

ROBERT L. DISE, JR.

TRAJAN, THE ANTONINES, AND THE GOVERNOR'S STAFF

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 116 (1997) 273–283

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

TRAJAN, THE ANTONINES, AND THE GOVERNOR'S STAFF¹

Since the late nineteenth century, scholars have succeeded in mapping the general outlines of the elaborately structured third-century Roman governor's staff, the *officium consularis*. Recent work has even begun to clarify its complex workings.² But the third-century *officium* did not appear *ex nihilo*. It resulted from a long evolutionary process, the beginnings of which lie far back in the early decades of the Principate. While a great deal is known about the mature *officium*, very little is known about its evolution, for although hundreds of inscriptions document the inner workings of the *officium* in the third century as well as the personnel assigned to it, very little information survives illuminating the earlier stages of its development. A possible reference in Tacitus' *Histories* (*Hist.* iv.48) a handful of passages

¹ In this article the following abbreviations will be used:

- Alföldy, *Noricum* G. Alföldy, *Noricum* (London 1974).
 CBFIR E. Schallmayer, et al., *Der römische Weihebezirk von Osterburken I*, Corpus der griechischen und lateinischen Beneficiarii-Inschriften des Römischen Reiches (Stuttgart 1990).
 Mirković M. Mirković, "Beneficiarii Consularis and the New Outpost in Sirmium", *Roman Frontier Studies* 1989 (Exeter 1991) 252-256.
 Ott J. Ott, *Der Beneficiarius* (Stuttgart 1995).
 RO² A. von Domaszewski and D.J. Breeze, *Die Rangordnung des römischen Heeres* (Köln² 1967).
 Schallmayer, *RFS* 1989 E. Schallmayer, "Zur Herkunft und Funktion der Beneficiarii", *Roman Frontier Studies* 1989 (Exeter 1991), 400-406.
 Thomasson B.E. Thomasson, *Laterculi Praesidum* I (Göteborg 1984).
 Winkler G. Winkler, *Die Reichsbeamten von Noricum und ihr Personal* (Vienna 1969).

Additional bibliography:

- Alföldy, G., *Konsulat und Senatorenstand unter den Antoninen* (Bonn: 1977).
 Birley, E., "The Religion of the Roman Army 1895-1977", *ANRW* II.16.2 (1978) 1506-1541 (reprinted in E. Birley, *The Roman Army. Papers 1929-1986*, 397-432).
 Breeze, D.J., "The organisation of the career structure of the immunes and principales of the Roman army", *Bonner Jahrbücher* 174 (1974) 245-292.
 Chilver, G.E.F., and Townend, G.B., *A Historical Commentary on Tacitus' Histories IV and V* (Oxford 1985).
 Dise, R., "A Reassessment of the Functions of *Beneficiarii Consularis*", *The Ancient History Bulletin* 9 no. 2 (1995) 72-85.
 —, "The *Beneficiarii Procuratoris* of Celeia and the Early Development of the *Statio* Network", *ZPE* 95, 1996, 286-292.
 —, "The Recruitment and Deployment of *Beneficiarii Consularis* in the Danube Provinces", *The Ancient World* (forthcoming).
 von Domaszewski, A., "Die Religion des römischen Heeres", *Westdeutsche Zeitschrift* 14 (1895) 1-121.
 Jones, A. H. M., "The Roman Civil Service (Clerical and Sub-Clerical grades)", *JRS* 39 (1949) 38-55.
 Mann, J.C., *Legionary Recruitment and Veteran Settlement during the Principate* (London 1983).
 Mócsy, A., *Pannonia and Upper Moesia* (London 1974).
 Rankov, N.B., "A Contribution to the Military and Administrative History of Montana", *Ancient Bulgaria* (Nottingham 1983) 40-73.
 Speidel, M.P., "Centurions Promoted from *Beneficiarii*?", *ZPE* 91 (1992) 229-232.
 Syme, R., "The Ummidii", *Historia* 17 (1968) 72-105.

