as it demonstrates his piety and the care he showed for the well-being (*salus*) of his governor.

The position of *amicus consiliarius* is mentioned first in the inscription, but this does not necessarily mean that this was Baebius Modestus' most recent position, as inscriptions listing the offices of a senator or a Roman knight could equally well have a descending as an ascending order.³ However, considering the context, the position as governor of Sardinia likely predates that of *amicus consiliarius*. First, a vow for the *salus* of a person necessarily implies acquaintance, either real or, in the case of the *salus* of the emperor and high-ranking dignitaries, notional. Had Baebius Modestus not been governor of Sardinia, it is unlikely that Servatus (or any other person in Sardinia)⁴ would have known of him, or considered his well-being important enough for a vow. Considering that the erection of the votive altar *pro salute* indicates that the Nymphs have granted the prayer, that is to say, the *votum* has been *solutum/reddatum*,⁵ some time must have elapsed from the moment of the initial vow. Secondly, Baebius Modestus had been elected a member of the *consilium* of Caracalla and Geta, and Geta was still alive when the altar was inscribed. Having become a member of the imperial council after 4 February 211, it does not seem likely that Baebius Modestus would immediately have been sent away from Rome to Sardinia. That leaves little time for Baebius Modestus' arrival in Sardinia, the making of the vow, the happy outcome, and the commission and erection of the inscription, all of which transpired before Geta's

² On the joint reign, see Kienast 1996: 162, 166. For the dating of Geta's murder to late December 211, see, e.g., Alföldy 2000: 20; Letta 1991: 672–673.

³ Contemporary evidence from Sardinia (as from elsewhere) is inconclusive. In *CIL* X 7580 = *ILS* 1358 from Carales in Sardinia, L. Baebius Iuncinus, who preceded Baebius Modestus as governor by about a decade, is honoured by one of the officers under his command. The inscription lists his whole career, in descending order: *proc(urator) heredit(atium)*, *proc. Aug. praef. prov. Sard(iniae)*, etc. The ascending order pattern, from earlier offices to the most recent, is found in two inscriptions of M. Cosconius Fronto, a contemporary of Baebius Modestus and honoured as governor of Sardinia in Carales (*CIL* X 7583; *CIL* X 7584 = *ILS* 1359), and in the inscription of Licinius Rufinus: see Herrmann 1997: 114 (and below, Section iv).

⁴ According to Serra and Bacco (1998: 1245, n. 101), another inscription for Baebius Modestus' well-being seems to have been erected at the same spot; see below, n. 6.

⁵ There is no verb in the inscription, but in this matter I rely on the expertise of one of the anonymous referees of this paper.

murder. Therefore, it is more likely that this process had begun earlier—perhaps Baebius Modestus became governor even before Septimius Severus' death—and that the *adlectio* to *consiliarius* occurred when Baebius Modestus was already in Sardinia. The votive altar was, then, erected either as he was about to leave for Rome, or when he had already left.

The vow made by the imperial freedman Servatus for the *salus* of Baebius Modestus, reinforced by another *votum* made by a Roman officer,⁶ evidently alludes to an event that involved a certain risk to the life of the governor. Unfortunately, the choice of words is too general to allow any conclusions regarding the nature of this peril.⁷ Although some uncertainties remain regarding the order of events, we can be sure that in A.D. 211 Baebius Modestus was both governor of Sardinia and elected to the imperial council (this is born out by the fact that the inscription mentions two *Augusti* in connection with both these offices), and we can be reasonably sure that he was in Sardinia before leaving to take up his position on the imperial council in Rome. Some corollaries to these insights will be explored in the following sections.

III. *AMICUS CONSILIARIUS*

The Roman emperor did not rule in absolute isolation. In his decision making, he was assisted by people of various ranks. Modern scholars use the term *consilium principis* to denote the body upon whose opinions and expertise the emperor drew when making administrative and judicial decisions. The *consilium principis* developed slowly during the first two centuries A.D., as Crook has described in his fundamental study. Although it is evident that the emperors met frequently with their advisors, the *consilium* did not have a set membership; individual participation depended on the matter at hand and on those available for consultation.⁸

There are three Latin epithets (with corresponding Greek terms) that denote a special relationship to the emperor: *amicus* (φίλος), *comes* (companion,

⁶ Another inscription from the same site, the content of which has so far only been summarily given as "per la salute di Q. Bebio Modesto . . . [.]lanus [.] *cob(ortis) II v(otum) s(olvit)*" seems to record the fulfilment of a similar vow: see Serra and Bacco 1998: 1245, n. 101.

⁷ A prayer for someone's *salus* often indicates a change or a period of uncertainty, for instance a voyage of some kind. Therefore, we often find epigraphical records of combined prayers for *salus*, *itus*, and *reditus*. See, in contemporary inscriptions, the formula *pro salute et victoria et reditu imperatorum duorum* . . . (CIL VI 227 = ILS 427) and *pro salute victoria et reditu imperatorum trium* . . . (ILS 433); many more examples might be cited. The inscriptions from Forum Traiani do not mention travel or return, but we know for a fact that a voyage was involved, because the position of *consiliarius* necessarily involved a stay away from Sardinia at court. It is tempting to suggest that precisely the travel to Rome and the troubled court of Caracalla and Geta occasioned the vows for Baebius Modestus' well-being, but I cannot cite any parallel for a vow of that kind. We might simply be dealing with something as trivial as a bout of the flu or a hunting accident that caused concern among his staff.

⁸ The standard treatment is still the one by Crook (1955, with an extensive list of *amici* and *comites* at 148–190); cf. the comments and additions by Syme (1971: 292–299, originally from 1956). Dietz (1980: 300–314) focuses on the relationship of Severus Alexander and Maximinus Thrax to their respective councils; see also Gaudemet 1982; Brunt 1988. For Amarelli 1983, see the strongly critical review by Eck 1990. On the *consilium principis*, see also Eck 1998b, 2000a.

συναπόδεμος], and *consiliarius* (or a similar expression, σύμβουλος τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ).⁹ Of these epithets, *consiliarius*, which occurs but rarely, was clearly used only for members of the emperor's council. *Comes* denoted a companion of the emperor; he was a person who was part of the emperor's entourage while he travelled, although he did perhaps not always participate in the imperial council. Some *comites* travelled as companions in official capacities (officials, officers), others accompanied the emperor as *privati*. *Comites* are commonly considered to have been also *amici* of the emperor.¹⁰

The epithet *amicus* is the most ambiguous of the three, and it defies any simple definition.¹¹ One could be called an *amicus* of the emperor without participating in the *consilium* or even without being in the emperor's presence; this is the case when, as happens with some frequency, a letter from the emperor addresses a provincial governor as *amicus*.¹² Yet sometimes *amicus* is precisely the epithet the emperor applies to members of his council;¹³ indeed, one must assume that the emperor would call only upon the experience of his *amici*, or promote only *amici* to those prestigious posts that almost automatically led to membership in the *consilium*.

Although the title *amicus consiliarius* was hitherto unknown, it undoubtedly denotes a member of the imperial council. But is this joining of epithets simply a redundancy or does the phrase refer to a specific office? As just noted, one would have thought that each member of the council was an *amicus* of the emperor. Possibly we might understand the inscription to mean that Baebius Modestus, previously an *amicus*, had recently been elevated to *consiliarius*. But it seems more likely that the position or quality of *amicus (imperatoris/um)*, which is implied for a *consiliarius*, was considered to be so significant that it needed to be spelled out. The much rarer position of *consiliarius* may not have been thought to convey all the prestige that had been bestowed on Baebius Modestus. In either case, however, it is clear that it is the *adlectio* that is being stressed in the inscription.

⁹ For *consiliarius* and its Greek equivalent, see Crook 1955: 73.

¹⁰ On the meaning of *comes*, see Crook 1955: 24–25: “all *comites* were *amici*, but not every *amicus* was a *comes*” (the view of Mommsen); Millar 1992: 117; Halfmann 1986: 92–93. See most recently Eck 2000a: 206–207 (= Eck 1998b: 19–20), acknowledging the varying situations: while the *comites* were normally chosen from among the *amici*, the status of *amicus* was sometimes achieved because of one's position as *comes*. A list of thirty-eight epigraphically attested instances of *comes* or συναπόδεμος is presented in Pflaum 1981: 108–109; a handful of later discoveries could be added. For a list of eighty-one *comites*, see Halfmann 1986: 245–252.

¹¹ Crook 1955: 22–30; Syme 1971: 292: “the term *amicus* is nothing if not comprehensive. It quickly becomes definite, and can be employed as a title”; Millar 1992: 111–115, esp. 111: “there is nothing, however, to show that it could always have been clearly stated whether a man was an *amicus* of the emperor or not”; Eck 2000a: 206–207.

¹² Cases listed in Millar 1992: 115, to which add no. 5 listed in the Appendix below.

¹³ Millar 1992: 121, with reference to *POxy.* 3019, line 7, a document that lists those sitting on the imperial council in A.D. 200 in Alexandria under Septimius Severus.

Among the peculiarities of the inscription is the context in which the term *amicus* (*imperatoris/um*) appears. It has been noted that only rarely does the term *amicus* (of the emperor) appear in inscriptions, except in quotations from an imperial letter.¹⁴ A survey of all the known epigraphical and papyrological occurrences of imperial *amici* / φίλοι underscores this point. In all, the epithet is expressly and demonstrably used for thirty-four persons (other than Baebius Modestus), of which only six cases do not cite an imperial communication.¹⁵ Presumably there was the risk of appearing too presumptuous if one used the term without some official sanction. On this account too we are dealing with an unusual instance, for our inscription was erected by a private individual (albeit not by the “friend” himself but by a subordinate who held an appointment in the imperial administration) and the text does not purport to offer a direct quotation from an official document.¹⁶

It is also noteworthy that Baebius Modestus, the friend of the two emperors, is a member of the *equester ordo*. The epithet *amicus* is applied to very few equestrians.¹⁷ Furthermore, although there were demonstrably equestrians in the *consilium* from the late first century onwards¹⁸ (and possibly earlier), these men were usually either high imperial secretaries at court (such as the *ab epistulis*), holders of the three most important prefectures in Rome (the two *praefecti praetorio*, the *praefectus vigilum*, the *praefectus annonae*—these officials seem almost to have been members of the council *ex officio*),¹⁹ or jurists.²⁰ This makes one wonder what opened the door to this illustrious company for Baebius Modestus, for he seems to have been

¹⁴ Millar 1992: 116. One example is *IGR* III 777 (no. 12 in the Appendix): an *equus* honoured by his son. *Comes* is more frequent in inscriptions, for it is less open to interpretation. The epithet *comes* refers, at least until the early third century, to an actual stay at the side of the emperor, mostly on a journey: see Millar 1992: 117; Eck 2000a: 206.