² The canonical treatment of the *officium* is found in RO2, 29-38. A. H. M. Jones included a discussion of the *officium* in "The Roman Civil Service (n. 1, Add. bibl.), 44-46. Joachim Ott devotes lengthy analysis to the *beneficiarii* who served the governors in Ott, 82-155. The literature on the *beneficiarii* is abundant and reaches back to the late 19th century, although the bulk of the analyses have focused on particular sites, texts, or on their role in the army rather than in imperial administration. Discussions of the *beneficiarii* have proliferated since the 1980s. There have also been some very exciting epigraphic finds during excavations of *beneficiarius* posts. Egon Schallmayer, Ott, and others excavated a *beneficiarius statio* at Osterburken in the *agri decumates* during the 1980s, containing thirty-one altars dedicated by *beneficiarii* who served there. He and his colleagues subsequently collected and published the texts of all *beneficiarius* inscriptions known up through the late 1980s in CBFIR. An even larger find was made at Sirmium (Srem Mitrovica) in 1988: the remains of a *statio* containing eighty-four *beneficiarius* altars, the largest single trove of *beneficiarius* texts ever found. Unfortunately, the find came too late to make it into Schallmayer's CBFIR and publication of the texts has been delayed by the Balkan wars. However, Mirković's article in *Roman Frontier Studies* 1989 (pp. 252-256) offers a very useful summary of the information they contain.

in Pliny the Younger's Bithynian correspondence with Trajan (*Ep.* x.21, 22, 27), and several dozen inscriptions comprise the sum total of extant material documenting the governor's staffs during the first century and the first seven decades of the second. But careful study of this meager *corpus* makes it possible to recover the broad features of the evolutionary process.

Two major stages in that process can be identified. The first came early in the second century, under Trajan, who began the practice of using members of the staff to man administrative posts in towns and along roads away from the governors' headquarters, thus giving them a formal operational role within the scheme of administration. The second began at mid-century, during the principate of Antoninus Pius, and lasted some fifteen to twenty years, coming to an end under Marcus Aurelius. This stage had two elements. First, it greatly enlarged on the work initiated by Trajan, expanding the infrastructure he created, and with it the presence of the staff in the interiors of the provinces. Second, it fundamentally altered relations between the members of the staff and the governors whom they served. The staff emerged from the Antonine stage in its evolution with an insitutional identity and a role in provincial administration that made its members a widespread presence in the life of the provinces, at least along the frontiers. It stood poised for the last phase in its evolution, which under the Severans produced the *officium consularis* so well known from the third-century evidence.

I. Early Beginnings

During the first century, arrangements for providing governors with staff assistance in performing their duties were informal. Since the Republic, governors had brought *amici* and members of their personal households with them when they went out to their provinces, and under the Principate these individuals undoubtedly continued to assist in various official activities, although they have left scant trace in the record. But because governors were military commanders, they also could draw on the troops under their command for assistance. Literary evidence demonstrates that at least since the civil wars at the end of the Republic senior officers had been detailing men from the ranks to serve them as attendants and orderlies (Caesar, *B.C.* i.75; iii.88). Because such soldiers were recipients of the personal favor, or *beneficium*, of release from routine duties to attend a senior officer, the generic term for them was *beneficiarii*. The first indication that *beneficiarii* were being used by governors may come as early as the principate of Gaius, when *legio III Augusta* was removed from the authority of the proconsul of Africa and placed under the command of an imperial legate. According to Tacitus, the proconsul and the legate divided the *numerus beneficiorum*, or number of patronage exemptions, equally between them.³

Inscriptions of gubernatorial *beneficiarii* begin to appear soon afterward, in the middle of the first century.⁴ They are extremely rare, though, down to the beginning of the second century. Only three can