¹⁵ In private formulations *amicus* appears for Ti. Claudius Herodes Atticus, Creperius, Gellius Maximus, M. Cn. Licinius Rufinus, T. Messius Extricus, and C. Sentius Severus Quadratus: see below, Appendix, nos. 10, 12, 17, 24, 25, 31.

¹⁶ Yet the lack of an official quotation does not seem to warrant any doubt about the accuracy of the text. Both parties in the inscription belonged to the imperial administration, and the inscription was erected on a much frequented public site, as noted above, n. 1.

¹⁷ Very few ordinary equestrians (excluding holders of the three highest *praefecturae*, of Egypt, the *annona*, and the Praetorian Guard, and important court officials such as the *ab epistulis*) can be counted among the *amici* / φίλοι (*expressis verbis*); note only Appendix, nos. 12 (Creperius), 17 (Gellius Maximus the physician), 28 (Otaclius Sagitta), 33 (Theon from Alexandria), and perhaps no. 20 (Iulius Planta, status uncertain). Syme (1971: 294) suggested that the otherwise unknown equestrians Baebius Longus and Calenus should also be counted as *amici* (SHA *Marc.* 3.8: *amavitque ex condiscipulis praecipuos . . . ex equestri (ordini) Baebium Longum et Calenum*). For the two Alexandrian ἐταῖροι of Claudius, see the Appendix, uncertain cases d and e. In any case, the context of Claudius' relations to Alexandrian leaders is wholly different from the context under consideration.

¹⁸ On a meeting of the *consilium* under Domitian, see Eck 2000a: 197.

¹⁹ Eck 2000a: 198–199, 201–202.

²⁰ For a list of six equestrian *consiliarii* or officials called a *consiliis* (deemed to be a title that supplanted that of *consiliarius* in the mid-third century), see Pflaum 1960–61: 3.1024. Five cases are known from inscriptions and one from *Dig.* 36.1.23 (22) *pr.* That these men were in fact *iuris periti*

a mere equestrian procurator.²¹ For the time being, however, this question must remain unanswered, for the record is otherwise silent about his life.²² However, the fact that the equestrian governor of Sardinia was expected to have some military experience is suggestive.²³ As a military commander in Sardinia, Baebius Modestus and his troops were the force closest to Rome, weather permitting, after the soldiers stationed in and around the capital and the naval units at Misenum.

IV. THE ADLECTIO

Our text is also noteworthy, for it contains what must be considered the earliest example of someone said to have been *adlectus* to the position of *amicus consiliarius*. As far as the emperor's entourage is concerned, until very recently, the *adlectio* was known only in a context where it was applied to *comites*.²⁴ The term reflects official nomenclature (*adlectus* is commonly used to describe a promotion by the emperor)²⁵ and clearly indicates that an official decision of the emperor lay behind the entry into the imperial council.²⁶ Is the use of *adlectio* significant or does it merely reflect the personal taste of the person who erected the inscription? It has generally been argued that no formal election to the imperial *consilium* ever took place and that, therefore, membership in the *consilium* could not be

has recently been doubted by Eck (2000a: 205), but new evidence shows that there is little ground for such doubts: see Millar 1999: 98–99.

²¹ As we shall see below, legal expertise could open the door to the imperial *consilium* for equestrians, but I have found no evidence for an otherwise unidentified Baebius or Modestus excelling in this field.

²² It seems that another dedication from the same site also mentions Q. Baebius Modestus, erected by someone from an unidentified *cohors II*: see above, n. 6. Since Baebius Modestus was previously unknown, he does not appear in *PIR*² and nothing can be said about his family ties. But *CIL* VI 32331, a fragment of the Acts of the *Ludi Saeculares* of A.D. 204, records one Baebius M[. . .]. The mention is normally referred to Baebius Marcellinus (*PIR*² B 25), but a different restoration of the name might be possible; I am indebted to one of the referees for this observation.

²³ Eck 1998d: 98; 2000c: 260.

²⁴ The *adlectio* is explicitly mentioned for four *comites*: C. Iulius Quadratus Bassus (as identified by Crook [1955: 169] and Halfmann [1986: 248–249]; the name is not preserved: *AE* 1934, 177, reign of Trajan); Aemilius Pudens (*AE* 1949, 38, reign of Commodus); C. Junius Faustinus Placidus Postumianus (*CIL* VIII 597 = 11754, likely reign of Severus and Caracalla); C. Julius Pacatianus (*CIL* XII 1856 = *ILS* 1353, A.D. 209/11). In the case of the jurist M. Aurelius Papirius Dionysius under the emperor Marcus we find the expression *adsumptus in consilium ad sestertium LX m (ilia) n (ummu)* in *CIL* X 6662 = *ILS* 1455. The same inscription relates that Papirius Dionysius was later given a more prominent role in the imperial *consilium* when he became *centenarius consiliarius Augusti*; for his career, see Pflaum 1960–61: 1.472–476. An imperial decision regarding the advancement to the council of the praetorian prefect is recorded in *CIL* XI 6337 = *ILS* 1422 for Ti. Claudius Zeno Ulpianus of Severan date, who was *ex sacra iussione adhibitus in consil(ium) praef(ecti) praet(orio) item urb(i)*.

²⁵ As in expressions such as *adlectus inter consulares* and many others: see De Ruggiero 1895.

²⁶ Similar expressions could be used for membership in the *consilium* of certain high officials; cf. the expression *ex sacra iussione adhibitus in consilium praefecti praetorio item urbi* in n. 24 (*CIL* XI 6337 = *ILS* 1422), where the *sacra iussio* should refer to a decree by the emperor towards the end of the second century.

mentioned in a *cursus* inscription.²⁷ However, our Sardinian text, together with a recently discovered inscription from Thyatira in Lydia honouring M. Cn. Licinius Rufinus, now suggests that this thesis be revised.

Two previously known inscriptions refer to Licinius Rufinus as a φίλος τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ; one was set up by a grateful beneficiary (*IGR* IV 1215 = *TAM* V.2 984), the other was erected by the tanners of Thyatira (*IGR* IV 1216 = *TAM* V.2 986).²⁸ In addition, Licinius Rufinus appears as a jurist in *IG* X.2,1 142 (ἐνπειρότατος νόμων = *iuris peritissimus*), and in fact several legal passages of his are known.²⁹ Now a new inscription, set up by people from his home town, outlines almost his whole career.³⁰ Although he came to reach the rank of *consularis*,³¹ the inscription makes it clear that he started out as an *eques Romanus*, and his first position is listed as that of σύμβουλος Σεβ(αστοῦ) or *consiliarius*. Last in the list of offices is that of ἐπιλεχθεὶς φίλος τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ, or *adlectus amicus Caesaris*.³² Thus we find the *adlectio inter amicos* in Baebius Modestus' inscription confirmed by Licinius Rufinus' career, albeit some three decades later. Furthermore, if the offices that Licinius Rufinus held are listed in strict chronological order on the inscription, the *adlectio inter amicos* would have taken place only after A.D. 238, even though Rufinus must have been *consiliarius* already in the 210s or early 220s.³³ If so, we would have interesting evidence that the position of *consiliarius* was not equivalent to being nominated *amicus*.

To judge from the evidence of these new sources, it looks as if from the Severan period onwards the honour of being called *amicus imperatoris* had, in some cases, come to be construed as something akin to an official title. However, one should not exclude the possibility that there might have been earlier cases of the official nomination of an *amicus*; the evidence is too tenuous for any definite conclusions.³⁴ Worthy of notice in this context is the expression *quaestor imperatoris Caesaris Hadriani Augusti inter amicos* used for the young Herodes Atticus. The phrase is unique and difficult to explain,³⁵ but in the case of this imperial favourite it is

²⁷ Eck 2000a: 200–201, esp. 200: “[*amicus*] . . . never had any official recognition,” in a contribution that clearly was unable to take Herrmann 1997 fully into account; similarly Eck 1998b: 11.

²⁸ See Millar 1999: 92–93 with English translations.

²⁹ Millar 1999: 91, 98.

³⁰ Herrmann 1997; for further discussion, see Millar 1999: 96–99.

³¹ On his career as a senator, see Millar 1999: 98.

³² Thus Herrmann 1997: 122.

³³ For the chronology, see Millar 1999: 96–97.

³⁴ For the nomination of *amici*, there is Pliny's description of how Trajan chose his *amici*: *tu amicos ex optimis* (*Pan.* 45.3); a verb, <*sumis*> or <*legis*>, is sometimes added to the phrase. But the recent Teubner editor M. Schuster (Stuttgart and Leipzig 1992) considers any emendation superfluous, as stressed by one of the referees. In any case, whatever the original expression, one should probably not assume that an official decision is meant. Plin. *Ep.* 4.22.1 (*interfui optimi principis cognitioni in consilium adsumptus*) refers to membership in the council without saying anything about the epithet *amicus*.

³⁵ See most recently Birley 1997a: 177; 1997b: 220, 236. The expression *inter amicos* resembles the terminology used for an *adlectio inter* (. . .). The text is presented and briefly discussed by

easy to see why we might be dealing with an exception from the practice of that time.

Moreover, there is a third inscription which has not previously been considered in this context. In *IGR* III 777 from Attalia a Roman knight, whose name can be restored as Crepereius (see the Appendix, below, no. 12), is referred to as φίλος καὶ ἐπίτροπος γενόμενος τῶν Σεβαστῶν—the man had become “friend and procurator of the emperors.” The interesting feature of this inscription is that the acquisition of the epithet φίλος and the nomination to the post of ἐπίτροπος are joined together. It does not look as if this was done in order to save space on the stone, for the text records a career comprising many offices. Instead, one gets the impression that a similar procedure lay behind becoming *amicus* and becoming procurator. The Greek γενόμενος appears with some frequency in inscriptions listing public offices,³⁶ although it is certainly not necessary for denoting an imperial nomination. Γενόμενος can perhaps be compared to the Latin *factus*, which is used to denote both military and civil promotions. Although *factus* is not necessarily a *terminus technicus*, it certainly denotes that an official decision has been made.³⁷ The inscription about Crepereius fits well into this context. Pflaum dated the career of this knight to the first half of the second century without any firm chronological evidence, taking the mention of multiple emperors to refer to successive rulers.³⁸ However, the text could easily be later.

The *adlectio* of an *amicus* ought to mean that a formal decision which could be verified in some archival act underlay the nomination; as such, it is one step more official than the use of the mere epithet *amicus* in imperial correspondence.³⁹ But was this formal adlection the rule for *amici* after the Severan period, when Baebius Modestus' case shows the practice as being in use? At the moment it is impossible to be certain; in the epigraphic record very few *amici* can be dated after Septimius Severus, and these data are inconclusive.⁴⁰ In contrast, all but one of the known cases of *adlectio* of *comites* come from the last decades of the second century or later.⁴¹

Ameling (1983: 2.105–106, no. 76), who tentatively suggests an influence from the Greek expression σεβαστόγνωστος. This is hardly likely, for as shown by Nadel (1952), that epithet is not equivalent to *amicus Caesaris*, as it merely denotes someone “known to the Emperor.” Moreover, the epithet is regularly used by men of lesser rank. Interestingly enough, σεβαστόγνωστος seems more common in Greek private inscriptions than φίλος τοῦ Σεβ.

³⁶ See, for example, *ILS* 8821, 8829, 8860.

³⁷ For examples of military and civilian promotions denoted by *factus est*, see *CIL* VI 228, 375, 1421, 1598, 2132, 2601, 2977, 31158, 33993. Many more from all over the Roman world could be cited.

³⁸ Pflaum 1960–61: 1.347–348; likewise Devijver 1976: 306, no. 254 (nothing on chronology in Devijver 1987: 1531). Barbieri (1952: 152) dated him to the reign of Marcus.

³⁹ Ideally, in this case a record should also have been kept; cf. Trajan's pronouncements on records of letters by Domitian: Plin. *Ep.* 10.66.

⁴⁰ Besides Baebius Modestus, there are the nos. 3, 12 (?), 13, 16, 17, 24, 25, 31 (?) in the Appendix below.

⁴¹ See the instances listed above, n. 24.

Do the sources also permit us to interpret the mention of the *adlectio* as something other than an official act? One might argue that, because the expressions *amicus consiliarius adlectus* and *amicus adlectus* (ἐπιλεχθεὶς φίλος) do not appear in official letters of the emperors, but in two of the very few inscriptions in which private individuals refer to an *amicus principis* and which happen to belong to the third century, nothing had changed in the procedure of becoming an *amicus* of the emperor: by pure chance we have some late private inscriptions that refer to the *adlectio*, which imperial documents never thought necessary to mention although the same procedure had been in use for a long time. But against this explanation stands the fact that before the third century private individuals *de facto* were very reticent about mentioning the status of *amicus imperatoris*.⁴² Surely the current explanation for this behaviour during the earlier period—that only those suffering from *hubris* would write out the position of *amicus imperatoris*, because it was unofficial—is the right one.

One could also object that if the *adlectio* of *amici* had been introduced ca A.D. 200 (or had become more common thereafter), we should expect to find more examples of it after that date. But this is not a compelling argument. First, in Crook's list there are only few identified *amici* recorded for the third century; of these, for fewer still do we have career inscriptions. Secondly, in several of the known career inscriptions of imperial favourites registered by Crook we find mention of an adlection as *comes* or a nomination as *consiliarius*. This likely would have made the inclusion of the title *amicus* superfluous.

Explanations for this innovation, if this is what we are dealing with here, are not difficult to find. By making the position of *amicus* contingent upon official nomination, the emperor would confer more dignity on those he wanted to decorate while strengthening imperial control over the distinction. It is significant that the known cases of adlected *amici* are all equestrian in origin. Perhaps, as the emperors increasingly turned to the equestrian order for capable administrators from the later part of the second century onwards, it was felt that a formal *adlectio* was a helpful mark of distinction for some of the closest imperial advisors.⁴³ We might be dealing with a movement parallel to the imperial *adlectiones* of suitable equestrians to the Senate.

Finally, it is important to consider the rank and salary of Baebius Modestus with the advent of his *adlectio* as *consiliarius*. It is generally assumed that the *procurator Aug. praef. Sardiniae* drew an annual salary of 200,000 *sestertii*, that

⁴² It is significant that we find the emperors using the epithet, but it is missing in the career inscriptions of the persons concerned. Moreover, we should be looking for the term *amicus* not only in the career inscriptions of the men listed in the Appendix below, but in those of the several hundred prominent men who were counted as *amici* in Crook 1955. I certainly agree that the persons listed by Crook might be regarded as *amici principis*, but because explicit official and/or contemporary sources for that status are lacking, they have not been included in the Appendix.

⁴³ For the context in which emperors after the mid-second century had to look for their chief collaborators and "friends," see Brunt 1988: 55–56.

is to say, he had advanced to the *ducenarius* level in the equestrian hierarchy.⁴⁴ The evidence so far available for *consiliarii* indicates that they received a salary of no more than 100,000 *sestertii* (*centenarius* rank), with junior *consiliarii* earning only 60,000.⁴⁵ After the middle of the third century, however, we encounter a δοικῆναριος ἐπὶ συμβουλίου τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ (OGIS 549 = IGR III 179), which is taken to be a holder of the position of a *consiliis*, who was rewarded with 200,000 *sestertii* yearly. Baebius Modestus seems to have been a *consiliarius ducenarius*, for the chronology suggests that he ought to have been governor before joining the imperial *consilium*. The nomination to *consiliarius* must have been a promotion and can hardly have led to a lower salary.

Here again the evidence prompts new questions. Had the salary of the *consiliarii* already risen to 200,000 *sestertii* by A.D. 211, or was there a great variety in the salaries accorded to members of the *consilium*? Or is it possible that some equestrian governors of Sardinia could be only of *centenarius* rank? The last alternative seems less likely; surely there *was* a difference in the salaries for *consiliarii*, and by A.D. 211 there were some *consiliarii*, such as Baebius Modestus, who were of *ducenarius* rank.

V. PROCURATOR AUGUSTORUM (ET) PRAEFECTUS SARDINIAE

The structure of the administration of Sardinia changed several times during the imperial period. An administration led by a senator as *proconsul provinciae Sardiniae* alternated with one that was headed by an equestrian who bore the double title *procurator Augusti (et) praefectus prov. Sardiniae*.⁴⁶ The last change in the status of Sardinia can be discerned during the early years of the reign of Septimius Severus, when a new series of equestrian governors began.⁴⁷ Our sources show a considerable concentration of procuratorial governors from the reign of Septimius Severus to the beginning of Caracalla's sole rule in the last days of 211.

The governor-procurators who can certainly be said to belong to this period are:⁴⁸

⁴⁴ On the *ducenarius* rank, see Pflaum 1960–61: 3.1044; 1974: 62, postulating four different levels among the *ducenarii* and placing the *proc. Sardiniae* on the lowest.

⁴⁵ Pflaum 1974: 60. For the list of *consiliarii* and a *consiliis*, containing some mentions of their salary, see Pflaum 1960–61: 3.1024. That M. Aurelius Papirius Dionysius, *adsumptus in consilium ad sestertium LX m(ilia) n(ummum)* (CIL X 6662 = ILS 1455), the only example of a *consiliarius* with such a salary, had actually been elected to the imperial council is refuted by Eck (2000a: 204), who suggests that he was a member of the *consilium* of the *praef. Urbi* or the *praefecti praetorio*. But the discovery of another equestrian *iuris peritus* who began his career as a *consiliarius*, and thus likely with a lower salary, reinforces the standard view; see the career of M. Cn. Licinius Rufinus in Herrmann 1997; Millar 1999: 99.

⁴⁶ On the duties of a procurator governing a province ("presidial procurator"), see Pflaum 1974: 50–53; Eck 1995.

⁴⁷ For the change, see Hirschfeld 1905: 373; Meloni 1958: 36; Pflaum 1960–61: 3.1045. For the mention in Hippolyt. *Refutat. omn. haer.* 11.9 (ed. Wendland), dated to ca 190, see Pflaum 1960–61: 1106, but the passage is considered of doubtful value by Thomasson (1984: 8).

⁴⁸ This list is primarily based on Thomasson 1984: 8–9, 12; Aelius Peregrinus is added according to Sotgiu 1991: 728–729; cf. Benseddik 1992: 425–437; Thomasson 1999: 163. The lists in Pflaum

193/198	L. Baebius Aurelius Iuncinus
early years of Septimius Severus' reign	M. Pi[.]us[. . .]
before 201	P. Aelius Peregrinus
ca 204	Raecius (?) Constans
198/209	M. Cosconius Fronto
200/209	M. Domitius Tert[ullus?]
209/211	Q. Gabinius Barbarus
198/211	[. . .]mius Vi[. . .]
198/211	anonymous (<i>AE</i> 1971, 122). ⁴⁹

In theory, Q. Baebius Modestus might be identical to the anonymous governor in *AE* 1971, 122, but since the latter was *proc. Augg*[[g.]] this would mean that Baebius had begun his tenure while Septimius Severus was still alive. If these men are not identical, we can now add another governor to the six or seven already known during the period 198–211, that is an official who was in office sometime in the period 4 February to 19/26 December, 211.⁵⁰

This addition to the list of Sardinian governors brings up a question of wider importance. With at least seven known governors in some fourteen years, their respective term of office was an average of only two years.⁵¹ But in reality, this average may have been less, for it is doubtful whether we know all the procurators who were in office during that period. Such a short tenure of office is unusual in the provincial administration, except for the *proconsules*.⁵² A governor who acted as *legatus Augusti pro praetore* and held more substantial military commands remained in each position an average of between two and three years.⁵³ The average tenure of the equestrian *praefectus Aegypti* was a little less than four years,⁵⁴ and it is commonly assumed that equestrian provincial (presidial) procurators, like

1960–61: 3.1045 and Pflaum 1982: 117 are less accurate, while Serra and Bacco 1998: 1244, n. 101 is quite incomplete. In some cases the dates in Thomasson 1984 have been modified: the tenures of those officials who are *proc. Augustorum duorum* have been narrowed down to ca 198/209; consequently, the dates for *procuratores Augustorum trium* become A.D. 209/211. For Geta's *dies imperii* in 209, see recently Birley 1999: 294.

⁴⁹ Pflaum (1960–61: 3.1045) adds P. Vibius Marianus to this period, but without good cause.

⁵⁰ On the duration of the joint reign of Caracalla and Geta, see above, n. 2.

⁵¹ Even if Baebius Modestus is identical with the anonymous governor in *AE* 1971, 122, it creates further “crowding” among the governors. There are several governors who indicate that they were in office under “three Emperors.” If Baebius Modestus occupies the end of this period and holds office into the reign of Caracalla and Geta, the others, Q. Gabinius Barbarus and [. . .]mius Vi[. . .], have even less space for their tenures.

⁵² The senatorial proconsuls stayed in office for only one year. This applied both to the important and ceremonial governorships of Africa and Asia respectively and to the more numerous and less important praetorian proconsulships. In general on the senatorial career, see Eck 1996; Birley 1981: 30–31.