³ *Hist.* iv.48. G.E.F. Chilver and G.B. Townend, *A Historical Commentary* (n. 1, Add. bibl.), 60, state correctly that *beneficium* was a term generally used for patronage, but go on to assert that this passage does not refer to the creation of *beneficiarii*. If so, it is curious that, of all the administrative adjustments that the removal of *III Augusta* from the proconsul's command and its placement under a legate must have entailed, this division of the "patronage" is the *only* one that Tacitus, writing eighty years later, deems worth mentioning. What could this "patronage" have been, involving *III Augusta* as it did, except the bestowal on men of the *beneficium* of detaching them from their routine military duties to attend the proconsul, or the legionary commander and his staff, thus making the recipients of this patronage *beneficiarii* in the very generic sense which the term carried before the late second century? And while it is true, as Chilver and Townend point out, drawing on D.J. Breeze's unpublished dissertation, that no *explicit* evidence exists of *III Augusta* providing *beneficiarii* to the proconsul, the altar *AE* 1961, 224 (*CBFIR* 743) was set up in AD 166/167 at Hippo Regius by two *b(ene)f(iciarii) anno Acili(i) Glabronis proco(n)sulis c(larissimi) v(iri)* who do not specify their parent military unit and, in the opinion of the most recent commentator on the text, may have been soldiers of *III Augusta* rather than of the *cohors I urbana* at Carthage (*CBFIR* p. 576). Ott is inclined to accept Chilver and Townend's analysis (84 n. 7), but the matter must be considered still open. It should be noted, further, that this inscription is the only epigraphic evidence for any *beneficiarii* of the proconsul.

⁴ *AE* 1967, 525 (*CBFIR* 700) β[ενεφικιαρίωι] Τιβερίου Κλαυδίου Φήλικος ἐπιτρόπου Σε[βατοῦ Ἰουδαίας], from Bir-el-Malik in modern Israel. The restoration of the name of the *procurator Augusti Iudaeae* as Ti. Claudius Felix is not entirely certain: *CBFIR* pp. 541-542 discusses the various individuals who might be represented here. If it was in fact Felix, then his procuratorship falls between 52 and 60.

be assigned with certainty to the years before AD 100;⁵ another two might fall within that period or, possibly, in the first half of the second century.⁶ All five are funerary monuments. One was clearly set up in a different province from the one in which the man served,⁷ but the duty stations of the rest of these men cannot be determined from the findspots of their texts. Since they are funerary monuments, marking either the graves of the men involved or of some loved one, those findspots need not correspond to the men's duty stations. Presumably these men served at their governors' headquarters. The patronage relationship that bestowal of the *beneficium* established between the governor and its recipient is reflected in the incorporation of the governor's personal name into the titles of four of the five *beneficiarii*.⁸ It is probable that a man's service as *beneficiarius* normally coincided with his patron's term as governor. Reappointment by the next governor was infrequent but not unknown: two examples exist, one from Numidia in the late first century and another from Noricum in the mid-second, of *beneficiarii* who name two consecutive governors under whom they served;⁹ no examples exist of men who served governors who were not consecutive. The paucity of inscriptions suggests that *beneficiarii* were few in number at this time, but the wide geographical distribution of the handful of texts shows that their use was not peculiar to any one region of the empire.

II. Trajan

It was under Trajan and most likely at his direction that gubernatorial *beneficiarii* first were given a distinct niche in the operational scheme of provincial administration. This occurred in conjunction with the establishment of an embryonic network of outposts, or *stationes*, scattered in various provinces, to which gubernatorial *beneficiarii* were assigned. That imperial directive led to the creation of these *stationes*, rather than the spontaneous initiative of individual provincial governors, is indicated by a series of circumstances surrounding their appearance: the *stationes* sprang up over a very short period of time, between *ca.* 110 and *ca.* 120; furthermore, they appeared in provinces scattered across the breadth of the empire, rather than concentrating in any one region; finally, all of them were manned in the same way, that is, by *beneficiarii* of the governors of the provinces concerned.

The evidence for the *beneficiarii* manning these Trajanic *stationes* differs markedly in kind from the evidence for the *beneficiarii* of the late first century. Instead of funerary texts, it consists of votive altars, erected by the *beneficiarii* while on active duty, at their places of assignment, expressing gratitude to various deities, but most often to Iuppiter Optimus Maximus.¹⁰ Furthermore, the early second-century altar evidence is far more plentiful than the funerary evidence, whether from the early second century or from the late first. Since the altars were expressions of thanks to the gods, set up by the men in fulfillment of vows, this abundance suggests that the men attached great importance to their assignments

⁵ AE 1967, 525 (CBFIR 700), AD 52-80; CIL 12.2602 (CBFIR 39), indicating service as a *beneficiarius* beginning in AD 79; CIL 8.27854 (CBFIR 751), indicating service as a *beneficiarius* AD 81-83.