⁵³ See recently Eck 1995: 331; 1998c: 58–59; 2000b: 231.

⁵⁴ For the tenure of the *praef. Aeg.* and of equestrian presidial procurators, see Brunt 1983: 49–50; for an updated list of *praefecti Aeg.* until A.D. 236, see Brunt 1990: 245–254; cf. Eck 1995: 332 on the tenure of the *praef. Aeg.*: an average of between three and four years during the second century A.D.

those in Sardinia, would have remained in office for a similar period of time.⁵⁵ However, recent epigraphic discoveries naming previously unknown provincial procurators seem to prompt a revision of this thesis. It is now clear that for certain periods in the second century there were as many as four procuratorial governors in the province of Raetia in a single decade; the data seem to indicate that the situation was even more fluid in Mauretania Tingitana, for on two occasions that province had four governors in one decade.⁵⁶ Early third-century Sardinia seems to conform to this pattern.

Are these findings exceptional or do they reflect common practice? One can suggest two explanations as to why the tenure of governors was, on average, so brief. First, it is possible that this was a period with special problems (in Sardinia or elsewhere) that necessitated these frequent changes. It is of course easy to see why this might be true during the reign of Septimius Severus. Equally, however, it is possible that such administrative changes were not exceptional in Sardinia. Accordingly, we should assume that it was a rule to change governors often, and that it is only through fortuitous discoveries that we happen to be able to identify more governors during this particular period than is commonly the case.⁵⁷

Hopefully, further discoveries will shed more light on this question. For the time being, however, the term of office remains one aspect of Roman imperial administration that needs to be examined, for it affects our views of the professionalism and efficiency of the Roman provincial government.⁵⁸

VI. *PROCURATOR METALLORUM ET PRAEDIORUM*

An office not previously found in inscriptions attesting imperial freedmen is that of *procurator metallorum et praediorum*, held by Servatus *Aug(ustorum) lib(ertus)*, the man who commissioned the votive altar under discussion. According to this title, Servatus was in charge of *both* mining (or quarrying) activities and of imperial domains, for it is most unlikely that the *et* conjunction should denote consecutive offices here. Separately, there are parallels in the Roman world for both these tasks; in general, imperial domains produced wealth for the emperor through agriculture or mineral extraction.⁵⁹

⁵⁵ Recently Eck 1995: 332–333.

⁵⁶ See Christol and Magioncalda 1989: 165–166 (Mauretania Tingitana A.D. 152–161, Raetia A.D. 151–160), 172–173 (Mauretania Tingitana A.D. 172–181). A similar situation seems to exist in Mauretania Caesariensis under the Severi from ca 198–ca 212: see Benseddik 1992: 434.

⁵⁷ Indeed the site of Forum Traiani and the inscriptions found there represent a special situation that might distort the evidence; we are dealing with a centre for administrative and local cultural activities: see above, n. 1.

⁵⁸ Cf. Eck 1995: 333: “Eine stärkere Professionalisierung ist, zumindest unter diesem Aspekt [i.e., concerning the duration of office for the presidial procurator], auch bei den Rittern nicht festzustellen.”

⁵⁹ For some epigraphic evidence on titles, see the following notes. Brief comments on equestrian and freedman procurators of imperial domains and mines and quarries can be found in Brunt 1983: 72–73, nos. 18–19.

In the Sardinian context it is no surprise to find proof of the existence of imperial landed property (*praedia*) at the beginning of the third century A.D. in Servatus' title, but direct sources for this particular period have hitherto been lacking. Instead, sources are particularly rich for the mid-first century when there is much evidence for the extensive possessions of Nero's mistress, Claudia Aug. I. Acte, in Sardinia. These were quite likely taken over by the imperial *patrimonium* under Vespasian; however, one cannot exclude the possibility that some might have been sold off.⁶⁰

The title *proc. metallorum* was used also for procurators supervising marble or granite quarries,⁶¹ but the Sardinian context makes it much more likely that we are dealing with mining activities. Silver, lead, and other metals were mined in Sardinia, as can be inferred from various sources spanning the entire imperial period.⁶² Many lead ingots have been found in shipwrecks in the waters around the island; indeed, some have been found on the island itself. While most of these ingots had been brought from Spain instead of having been produced in Sardinia itself,⁶³ some are considered to be Sardinian, and of these a few carry a stamp of the emperor.⁶⁴ If indeed they are from Sardinia, they could well be from the same mines that Servatus the *proc. metallorum* was supervising in A.D. 211.

Both of the activities that can be inferred from the title *proc. metallorum et praediorum* refer to the supervision of imperial lands; as such the joining of these two tasks is not surprising. That being said, the terminology is unique, which prompts us to ask if we should assume that freedman procurators all over the empire regularly supervised both mines and imperial estates in their province on the basis of this explicit title. On the other hand, Servatus' unusual title might indicate the opposite, that these two functions were normally handled separately.

Evidence from other imperial procurators in these two sectors ought to be considered here. The best-known freedman *procurator metallorum* in the Roman world is encountered in the famous dossier concerning the Roman

⁶⁰ On the possessions of Acte, see Crawford 1976: 39–40, 69–70; on the assimilation into the imperial possessions after Nero's death, see Mastino and Ruggeri 1995: 531–532. For evidence of imperial freedmen and slaves, who often were connected to imperial domains, see Sotgiu 1957: 44–48; Haensch 1997: 401, n. 16.

⁶¹ For instance, M. Ulpius Aug. lib. Chresimus was *proc. metallorum* at the granite quarries of Mons Claudianus in Egypt: see *IGR* I 1255–56; cf. Hirschfeld 1905: 167. It is now clear from Herrmann 1988 that a different imperial freedman named Chresimus was active in the quarries in Asia Minor. For further mention of *metalla* in connection with the quarries of Mons Claudianus, see Bingen *et al.* 1997: nos. 371, 374–376.

⁶² Davies 1935: 69–72; Sotgiu 1957: 42–44; Le Bohec 1992: 255. Hirschfeld (1905: 162) registered one [E]arinus *proc. f(erro) r(ariarum) p(rovinciae) S(ardiniae?)* (*CIL* X 6315 from Terracina), but this interpretation is clearly open to doubt; cf. Brunt 1983: 73.

⁶³ For the foreign origin, see Giacobelli 1991: 136; Salvi 1992: 671–672; Gasperini 1992: 571–573.

⁶⁴ *CIL* X 8073.1: *Caesaris Aug. . . .*; *CIL* X 8073.2: *Imp. Caes. Hadr. Aug.*; considered of Sardinian origin by, e.g., Davies (1935: 70) and Bonello Lai (1986–87: 32–33), who suggests (39) that other lead pigs derive from Sardinia as well (although the scholars cited in the previous note are in disagreement).

silver mines at Vipasca in modern Portugal (*FIRA* I² 104–105). The *proc. metallorum* at Vipasca was in charge of the mines, but his most important task was that of dealing with contractors who extracted and processed the ore and handled other activities in the mining area.⁶⁵ Mining procurators are found in many other provinces, too. The evidence shows that the emperor owned the most important mines in the Roman empire,⁶⁶ and that the imperial administration used procurators to supervise mining activities.⁶⁷ We have evidence for such procurators from Gaul, the Spanish provinces,⁶⁸ Noricum, Dalmatia and neighbouring provinces south of the Danube,⁶⁹ and Dacia;⁷⁰ a variety of metals were mined in these provinces. Supervising this mining are both *equites*⁷¹ and imperial freedman procurators. Often they are simply called “procurator,” instead of *proc. metallorum*, *proc. argentarium*, or the like; this makes our inscription unusually explicit. The competence of Roman mining procurators varied. Senior procurators, particularly of equestrian status, might supervise mines in many contiguous provinces; other *procuratores metallorum* of lower rank supervised individual mining districts and were subordinated to the provincial procurator.⁷² The imperial freedman procurators are part of this latter group.

Procurators were also employed in the supervision of imperial domains, *praedia*, all over the empire; the best known are those in the Bagradas valley in North Africa. But here too the organization varied. The day-to-day supervision of

⁶⁵ For the texts of the dossier, German translation, and discussion, see Flach 1979. For an English translation of the whole dossier, see Lewis and Reinhold 1966: 188–194; for a new study of the *lex metallis dicta*, Flach’s table A, see Lazzarini 2001. Cf. also the inscription from Pergamon mentioning a freedman ἐπίτροπος μετάλλων Οὐλπα(σ)κηυσίων (*AE* 1933, 273 = Habicht 1969: 88–92, no. 44), discussed in Christol and Demougine 1990: 176–177 = *SEG* XL 1133 and further discussed in Section VII, below. Contractors did not operate imperial mines everywhere; there were different ways of managing the activities, mixing direct and indirect exploitation: see Edmondson 1987: 37–39; Domergue 1990: 301–307; Ørsted 2000.

⁶⁶ Some less important mines always remained in private possession: see Hirschfeld 1905: 146–150; Millar 1984: 142; Edmondson 1987: 37–39.

⁶⁷ On the administration in general, see Hirschfeld 1905: 145–180.

⁶⁸ For Gaul, see Pflaum 1960–61: 3.1053. Domergue (1990: 296) gives a list of twelve Iberian freedman procurators supervising mining on the spot. Of these only five mention the *metalla* in their title.

⁶⁹ Dušanić 1977: 79–93, with references to more detailed studies at 81, n. 195.

⁷⁰ Noeske 1977: 296–300 (seven equestrian and three freedman procurators are known); cf. Mrozek 1977: 97.

⁷¹ See Pflaum 1960–61: 3.1053 for six *proc. ferrarium Galliarum*; 1062 for one *proc. ferrarium Delmatiae*; 1063 for fifteen *proc. argentarium Pannonicarum et Delmaticarum*; 1064 for one *proc. vectigalis ferrarium Pannoniae Superioris*; 1065 for five *proc. aurarium (Daciarum?)*. Note that the titles found in the sources rarely are this explicit; the titles represent Pflaum’s inference from the context.

⁷² Eck 1998d: 76, 81–82 (= Eck 2000c: 244, 248); cf. Christol and Demougine 1990: 186–187, 192–197; Dušanić 1977: 79–93 (also advocating, against the common opinion, a central administration in Rome); Mrozek 1977: 97–98; Domergue 1990: 288.

the *coloni* who worked the land was conducted by private *conductores*,⁷³ the imperial administration was led by procurators of varying status, with the ranks of *proc. tractus* and *proc. regionis* towards the top and the *proc. saltus* at the bottom.⁷⁴ In other operations, the management could be organized differently.⁷⁵ But compounding the uncertainty here is the fact that many of the procurators who have been considered by modern scholars to have been supervisors in the imperial domains give no precise indication at all that they were concerned with imperial *praedia*.⁷⁶ The title *proc. praediorum* occurs but very rarely in our evidence.⁷⁷

We are left with no adequate explanation for the unusual title employed by Servatus. It is likely, however, that the combination of the tasks of *proc. metallorum et praediorum* may have been due to the paucity of the mines and the few imperial estates in Sardinia.

VII. ADIUTOR

Servatus also labels himself *adiutor* of the governor-procurator Baebius Modestus, and this provides a useful starting point for a final consideration of his tasks and position in the imperial administration.

We know that in a procuratorial province such as Sardinia the governor-procurator was also in charge of the revenues from the imperial domains.⁷⁸ Thus Servatus, the *proc. metallorum et praediorum*, must have been a subordinate of Baebius Modestus. Therefore, it might seem natural that Servatus should call himself *adiutor eius* with *eius* referring to the equestrian governor-procurator.

However, it is worth considering whether the epithet *adiutor* should be construed as having an official meaning (there were imperial freedmen who

⁷³ For North Africa, see Flach 1990: 88–117; for the relation between imperial procurators and the *conductores*, see Kehoe 1988: 123–127. For imperial estate management in general, see Crawford 1976: 44–54; for a list of procurators and other officials who can be assigned to these activities, see *ibid.* 57–70.

⁷⁴ Flach 1990: 103–117; Boulvert 1970: 213–217, 292; a large collection of equestrian procurators can be found in Pflaum 1960–61: 3.1093–95.

⁷⁵ Sometimes the procurators exercised more direct control over the farming of imperial land, to the extent that the imperial administration dealt directly with the free tenants or the slaves who farmed the land; cf. Crawford 1976: 44–54; Boulvert 1970: 213. For a new piece of evidence on imperial estate management in the territory between Rome and Ostia, see Bruun 1999: 38–40.

⁷⁶ See the bibliography in the two preceding notes.

⁷⁷ *MAMA* 124 from Laodicea Combusta in Phrygia, dated to A.D. 222/235, presents one Glycerinus (Aug.) lib. [*proc.*] *praediorum Quadratia[no]rum*. In *CIL* VIII 5351 = *ILS* 1435, listing the career of the equestrian T. Flavius Macer (of Trajanic date), there appears the office of *proc. Aug. praediorum saltu (u)m Hipponiensis et Thevestini*; in *ILAlg* 3992 = *AE* 1922, 19 his office appears as *proc. Aug. ad praedia saltus Hipponiensis et Thevestini*; cf. Pflaum 1960–61: 1.229, no. 98. In *AE* 1981, 600, an equestrian is mentioned as [*missus? ab Im*]p. *Hadrian[o ad Caes]ar(is) pr(aedia) divide[nda]*. As recorded by Crawford (1976: 69), there are imperial *vilici* and *exactores praediorum* (but no procurators) in *CIL* VI 276, 721, 745, 8683, 30983; *AE* 1922, 93 = *CIL* XIV 4570 (205).

⁷⁸ Eck 1995: 339.

carried titles such as *adiutor a codicillis* [CIL VI 8442], *adiutor a commentariis* [CIL VI 37748], and the like),⁷⁹ or whether it is merely a courtesy or a sign of personal affiliation. In this context it is important to survey the evidence for freedman procurators known from various Roman provinces. In some thirty cases, these procurators employ the title *proc. provinciae*.⁸⁰ As a result, they are all considered to have been the subordinated party in a system of "unequal collegiality" (also called "dual procuratorship"). Under this system, an imperial freedman worked as the subordinated "unequal colleague" to an equestrian procurator who carried an identical title and who functioned as the real head of the administration.⁸¹

Equestrian *procuratores provinciae* had different tasks, depending on the status of the province: in a province governed by a senatorial *legatus Augusti pro praetore*, the equestrian procurator was a "finance procurator," responsible both for taxes and other state income, and for the imperial domains. In a province governed by a senatorial *proconsul*, an accompanying *quaestor provinciae* was in charge of state income, while the equestrian procurator was a "patrimonial procurator" and dealt only with the imperial domains.⁸² Some provinces, however, were governed by an equestrian "presidial procurator," as is the case of Sardinia. In such a province, the governor-procurator was in charge of both the state income and the imperial domains.⁸³ I know of only two freedman *proc. provinciae* from a province led by a presidial procurator; one is Acastus Aug. lib., *proc. provinciae Mauretaniae* (CIL X 6081 = ILS 1483), the other T. Flavius Aug. lib. Pergamus, *proc. insulae [Cyr]ni* (= Corsica) (I.Ephesos 855 = AE 1982, 877).⁸⁴

⁷⁹ See Vaglieri 1895: 81–83 for seventeen different kinds of *adiutores* in the imperial administration; many can be found also in Boulvert 1970: *passim*. The most thorough treatment of the subject is Weaver 1972: 231–240 on "*Adiutores*: junior clerical grades."

⁸⁰ There is a list of twenty freedman provincial procurators in Weaver 1972: 276–277, many of whom held more than one such post. The list is not complete, but that is irrelevant for the present purpose. For additions, see, e.g., Plin. *Ep.* 10.27–28, 84–85 (Pontus-Bithynia); Tac. *Ann.* 13.1 (Asia); AE 1933, 282 (Asia); I.Ephesos 855 (Asia, Narbonensis, Corsica—although in the last case the man is called *proc. insulae [Cyr]ni* and, according to one of the anonymous referees, may not have been a *proc. provinciae* proper, but rather subordinated to one); Eck 1998e: 253 (Syria Palaestina); Boulvert 1970: 394–397 (on North Africa, but see the comments by Eck 1998e: 253). The inscription SEG XXXVII 1186 = AE 1989, 721 perhaps concerns Phrygia; see Haensch 1997: 624; on freedman procurators in that region, Boulvert 1970: 293–295; Mitchell 1999: 37–45. On equestrian *proc. provinciae Phrygiae*, see Potter 1998: 271–274.

⁸¹ Weaver 1972: 233, 278–281; Eck 1998d: 91–93 (= Eck 2000c: 255–256). An interesting support for the modern concept of "unequal colleagues" seems to have come to light in SEG XXXVII 1186, line 31 (= AE 1989, 721) from Tacina (Phrygia), in which the freedman procurator Aurelius Philocyrius addresses as *mi domine frater et collega* a man who seems to be an equestrian procurator.

⁸² Eck 1998d: 75–78 (= Eck 2000c: 244–246). For a somewhat wider conception of the financial duties of equestrian procurators in proconsular provinces, see Burton 1993 (with 27–28 on procuratorial jurisdiction).

⁸³ Eck 1995: 338–339.

⁸⁴ On the presence of presidial procurators on Corsica, see Haensch 1997: 745–747; cf. the scepticism regarding Pergamus' duties recorded in n. 80.

The question now is if the epithet *adiutor* indicates that Servatus, *proc. praediorum et metallorum*, was the “unequal colleague” of the presidial procurator Baebius Modestus. Are there any parallels for this meaning of *adiutor*? Only two imperial freedman procurators who use the expression *adiutor eius* (or the Greek equivalent βοηθὸς αὐτοῦ) in relation to an equestrian provincial procurator seem relevant to our case,⁸⁵ but neither of them worked with a presidial procurator. In the first case we find the function of *adiutor* in relation to an equestrian financial procurator of Syria; in the second it is in relation to an equestrian patrimonial procurator of Pontus-Bithynia.⁸⁶

One might suggest that in an equestrian province, such as Sardinia, no real “unequal collegiality” could exist, because the tasks of the presidial procurator also entailed military command and an extensive jurisdiction.⁸⁷ Yet the freedman Acastus from Mauretania undoubtedly uses the title *proc. provinciae*. It all comes down to whether one is entitled to regard Servatus as the freedman *proc. provinciae* because he is in charge of domains and mines, and because he calls himself *adiutor* of the presidial procurator. It may be significant that the *adiutores* of the equestrian procurators of Syria and Pontus-Bithynia do not mention their own titles. It has always been assumed that the title of such freedman assistants would be identical to that of the equestrian superior, as one would expect in the relation of “unequal collegiality.” But perhaps this needs to be reconsidered, for we now have a provincial *adiutor* who does spell out his title. The title is *proc. metallorum et praediorum* and it is not identical to that used by the equestrian counterpart.⁸⁸

Of course Servatus’ title would seem to cover precisely those duties that are thought to have belonged to the roughly thirty freedman provincial procurators that are known.⁸⁹ Because of the size of Sardinia, Servatus might, as the only high-ranking imperial freedman on the island, have been in charge of *praedia* and

⁸⁵ *CIL* III 431 = 7116 = 13674 = *ILS* 1449 from Ephesus; *CIG* II 1813b = *ILS* 8849 from Nicopolis in Epirus. These inscriptions were singled out in Weaver 1972: 231–233.

⁸⁶ On these provinces, see Haensch 1997: 396–397; for the different tasks of these procurators, see Eck 1998d: 75 (= Eck 2000c: 244).

⁸⁷ On the tasks, see Eck 1995: 335–338.

⁸⁸ Perhaps one should not take for granted that professed *adiutores* of senior equestrian procurators always would have used an official title identical to that of their superior. Weaver (1972: 231) lists two other cases: Carpus Aug. lib. Pallantianus *adiutor Claudii Athenodori praef. annonae* (under Nero, *CIL* VI 8470 = *ILS* 1535), and Capito Aug. l., *adiutor eius*, referring to Flavius Apollonius *proc. Aug. qui fuit a pinacothecis* (A.D. 153, *CIL* VI 10234 = *ILS* 7213). There is also the fragmentary dedication to an anonymous equestrian procurator for whom the last office was that of *proc. Syriae* by one Hermes Aug. lib. *adiut. eius* (*CIL* III 431 = *ILS* 1449 from Ephesus). It is not possible to determine whether Hermes was a procurator or not. One could also point to the famous dossier from Saepinum. In that exchange of correspondence, the imperial freedman *a rationibus* Cosmus, based in Rome, refers to Septimianus who is supervising imperial flocks in Samnium as *collibertus et adiutor meus*, while the latter in a letter to Cosmus uses the address *domine* (*CIL* IX 2438 = *FIRA* I² 61; see also Corbier 1983: 126–127 for text and English translation). These officials can hardly qualify as “unequal colleagues.”

⁸⁹ See above, n. 80.

metalla and have acted as the main assistant and *adiutor* of the presidial procurator. In practice, then, he might have been *the* freedman provincial procurator.