⁶ IGR 3.677 (CBFIR 680), AD 70-130; AE 1991, 1473, perhaps under Nero, or perhaps second century, according to the editor of the text.

⁷ CIL 12.2602 (CBFIR 39). The man was buried at Genava in Gallia Narbonensis, but served in Gallia Lugdunensis.

⁸ IGR 3.677 (CBFIR 680), from Patara in Lycia et Pamphylia, uses the simple title βενεφικτάριος ἡγεμόνος.

⁹ The exceptions are Sex. Sulpicius Senilis, who was *beneficiarius* Tetti(i) Iuliani et Iavoleni Prisci leg(atorum) Aug(usti) AD 81-83, CIL 8.27854 (CBFIR 751), and Adnamius Flavinus, who was first *beneficiarius* Ulpi(i) Victoris proc(uratoris) Aug(usti) *ca.* 156 (CIL 3.5161 [CBFIR 220]), and then *beneficiarius* Useni(i) Secundi proc(uratoris) Aug(usti) *ca.* 158 (CIL 3.5162 [CBFIR 221]). Both inscriptions of Adnamius Flavinus are altars from the *statio* at Celeia in Noricum. For the dating of the two Numidian legates, see Thomasson, 395, nos. 11 and 12; for the praesidial procurators, see Alföldy, *Noricum*, Appendix V 246. Winkler, 55-56, places Ulpius Victor *ca.* 154-158 and Usenius Secundus *ca.* 158.

¹⁰ The literature on the religion of the Roman army is extensive, beginning with Domaszewski's "Die Religion" (n. 1, Add. bibl.). A critical discussion of Domaszewski and a bibliography on the subject through the mid-1970s can be found in E. Birley, "The Religion", (repr. in E. Birley, *The Roman Army* (n. 1, Add. bibl.).

to these *stationes*, an importance noticeably greater than that which they attached to service at the governor's headquarters, where altars of *beneficarii* are almost unknown.¹¹

The altars conclusively demonstrate Trajanic origins for at least two *stationes*. One was located at Sirmium, on the lower Sava River in southern Pannonia inferior. Miroslava Mirković, the excavator of this *statio*, which was discovered in 1988, reports that of the more than eighty *beneficarius* altars found at the site, four or five can be dated to the period prior to 150, and that the earliest of these are Trajanic (Mirković, 252). The other *statio* lay in southeasternmost Noricum, at Celeia. Twelve altars datable to before 150 were found at Celeia, documenting the service of eleven *beneficarii* of the praesidial procurators who governed Noricum prior to the Marcomannic wars. The earliest text from Celeia records a *beneficarius* of the procurator P. Prifernius Memmius Apollinaris, whose governorship falls around 110,¹² another *beneficarius* served Q. Caecilius Redditus, who governed the province *ca.* 115.¹³

Celeia was a Claudian *municipium* that lay on the route that led out of northern Italy through the Alps then east down the Sava and Drava valleys to the Danube. It was the first provincial town that traffic encountered along that route after leaving Italy. Sirmium lay close to the Danube at the route's eastern end; a Flavian colony whose origins went back to Augustus, it developed into the most important city in the Danube region. Both *stationes*, then, were located in well Romanized communities of some importance, at opposite ends of a major imperial communications artery. Their establishment must be seen both against this political, cultural, and geographical background as well as in the historical context of Trajan's conquest and subsequent organization of Dacia. The two *stationes* remained in operation for many years, reflecting the importance both of their locations and of the route which ran through them: Celeia functioned until *ca.* 160, then was replaced briefly by a *statio* at nearby Praetorium Latobiorum in Pannonia superior; it subsequently reopened *ca.* 190 and operated until 217.¹⁴ Sirmium functioned without significant interruption until the 230s.¹⁵