Yet the size of imperial properties in the provinces varied, and one should perhaps not regard every *adiutor* of an equestrian procurator as an "unequal colleague." We know for a fact that some freedman procurators did supervise specific domains, quarries, and mines without being proper *procuratores provinciae*.⁹⁰

Finally, it may be of some interest to note that a discussion similar to the one conducted here has focused on the status of both the *procuratores metallorum* at Vipasca (in Lusitania) and of the freedman procurators who appear in the mining district in north-western Spain defined as "*Asturia et Callaecia*" in inscriptions (the *conventus Lucensis* and the *conventus Asturum*).⁹¹ Le Roux tentatively suggested that it was appropriate to regard the freedman procurators from these places (some of them carry the title *proc. metallorum*, some are only called *procurator*) as *proc. provinciae*.⁹² However, there are good reasons why in a province in which the financial/patrimonial administration was led by a pair of procurators as unequal colleagues there were subordinated imperial freedman procurators supervising activities such as mining.⁹³

The career inscription of the imperial freedman Saturninus from the late second century, which sparked the debate, illustrates the problem. In his career, the post ἐπίτροπος Ἀστυρίας καὶ Καλληκίας was followed by that of ἐπίτροπος μεταλλῶν Οὐλπα[σ]κησιῶν (*SEG XL 1133*).⁹⁴ If the first post, as some scholars suggest, was that of the freedman procurator assisting the high-ranking equestrian regional *proc. Asturiae et Callaeciae* (a region in which mining was important),⁹⁵ then the fact that the next post is *not* called *proc. Lusitaniae* (the province to which Vipasca belonged) should mean that at least at Vipasca his task concerned only mining providing that we are not dealing with inconsistencies in terminology. The procurator at Vipasca may, in any case, still have regarded himself as the *adiutor* of the provincial finance procurator.

⁹⁰ See above, Section VI; and, for procurators supervising Numidian marble quarries, Khanoussi 1998; for unspecified procurators at the Dokimeion quarry in Asia Minor, see recently Christol and Drew-Bear 1991. However, they have suggested (1991: 123) that these officials were *procuratores prov. Phrygiae*, while Fant (1989: 9) considered the duties of these procurators to have been restricted to the quarries.

⁹¹ For the latter location, see *ILS* 9125–29, 9131; *AE* 1967, 230, discussed in Le Roux 1982: 241–245.

⁹² Le Roux (1985: 231) considered the freedman *proc. Asturiae et Callaeciae* to be the assistant procurator of the province Hispania Citerior. "*Asturia et Callaecia*" was a district of Hispania Citerior, not a province, until the foundation, under Caracalla, of the new province of Hispania Superior, to which Callaecia was to belong: see Alföldy 2000: 17–34, esp. 25.

⁹³ Christol and Demougine 1990: 184–192; Domergue 1990: 292–294.

⁹⁴ The Greek Οὐλπα[σ]κησιῶν is considered to be a mistake for *Vipascensium*: see Christol and Demougine 1990: 170; Domergue 1990: 297.

⁹⁵ Thus, recently Alföldy 2000: 46–47; see Pflaum 1960–61: 3.1047 for some ducenarian *proc. Asturiae et Callaeciae* (not all the procurators listed are known by that title).

VIII. EPILOGUE

Returning once more to the chronology of our inscription and the context in which it was erected, it may be fitting to conclude by offering a final thought concerning the circumstances in which Baebius Modestus obtained his new position. The eleven months following the death of Septimius Severus on 4 February A.D. 211 was a period of intense political manoeuvring as Caracalla vied with his younger brother.⁹⁶ This cannot have been unknown to the members of the imperial administration. What sorts of thoughts would Baebius Modestus have had as he left for Rome to take up a seat on the *consilium* of the two Augusti? Of course, the fact that we do not hear more about Baebius Modestus (but cf. above, note 22) may be due to the vagaries of the epigraphic record. It does not have to mean that his fortune was affected by the downfall of Geta. However, some other members of the *consilium* did suffer.⁹⁷

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
TORONTO, ONTARIO
M5S 2E8

christer.bruun@utoronto.ca

APPENDIX: *AMICUS* OR ΦΙΛΟΣ OF THE EMPEROR(S) IN INSCRIPTIONS AND TEXTS
OF OFFICIAL CHARACTER (UNTIL DIOCLETIAN)⁹⁸

C = number in the list of *amici* by Crook 1955⁹⁹

1. (= C 6). Aelius Antipater, *ab epistulis Graecis*, ca A.D. 203, addressed by the co-emperor Caracalla—*I.Ephesos* 2026, line 17: ὁ φίλος μου καὶ διδάσκαλος¹⁰⁰
2. (= C 7). Aelius Coeranus, *a libellis*, circumstances as for no. 1—*I.Ephesos* 2026, line 19–20: [ὁ φίλος μου]¹⁰¹
3. L. Aelius Helvius Dionysius, *consularis*, A.D. 298—*Fragm. Vat.* 41 = *FIRA* II² p. 473: *vir clarissimus amicus noster*

⁹⁶ See Alföldy 1988: 183–193.

⁹⁷ As pointed out by Gaudemet (1982: 60), Aelius Antipater (*PIR*² A 137), *adlectus inter consulares* and *amicus* of Caracalla, was forced to commit suicide for criticizing the murder of Geta. SHA *Carac.* 3.4 mentions one “Laetus” who encouraged the murder but afterwards suffered the same fate; cf. Crook 1955: 173, no. 220. In general on the manhunt for Geta’s friends, see Letta 1991: 675; Cass. Dio 77.4–5.

⁹⁸ There are very few cases after the Severan dynasty, one being L. Aelius Helvius Dionysius, *vir clarissimus amicus noster* in A.D. 298. The epithet is used anonymously in *Fragm. Vat.* 271 = *FIRA* II² p. 522: *praeses provinciae amicus noster* (A.D. 286).

⁹⁹ Cf. Bang 1922, presenting a list of people for whom the epithets *amicus* or *comes* were used, but including also the literary references.

¹⁰⁰ See also Oliver 1989: no. 244, with commentary on p. 471–474. Oliver prints “φίλος μου,” *I.Ephesos* only “φίλος.” Oliver dates the inscription to A.D. 201, *I.Ephesos* dates it to ca 203 and certainly before 205.

¹⁰¹ I follow the integration in Oliver 1989: 470, no. 244 and leave out κράτιστος from the title.

4. Aemilius Iuncus, special senatorial envoy, Hadrian—*AE* 1986, 635b = *SEG* XXXII 462: τῷ κρατίστῳ φίλῳ μου
5. (= C 184). C. Antius A. Iulius Quadratus, *procos. Asiae*, Trajan—*CIL* III 7086 = *IGR* IV 336, line 19: [a]mico clarissimo
6. (= C 24). M. Antonius Iuvenis, senator, circumstances as for no. 1—I.*Ephesos* 2026, lines 16–17: οἱ κράτιστοι φίλοι μου (the name of another *amicus* has been deleted)¹⁰²
7. (= C 38). C. Asinius Gallus, *procos. Asiae*, Augustus—*IG* XII.3 174 = *Syll.*³ 780 = *IGR* IV 1031: τῷ ἐμῷ φίλῳ
8. (= C 52). Aurelius Larichus, *ab epistulis Graecis*, Commodus—*Hesperia* Suppl. 8 (1949) 288: ὁ φίλος μου¹⁰³
9. Q. Baebius Modestus, *proc. Aug. praef. Sardiniae*, Caracalla and Geta—*L'Africa romana* 12.3 (1998) 1244: *allecti inter amicos consiliarios*
10. Ti. Claudius Herodes Atticus, senator and Athenian millionaire, Hadrian—*SIG*³ 863, n. 1: *q(uaestorem) imp(eratoris) Caesaris Hadriani Aug(usti) inter amicos*¹⁰⁴
11. L. Cornelius Gallicanus, *procos. Baeticae*, Titus—*AE* 1962, 288: *amico meo*
12. (= C 128). Crepereius, procurator, II/III cent.—*IGR* III 777: φίλον καὶ ἐπίτροπον γενόμενον τῶν Σεβαστῶν
13. (= C 136). Domitius Ulpianus, jurist and *praef. ann.*, Severus Alexander—*Cod. Iust.* 8.37.4: *praefecti annonae . . . amici mei*
14. (= C 141). L. Fabius Cilo . . . , *praef. Urbi*, Severus and Caracalla—*Dig.* 1.15.4: *praefectus urbi amicus noster*
15. (= C 144). Paullus Fabius Persicus, *consularis*, Claudius—*CIL* XIII 1668 = *ILS* 212, lines 24–25: *nobilissimum virum amicum meum*
16. Flavius Latronianus, *praef. Urbi*, Gordian III—*AE* 1969/70, 599 = Reynolds 1982: 136, no. 22, line 9: τῷ φίλῳ μου¹⁰⁵
17. (= C 161). L. Gellius Maximus, physician, Caracalla—*AE* 1927, 171: φίλον καὶ ἀρχίατρον τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμ[ῶν] Μ. Αὐρηλίου Ἀντωνείνου Σεβ.]
18. Iulius Balbus, *procos. Asiae*, Trajan—Reynolds 1982: 113, no. 14, line 6 = *I.Smyrna* 593: τῷ φίλῳ μου καὶ ἀνθυπάτῳ
- (?)19. (= C 173). Julius Candidus, high-ranking equestrian financial official, Commodus—*Hesperia* Suppl. 8 (1949) 288: [ὁ φίλος μου]
20. (= C 181). Julius Planta, senator (?),¹⁰⁶ Claudius—*CIL* V 5050 = *ILS* 206: *amicum et comitem meum*

¹⁰² See Oliver 1989: 473, suggesting Sept(imius) Aper for the missing name.

¹⁰³ See also Oliver 1989: 421–425, no. 209.

¹⁰⁴ For this inscription, presented more recently by Ameling 1983: 2.105, no. 76, see the recent discussion by Birley 1997b: 236. The exact meaning of the expression *quaestor inter amicos* remains uncertain; the choice of words resembles an *allectio inter* (. . .).

¹⁰⁵ See also Oliver 1989: 549–551, no. 282.

¹⁰⁶ The most recent discussion (Reali 1997: 93) brings no clarification to the question about Planta's rank.

21. (= C 187). Cn. Iulius Verus, *leg. Aug. pro pr. prov. Syriae*, Marcus and L. Verus—*CIL* III 199 = *ILS* 5864: *per Iul. Verum leg. pr. pr. provinc. Syr. et amicum suum*
22. (= C 18). L. Iunius Annaeus Gallio, *procos. Achaiae*, Claudius—*Syll.*³ 801D: ὁ φίλος] μου
23. (= C 196). Q. Iunius Rusticus, *praef. Urbi*, Marcus and L. Verus—*Dig.* 49.1.1.3: *ad Iunium Rusticum amicum nostrum*
24. (= C 208). M. Cn. Licinius Rufinus, jurist and eventually *consularis*, Severus Alexander (?)—(1) *IGR* IV 1215–16: τὸν λαμπρότατον ὑπατικόν, φίλον τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ; (2) *Tyche* 12 (1997) 111: ἐπιλεχθέντα φίλον τοῦ Σεβ.
25. T. Messius Extricatus (?),¹⁰⁷ *praef. ann.*, *PPO*, and eventually consul, probably Caracalla—*CIL* VI 41190–91 (now replacing *CIL* VI 3839a–b = VI 31776a–b = *ILS* 1329; cf. *AE* 1979, 95): *comiti amico [fdis]simo*¹⁰⁸
26. (= C 233). Q. Naevius Cordus Sutorius Macro, *praef. Aeg.*, *PPO*, Claudius¹⁰⁹—(1) *BGU* 511 col. II, line 18: μου δύο φίλ[ου]ς . . . name missing; (2) *P. Lond.* 2785 col. I line 13: [μου δύο φίλ]λου]ς (cf. no. 33)
27. (= C 292). L. Octavius Cornelius P. Salvius Julianus Aemilianus, jurist and senator, Marcus and L. Verus—*Dig.* 37.14.17 pr.: *Salvi Iuliani amici nostri clarissimi viri* (cf. no. 35)
28. (= C 242). Otacilius Sagitta, *proc. prov. Corsicae*, Vespasian—*CIL* X 8038 = *FIRA* I² 72: *amicum et procuratorem meum*
29. (= C 243). C. Ovinius Tertullus, senatorial envoy, Severus and Caracalla—(1) *CIL* III 781 = *ILS* 423, lines 27–28: *legatus et amicus noster*; (2) *IGBulg* 659, lines 36–37: ὁ κράτιστος φίλος ἡμῶν καὶ πρεσβευτῆς
30. (= C 271). C. Pompeius Planta, *praef. Aeg.*, Trajan—(1) *Plin. Ep.* 10.7: *amicum meum*; cf. *Ep.* 10.10.2: *amicum tuum*; (2) *POxy.* 3022, lines 10–11:¹¹⁰ τῷ φίλῳ μου καὶ ἐπάρχῳ
31. (= C 301). C. Sentius Severus Quadratus, *consularis*, II/III cent.¹¹¹—*CIL* V 5811: *amico et comit. Aug. n.*
32. (= C 41). Statilius Maximus, *procos. Asiae*, A.D. 158, Marcus Aurelius as *Caesar*—*Syll.*³ 851 = *IGR* IV 1399 = *I.Smyrna* 600: ὁ κράτιστος ἀνθύπατος καὶ φίλος ἡμῶν

¹⁰⁷The name as preserved in the inscriptions is very fragmentary, but scholars generally agree that the texts refer to Messius Extricatus; see the comment by G. Alföldy in *CIL* VI, p. 4978 (*ad* 41190–91). A different identification was proposed by Salway 1997.

¹⁰⁸This epithet can be construed by combining what has been recorded with certainty in these two fragmentary inscriptions.

¹⁰⁹The texts referred to here are conveniently printed in Musurillo 1954: nos. 19 and 21. Naevius Cordus was executed before Claudius became emperor in A.D. 41 (See *PIR*² N 42). Because Claudius cannot be regarded as emperor-designate before the death of Gaius, Naevius' friendship with Claudius never really amounted to being among the *amici Caesaris*. But Claudius' use of φίλος for Naevius could be called posthumous *amicitia*, and the fact that the emperor deemed him worthy of it is still significant.

¹¹⁰See also Oliver 1989: 136–139, no. 46.

¹¹¹Real (1997: 99) seems to prefer a date in the third century.

33. (= C 321). Theon, ἐξηγητής in Alexandria, Claudius¹¹²—(1) *BGU* 511 col. II, lines 18–19: μου δύο φίλ[ουζ] ; (2) *P. Lond.* 2785 col. I, line 13: [μου δύο φί]λουζ (cf. no. 26)
34. Ulpian Marc[ellus?], *procos. Asiae*, Commodus—Reynolds 1982: 119, no. 16, line 13:¹¹³ τῷ φίλῳ μου
35. (= C 358). L. Volusius Maecianus, jurist and *praef. Aeg.*, Marcus and L. Verus—*Dig.* 37.14.17 pr.: *amicus noster* (cf. no. 27)

Uncertain Cases

- a. anonymous, Claudius—*CIL* V 7165: [*ex coh*]ort. *amicorum* [-]. This inscription is quite fragmentary, but it does mention the award by Claudius of military decorations to someone, who seems to have been an *amicus* of the emperor.¹¹⁴
- b. anonymous—*AE* 1968, 541: *amicus* (?) *Imp.* [[-]]. The text is too fragmentary for any meaningful conclusion.
- c. (= C 39). M. Appian (Atilian) Bradua, *consularis*, Hadrian—*ILS* 8824a: [φίλον καὶ συναπόδεμον] θεοῦ Ἀδριανοῦ. This restoration of the text is possible but cannot be proven.¹¹⁵
- d. (= C 89). Ti. Claudius Archibius (*PIR*² C 787), probably an influential Alexandrian,¹¹⁶ Claudius—*P. Lond.* 1912 col. V, line 108: τῷ ἐμῷ ἐτέ[ρῳ].¹¹⁷ The term used in this letter from Claudius to the Alexandrians is not φίλος; the choice of term might be relevant. There is of course no doubt that Claudius wished to express publicly his appreciation of Archibius.¹¹⁸
- e. (= C 91). Ti. Claudius Barbillus/Balbillus (*PIR*² C 812–813), influential in Alexandria, perhaps an *eques Romanus*,¹¹⁹ Claudius—(1) *P. Lond.* 1912 col. II, line 36: ὁ ἐμοὶ τιμ[ι]ώτατος Βάρβιλλος; (2) *P. Lond.* 1912 col. V, line 105: τῷ ἐμῷ ἐτέρῳ;¹²⁰ The situation concerning the terminology employed is identical to (d).

¹¹²For the texts, see conveniently Musurillo 1954: nos. 19 and 21. As with no. 26 (Naevius Cordus), this friend of Claudius was already dead when the emperor listened to envoys from Alexandria, probably in A.D. 53. This date is advocated by, e.g., Musurillo 1954: 118–124; Levick 1990: 184–185. On Theon, see Musurillo 1954: 103.

¹¹³See also Oliver 1989: 426–428, no. 211.

¹¹⁴No further clarification in Reali 1997: 118.

¹¹⁵In fact, Dessau in *ILS* gives a different reading. Crook (1955: 152) gives the above restoration, referring to E. Groag.

¹¹⁶See the comment in Bell 1924: 31. Oliver (1989: 84) considers him a member of the Alexandrian embassy to Claudius.

¹¹⁷The text is published in Bell 1924: 26; Oliver 1989: 80, no. 19.

¹¹⁸Halfmann (1986: 252) regards ἐταῖρος as equivalent to belonging to the *cohors amicorum*.

¹¹⁹On this person, see Musurillo (1954: 130–131), who considers him a Roman knight and later *praef. Aeg.* Pflaum (1960–61: 1.34–41, no. 15) prefers to view the ambassador as the father of the *praef. Aegypti*, as does Oliver (1989: 85), while acknowledging that no certainty on this is possible.

¹²⁰For the texts, see Bell 1924: 24–25; Oliver 1989: 79–80, no. 19.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alföldy, G. 1988. "Der Sturz des Kaisers Geta und die antike Geschichtsschreibung," in *idem*, *Die Krise des römischen Reiches. Geschichte, Geschichtsschreibung und Geschichtsbetrachtung. Ausgewählte Beiträge*. Stuttgart. 179–216 (orig. publ. *Bonner Historia-Augusta-Colloquium 1970* [Bonn 1972] 19–51).
- 2000. *Provincia Hispania superior*. Schriften der philosophisch-historischen Klasse der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften 19. Heidelberg.
- Amarelli, F. 1983. *Consilia principum*. Naples.
- Ameling, W. 1983. *Herodes Atticus*. 2 vols. Hildesheim, Zurich, and New York.
- Bang, M. 1922. "Die Freunde und Begleiter der Kaiser," in L. Friedländer, *Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms* IV^{9–10}. Leipzig. 56–76.
- Barbieri, G. 1952. *L'albo senatorio da Settimio Severo a Carino (193–285)*. Rome.
- Bell, H. I. 1924. *Jews and Christians in Egypt. The Jewish Troubles in Alexandria and the Athanasian Controversy*. London.
- Benseddik, N. 1992. "Usinaza (Saneg): Un nouveau témoignage de l'activité de P. Aelius Peregrinus sur la praetentura sévérienne," *L'Africa romana* 9: 425–437.
- Bingen, J. et al. 1997. *Mons Claudianus ostraca graeca et latina* 2: O. Claud. 191 à 416. Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, Documents de Fouilles 32. Cairo.
- Birley, A. R. 1981. *The "Fasti" of Roman Britain*. Oxford.
- 1997a. *Hadrian: The Restless Emperor*. London.
- 1997b. "Hadrian and Greek Senators," *ZPE* 116: 209–245.
- 1999. *Septimius Severus: The African Emperor*. Rev. ed. New York.
- Bonello Lai, M. 1986–87. "Pani di piombo rinvenuti in Sardegna," *Studi Sardi* 27: 7–39.
- Boulvert, G. 1970. *Esclaves et affranchis sous le Haut-Empire romain. Rôle politique et administratif*. Naples.
- Brunt, P. A. 1983. "Princeps and Equites," *JRS* 73: 42–75.
- 1988. "The Emperor's Choice of *amici*," in P. Kneissl and V. Losemann (eds.), *Alte Geschichte und Wissenschaftsgeschichte. Festschrift Karl Christ (65)*. Darmstadt. 39–56.
- 1990. *Roman Imperial Themes*. Oxford.
- Bruun, C. 1999. "Imperial *procuratores* and *dispensatores*: New Evidence," *Chiron* 29: 29–42.
- Burton, G. P. 1993. "Provincial Procurators and the Public Provinces," *Chiron* 23: 13–28.
- Christol, M. and S. Demougin. 1990. "De Lugo à Pergame: la carrière de l'affranchi Saturninus dans l'administration impériale," *MEFRA* 102: 159–211.
- Christol, M. and T. Drew-Bear. 1991. "Les carrières de Dokimeion à l'époque sévérienne," *Epigraphica* 53: 113–174.
- Christol, M. and A. Magioncalda. 1989. *Studi sui procuratori delle due Mauretanie*. Sassari.
- Corbier, M. 1983. "Fiscus and Patrimonium: The Saepinum Inscription and Transhumance in the Abruzzi," *JRS* 73: 126–131.
- Crawford, D. J. 1976. "Imperial Estates," in M. I. Finley (ed.), *Studies in Roman Property*. Cambridge. 35–70, 173–180.
- Crook, J. A. 1955. *Consilium principis: Imperial Councils and Counsellors from Augustus to Diocletian*. Cambridge.
- Davies, O. 1935. *Roman Mines in Europe*. Oxford.
- De Ruggiero, E. 1895. "Allectio," *Diz. Epigr.* 1.411–422.