Aside from the *corpora* of early second-century altars at Celeia and Sirmium, individual altars have been found at sites elsewhere, including Virunum and Iuvavum in Noricum,¹⁶ near Sebastopolis in Cappadocia,¹⁷ and at Charax in the Regnum Bosporanum.¹⁸ These texts indicate that Celeia and Sirmium were not isolated foundations, and that *stationes* manned by gubernatorial *beneficarii* were established elsewhere as well.¹⁹ These isolated altars have been dated to the years either side of 120, which indicates either Trajanic origins for the posts where they were found or a continuation of the program of *statio* foundation early under Hadrian. In either case, the fact that no altars appear subsequently at these locations points to the conclusion that operations had ceased at them by about 130.

What that activity may have been is difficult to say, since the duties performed by *beneficarii* assigned to the *stationes* have defied precise definition.²⁰ Given their geographical situation, it is only

¹¹ Of sixteen *beneficarius* altars from the period down to 150, only one, *CIL* 3.14362 (*AE* 1968, 408; *CBFIR* 249), comes from a provincial capital, Virunum in Noricum. Of twenty-two altars from the period 150-170, not a single one comes from a provincial capital, or even from a legionary base.

¹² *CIL* 3.5179 (*CBFIR* 222). For Apollinaris' dates, see *Noricum*, App. V, 243 and Winkler 40-42.

¹³ *CIL* 3.5163 (*CBFIR* 238). For his dates, see *Noricum*, App. V, 243 and Winkler 42-43. Thomasson places him *ca.* 122 (83, no. 7).

¹⁴ For a discussion of the *statio* at Celeia down to 160, see R. Dise, "The *Beneficarii Procuratoris*" (n. 1, Add. bibl.).

¹⁵ According to Mirković, 252-253, the last dated altar was dedicated in 231.

¹⁶ Virunum: *CIL* 3.14362 (*AE* 1968, 408; *CBFIR* 249), *ca.* AD 120. Iuvavum: *CIL* 3.11759 (*CBFIR* 261), *ca.* AD 110-125.

¹⁷ *IGRR* 3.110 (*AE* 1968, 504; *AE* 1991, 1476; *CBFIR* 689), AD 126-128.

¹⁸ *CBFIR* 658, *ca.* AD 120; R. Syme, "The Ummidii" (n. 1, Add. bibl.).

¹⁹ Perhaps not at Virunum, which was the headquarters of the praesidial procurator, although Alföldy regards it as the site of a *statio*: *Noricum*, App. VIII, 252.

²⁰ The problem of beneficiarial function is very vexed, for several reasons. First, virtually none of the epigraphic evidence from the *stationes* bears directly on it; second, function very probably varied from region to region and province to

logical to associate Sirmium and Celeia in some way with overland and river traffic between Italy and the Danube, but this does not mean that traffic supervision was their sole responsibility, nor does it mean that *stationes* elsewhere had the same function. The fact that each *statio* was manned only by one *beneficiarius*²¹ necessarily imposed some limitations on their role. But the notion that the *beneficarii* who manned the *stationes* functioned as generalists, carrying out a variety of tasks, probably comes closest to the truth. Recent scholarship has emphasized the wide array of tasks performed by gubernatorial *beneficarii*, both at *stationes* and at the governors' headquarters, and has cast serious doubt on efforts to isolate some sole function for *beneficarii*.²²

Although Trajan devised a wider role for *beneficarii* by using them to man his *stationes*, he did nothing to alter the relationship between the *beneficarii* themselves and the governors they served. That relationship remained personal in nature, reflected as before in the incorporation of the governors' personal names into *beneficiarius* titulature. The status of the governor made no difference: the *beneficarii* who served the equestrian praesidial procurators of Noricum used exactly the same formula as the *beneficarii* who served senatorial legates elsewhere: *beneficiarius* + the name of the governor in the genitive + the governor's title. In fact, the only change that occurred in this formula during the first half of the second century came in the title of senatorial legates, who from Trajan on are called "consularis" in the titles of their *beneficarii*, rather than "legatus Augusti".²³ But this change had no discernible effect on the personal quality of the relationship involved in the *beneficium* of appointment to the governor's service.

Service as a *beneficiarius* appears at this time to have remained a temporary affair, and recruitment seems to have been *ad hoc*, with soldiers being detached from their units to attend governors or other officials whenever the need arose, the men presumably returning to their units at the governor's pleasure or at the end of his term. This suggestion receives support from several sources. First, as noted previously, service under more than one governor was extremely rare (see note 9). Second, there is very little evidence that in the late first or early second centuries service as a gubernatorial *beneficiarius* played any role in the legionary career ladder, whether leading to further staff duties or to higher posts within the army. The only known early example of a man whose career continued past his service as a gubernatorial *beneficiarius* was M. Carantius Macrinus, who was *beneficiarius* of T. Tettienius Serenus, governor of Gallia Lugdunensis, from AD 78 to 83, then *cornicularius* of Serenus' successor, C. Cornelius Gallicanus, from 83 to 87; after becoming an *evocatus* in 87, he ended his career in 90 with promotion to centurion in his parent unit, *cohors I urbana*, stationed at Lugdunum.²⁴ The only other early example of a *beneficiarius* whose service led to promotion is a man who was *beneficiarius* to a le-

province; third, in all likelihood function also varied considerably between time periods; finally, function may never have been narrowly defined in the first place. The literature on function is extensive, and goes back to the late nineteenth century. The most recent discussions are Schallmayer, *RFS* 1989, 400-406; Mirković, *RFS* 1989, 255-256; Ott, 113-155; and R. Dise, "A Reassessment" (n. 1, Add. bibl.).

²¹ This is clear from the fact that the vast majority of altars are dedicated by individual *beneficarii*. The handful of joint dedications are discussed by Ott, 111-113 and, at Sirmium, by Mirković, 253. With a single exception from Africa proconsularis, dated to 166/167 (*AE* 1961, 24 [*CBFIR* 743]), there are no joint dedications prior to 170.

²² In particular see Dise, "A Reassessment" (n. 1, Add. bibl.) and the detailed discussion in Ott, 113-155.

²³ *AE* 1992, 1402, the funeral memorial from Carnuntum of a soldier of *legio I adiutrix* who died in active service and was, or had been, a *b(eneficiarius) leg(ati) co(n)s(ularis)*, is dated to the the last half of the first century by the editors of the text, but this seems unlikely. Not only is the titulature anomalous for the first century, even the late first century, but the dead man was a native of Savaria, and *I adiutrix* does not seem to have recruited in Savaria or elsewhere in Pannonia superior until after Hadrian posted it to Brigetio following its return from Trajan's *anabasis* (J.C. Mann, *Legionary Recruitment* [n. 1, Add. bibl.] Tables 17.2 and 17.3., pp. 119-120; A. Mócsy, *Pannonia* [n. 1, Add. bibl.] 98-99).

²⁴ *CIL* 12.2602 (*CBFIR* 39). He died during Nerva's principate and was buried at Genava. As might be expected, given how carefully Macrinus chronicled his career on his funerary monument, the literature on this text is lengthy. For a summary, see Schallmayer's comments and discussion in *CBFIR*, pp. 44-45.

gionary legate, not a governor, under Trajan.²⁵ It would seem, then, that appointment as a gubernatorial *beneficiarius* was indeed regarded as a personal favor, truly a *beneficium*, rather than as a career move. Finally, there is an injunction from Trajan in Pliny's Bithynian correspondence. Backing Pliny's refusal to assign additional *beneficarii* to Gavius Bassus, the *praefectus orae Ponticae*, beyond the ten he had already directed Pliny to give him, Trajan says that "... as far as possible we should keep to the rule that soldiers must not be withdrawn from active service," (*Ep.* x.22, in B. Radice's translation) which makes the clearest sense if *beneficarii* in Bithynia were recruited directly from the ranks as needed rather than being drawn from some precursor of the third-century *schola beneficiariorum*.²⁶