- Devijver, H. 1976. *Prosopographia militiarum equestrium quae fuerunt ab Augusto ad Gallienum* 1. Leuven.
- 1987. *Prosopographia militiarum equestrium quae fuerunt ab Augusto ad Gallienum* 4 (Supplementum I). Leuven.
- Dietz, K. 1980. *Senatus contra principem: Untersuchungen zur senatorischen Opposition gegen Kaiser Maximinus Thrax*. Munich.
- Domergue, C. 1990. *Les mines de la péninsule ibérique dans l'antiquité romaine*. CEFR 127. Rome.
- Dušanić, S. 1977. "Aspects of Roman Mining in Noricum, Pannonia, Dalmatia and Moesia Superior," *ANRW* II.6: 52–94.
- Eck, W. 1974. "Beförderungskriterien der senatorischen Laufbahn dargestellt an der Zeit von 69 bis 138 n. Chr.," *ANRW* II.1: 158–228.
- 1990. Review of Amarelli 1983. *ZSRG* 107: 491–493.
- 1995. "Die Leitung und Verwaltung einer prokuratorischen Provinz," in *idem*, *Die Verwaltung des römischen Reiches in der Hohen Kaiserzeit. Ausgewählte und erweiterte Beiträge* 1. Basel. 333–340 (orig. publ., 1988).
- 1996. "Criteri di avanzamento nella carriera senatoria (69–138 d.C.)," in *idem*, *Tra epigrafia prosopografia e archeologia. Scritti scelti, rielaborati ed aggiornati*. Rome. 29–93. (Translated and revised version of Eck 1974.)
- 1998a. *Die Verwaltung des römischen Reiches in der Hohen Kaiserzeit. Ausgewählte und erweiterte Beiträge* 2. Basel and Berlin.
- 1998b. "Der Kaiser und seine Ratgeber," in Eck 1998a: 3–29.
- 1998c. "Kaiser, Senat und senatorische Amtsträger," in Eck 1998a: 31–66.
- 1998d. "Die nichtsenatorische Administration: Ausbau und Differenzierung," in Eck 1998a: 67–106.
- 1998e. "Ein Prokuratorenpaar von Syria Palaestina in P. Berol. 21652," *ZPE* 123: 249–255.
- 2000a. "The Emperor and His Advisers," in *CAH*² 11: 195–213.
- 2000b. "Emperor, Senate and Magistrate," *CAH*² 11: 214–237.
- 2000c. "The Growth of Administrative Posts," *CAH*² 11: 238–265.
- Edmondson, J. C. 1987. *Two Industries in Roman Lusitania: Mining and Garum Production*. B.A.R. Int. Series 362. Oxford.
- Fant, J. C. 1989. "Cavum Antrum Phrygiae." *The Organization and Operations of the Roman Imperial Marble Quarries in Phrygia*. B.A.R. Int. Series 482. Oxford.
- Flach, D. 1979. "Die Bergwerksordnung von Vipasca," *Chiron* 9: 399–448.
- 1990. *Römische Agrargeschichte*. Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 3.9. Munich.
- Gasparini, L. 1992. "Ricerche epigrafiche in Sardegna (II)," *L'Africa romana* 9.2: 571–593.
- Gaudemet, J. 1982. "Note sur les *amici principis*," in G. Wirth et al. (eds.), *Romanitas-Christianitas: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Literatur des römischen Kaiserzeit*. Berlin and New York. 42–60.
- Giacobelli, M. 1991. "Su alcuni lingotti di piombo," *BollArch* 9: 125–127, 136.
- Habicht, C. 1969. *Die Inschriften des Asklepeions*. Altertümer von Pergamon 8.2. Berlin.
- Haensch, R. 1997. "Capita provinciarum." *Statthaltersitze und Provinzialverwaltung in der römischen Kaiserzeit*. Mainz am Rhein.
- Halfmann, H. 1986. *Itinera principum. Geschichte und Typologie der Kaiserreisen im römischen Reich*. HABES 2. Stuttgart.

- Herrmann, P. 1988. "Chresimus, *procurator lapidinarum*. Zur Verwaltung der kaiserlichen Steinbrüche in der Provinz Asia," *Tyche* 3: 119–128.
- 1997. "Die Karriere eines prominenten Juristen aus Thyateira," *Tyche* 12: 111–123.
- Hirschfeld, O. 1905. *Die kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten bis auf Diokletian*². Berlin.
- Kehoe, D. P. 1988. *The Economics of Agriculture of Roman Imperial Estates in North Africa*. Hypomnemata 89. Göttingen.
- Khanoussi, M. 1998. "Les *officiales marmorum Numidicorum*," *L'Africa romana* 12.2: 997–1016.
- Kienast, D. 1996. *Römische Kaisertabelle. Grundzüge einer römischen Kaiserchronologie*². Darmstadt.
- Lazzarini, S. 2001. *Lex Metallis Dicta: Studi sulla seconda tavola di Vipasca*. Rome.
- Le Bohec, Y. 1992. "Notes sur les mines de Sardaigne à l'époque romaine," in *Sardinia antiqua: Studi in onore di P. Meloni (70)*. Cagliari. 255–264.
- Le Roux, P. 1982. *L'armée romaine et l'organisation des provinces ibériques d'Auguste à l'invasion de 409*. Paris.
- 1985. "Procurateur affranchi in Hispania: Saturninus et l'activité minière," *MDAI(M)* 26: 218–233.
- Letta, C. 1991. "La dinastia dei Severi," in A. Schiavone (ed.), *Storia di Roma* 2.2. Turin. 639–700.
- Levick, B. 1990. *Claudius*. London.
- Lewis, N. and M. Reinhold (eds.). 1966. *Roman Civilization Sourcebook 2: The Empire*². New York.
- Mastino, A. and P. Ruggeri. 1995. "Claudia Augusti liberta Acte, la liberta amata da Nerone ad Olbia," *Latomus* 54: 513–544.
- Meloni, P. 1958. *L'amministrazione della Sardegna da Augusto all'invasione vandalica*. Rome.
- Millar, F. 1984. "Condemnation to Hard Labour in the Roman Empire, from the Julio-Claudians to Constantine," *PBSR* 52: 124–147.
- 1992. *The Emperor in the Roman World (31 B.C.–A.D. 337)*. Ithaca (orig. publ., 1977).
- 1999. "The Greek East and Roman Law: The Dossier of M. Cn. Licinius Rufinus," *JRS* 89: 90–108.
- Mitchell, S. 1999. "The Administration of Roman Asia from 133 B.C. to A.D. 250," in W. Eck (ed.), *Lokale Autonomie und römische Ordnungsmacht in den kaiserzeitlichen Provinzen vom 1. bis 3. Jahrhundert*. Schriften des historischen Kollegs, Kolloquien 42. Munich. 17–46.
- Mrozek, S. 1977. "Die Goldbergwerke im römischen Dazien," *ANRW* II.6: 95–109.
- Musurillo, H. A. ed. and tr. 1954. *The Acts of the Pagan Martyrs: "Acta Alexandrinorum"*. Oxford.
- Nadel, B. 1952. "A Note about σεβαστόγυνστος," *Eos* 52: 295–298.
- Noeske, H.-C. 1977. "Studien zur Verwaltung und Bevölkerung der dakischen Goldbergwerke in römischer Zeit," *BJ* 177: 271–416.
- Ørsted, P. 2000. "Roman State Intervention? The Case of Mining in the Roman Empire," in E. Lo Cascio and D. Rathbone (eds.), *Production and Public Powers in Classical Antiquity*. Cambridge. 70–76.
- Oliver, J. H. 1989. *Greek Constitutions of Early Roman Emperors from Inscriptions and Papyri*. Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society 178. Philadelphia.

- Pflaum, H.-G. 1960–61. *Les carrières procuratoriennes équestres sous le Haut-Empire romain*. 3 vols. Paris.
- 1974. *Abrégé des procurateurs équestres*. Paris.
- 1981. *Gaulle et l'Empire romain. Scripta Varia* 2. Paris.
- 1982. *Les carrières procuratoriennes équestres sous le Haut-Empire romain. Supplément*. Paris.
- Potter, D. S. 1998. "Procurators in Asia and Dacia under Marcus Aurelius: A Case Study of Imperial Initiative in Government," *ZPE* 123: 270–274.
- Reali, M. 1997. *Il contributo dell'epigrafia latina allo studio dell' "amicitia": Il caso della Cisalpina*. Firenze.
- Reynolds, J. 1982. *Aphrodisias and Rome. JRS Monographs* 1. London.
- Salvi, D. 1992. "Le *massae plumbae* di Mal di Ventre," *L'Africa romana* 9.2: 661–672.
- Salway, B. 1997. "A Fragment of Severan History: The Unusual Career of . . .atus, Praetorian Prefect of Elagabalus," *Chiron* 27: 127–153.
- Serra, P. B. and G. Bacco. 1998. "Forum Traiani: Il contesto termale e l'indagine archeologico dello scavo," *L'Africa romana* 12.3: 1213–55.
- Sotgiu, G. 1957. "La Sardegna e il patrimonio imperiale nell'alto impero," *Epigraphica* 19: 25–48.
- 1991. "Ricerche epigrafiche a Fordongianus (Cagliari)," in *Epigrafia (Actes du Colloque international d'épigraphie latine en mémoire de Attilio Degrassi pour la centenaire de sa naissance, Rome 1988)*. CEFR 143. Rome. 725–731.
- Syme, R. 1971. "Some Friends of the Caesars," in *Roman Papers* 1. Oxford. 292–299 (orig. publ. *AJP* 77 [1956] 264–273).
- Thomasson, B. E. 1984. *Laterculi praesidum* 1. Gothenburg.
- 1999. "Laterculi praesidum addendorum series tertia," *OpRom* 24: 163–174.
- Vaglieri, D. 1895. "Adiutor," *Diz. Epigr.* 1.79–86.
- Weaver, P. R. C. 1972. *Familia Caesaris: A Social Study of the Emperor's Freedmen and Slaves*. Cambridge.