Trajan's assignment of ten *beneficarii* to Bassus, and of another ten to the imperial procurator in Bithynia, Viridius Gemellinus (*Ep.* x.27), raises the question of the emperor's role in determining the number of *beneficarii* to be used in a province and how they were to be apportioned. It is on balance unlikely that emperors routinely attempted to micromanage provincial personnel matters. It must be remembered that circumstances in Bithynia at the time were unusual, Trajan having taken over the province from the Senate and dispatched Pliny to rectify its problems, which meant that Trajan had an unusually close interest in the administration of the province. Second, Viridius Gemellinus as procurator and Gavius Bassus as *praefectus orae Ponticae* both probably lay outside Pliny's direct authority as governor, being imperial, rather than gubernatorial, officials.²⁷ Trajan therefore would have determined how many *beneficarii* Gemellinus and Bassus should have, and would have directed Pliny, under whose authority the military units in the province lay, to detail men for their use. Nothing in the correspondence suggests that Trajan specified to Pliny as governor how many men he could detail as *beneficarii* for his own use, nor do any of the early second-century epigraphic sources hint at an imperial role in assigning quotas of *beneficarii* to governors elsewhere.

It is interesting that, despite the volume of altar evidence, the quantity of funerary evidence from the first half of the second century is comparable to that from the last half of the first. Only three funerary texts can be assigned to the period 100-150.²⁸ One comes from Sidon, recording a *beneficiarius* of C. Antius Vetus, who was governor of Syria at some point early under Trajan.²⁹ Another was set up at

²⁵ *CIL* 3.12411 (*CBFIR* 648). D. J. Breeze, "The organisation" (n. 1, Add. bibl.) 264. For an up-to-date discussion of *beneficiarius* career structure, see Ott, 39-59. Ott schematizes the information chronologically in his Appendix 1, 167-173. Unfortunately, since his concern is career structure, the schema he uses organizes the careers both by the type of unit from which the *beneficiarius* was drawn, such as praetorian cohort, urban cohort, *vigiles*, legions, etc., and, where no affiliation is known, by the staff on which the *beneficiarius* served, such as the *officium* of a procurator. He offers two other examples of a gubernatorial *beneficiarius* careers prior to 150, besides Macrinus. One is *CIL* 3.4319 (*CBFIR* 327), a man whom he labels an *ex b(ene)f(iciarius) co(n)s(ularis)* and whom he dates to the early second century. However, in *CBFIR* the restoration of the text reads *ex bf c[o(n)s(ularis)?]*. This doubt seems well placed. The title *beneficiarius consularis*, as will be seen later, did not come into use until after 150. The only basis for dating the man so early is the fact that his *praenomen* and *nomen* are T. Flavius. The other example is *CBFIR* 294, the gravestone of C. Aprilius Surus, *b(ene)f(iciarius) leg(ati)[leg(ionis)] XIII g(eminae)*. Ott identifies this man with the Surus who was *b(ene)f(iciarius) Memmi(i) Apoll(inarii) proc(uratoris) Aug(usti)* at Celeia ca.110 (*CIL* 3.5179 [*CBFIR* 222]). This identification is based on the fact that the one man's *gentilicium* is the same as the other's name. The commentator on the text in *CBFIR* makes no such identification (p. 245), in fact indicating the belief that the man was a native Norican; C. Aprilius Surus gives his *origo* as Milan. Alföldy was convinced that the Celeian Surus was a peregrine (*Noricum*, App. V.243).

²⁶ For epigraphic examples of these *scholae*, see *CIL* 3.876 (*CBFIR* 552), AD 200-201, from Potaissa in Dacia, and *CIL* 8.17628 (*CIL* 8.10717; *CBFIR* 755), early third century, from the *statio* at Vazaivi in Numidia.

²⁷ Bassus' office is not otherwise known, but the interaction between him and Pliny and Trajan does not suggest that he was Pliny's subordinate. It appears, for example, from *Ep.* x.21 that Pliny had never met Bassus before he came to demand additional *beneficarii* of Pliny. Furthermore, not only did Bassus appeal to Trajan when Pliny denied him those *beneficarii*, but Trajan replied directly to Bassus, with an only information copy to Pliny, rather than routing his reply through Pliny.

²⁸ This total rises to four or five if either *AE* 1991, 1473 or *IGRR* 3.677 (*CBFIR* 680) is placed in the early second rather than the late first century.

²⁹ *CIL* 3.151 (*CBFIR* 707). The reading of the inscription is uncertain in places, but identifies the governor as G. Ant(ius) Ve(tus); Thomasson gives his full name as C. Antius A. Iulius Quadratus. For his governorship, see Thomasson

Nemausus, for a *beneficiarius* of Iunius Homullus, who was governor of Hispania citerior around 133 (*CIL* 12.3168 [*CBFIR* 41]; Thomasson, 16, no. 25). Finally, a damaged text from Solva in eastern Noricum mentions a *beneficiarius* of Pontius Laelianus, probably M. Pontius Laelianus Larcius Sabinus, governor of Pannonia superior in the late 140s.³⁰ The fact that the quantity of funerary texts does not seem to rise in the first half of the second century emphasizes the importance of the *stationes*, and of the practice of dedicating altars at them, for our knowledge of the *beneficiarii*. It also suggests that the volume of altar evidence does not indicate a sharp increase in the actual number of *beneficiarii* in service. This is not surprising. Given that only one *beneficiarius* manned each *statio*, staffing the handful of *stationes* established by Trajan would have required only a comparable handful of *beneficiarii*. The dedication of altars is important, though, for what it reveals about the importance that the men themselves placed on their assignments to and service at the *stationes*. What made duty at the *stationes* something that the men bargained with the gods to achieve, in contrast to duty at the governor's headquarters? It may be that they sought the opportunity to serve alone, and unsupervised, at locations distant from meddling superiors, particularly locations, like Celeia or Sirmium, in Romanized towns. Or it may be that they valued the responsibility, or power, which such independent duty brought with it. It was, in any case, duty upon which the *beneficiarii* themselves placed a high premium from the very beginning.

III. The Antonines

Except perhaps at the beginning of his principate, Hadrian seems to have given little or no attention to the *stationes* created by Trajan, and, as noted, it appears that only Celeia and Sirmium remained in operation by about 130. Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius, however, more than compensated for any lack of activity on Hadrian's part. Much of what they did involved reviving and expanding the work begun by Trajan, but they also, and more importantly, went beyond his initiatives to address fundamental questions involving the relationship between the governors and their *beneficiarii* on the one hand and the relationship between imperial authority and gubernatorial authority in managing the details of administration on the other. It is not always clear where the line should be drawn between Antoninus Pius' actions and Marcus Aurelius', or even sometimes whether a line should be drawn at all. It is, however, apparent that the important changes that occurred within the staff during this period once again originated in imperial policy rather than in gubernatorial initiative, for not only did these changes occur over the entire empire in a very brief period of time, but they also would appear to have worked to the disadvantage of the governors, limiting their influence over the soldiers who served on their staffs.

Considered as a whole, the Antonine reform of the staff had two dimensions, which may be labelled "operational" and "organizational". The operational dimension centered on the revival and expansion of the *statio* network created by Trajan, and the resulting increase in the deployment of gubernatorial *beneficiarii* to locations around the interiors of the provinces. This is clearly reflected in the epigraphic record. As noted, evidence for *stationes* other than those at Celeia and Sirmium is absent for the period between about 125 and 150. During the 150s, however, there is a very sudden increase in both the number of altars and in the number of sites where they are found. Aside from Celeia and Sirmium, altars datable to the decade between 150 and 160 are known from six locations, in five provinces, including Germania inferior (Rigomagus: *CBFIR* 87),

Germania superior (Pontailleur-sur-Saône: *CIL* 13.5609 [*AE* 1961, 239; *CBFIR* 176], Pannonia superior (Praetorium Latobicorum: *AE* 1944, 134 [*CBFIR* 338]). Moesia inferior (Montana: *CIL* 3.7449

309, no. 40. *CBFIR* gives his *nomen* as Ant(istius) and seems to place his governorship somewhere 119 and 127, but this is surely too late, since he was *cos. suff.* in 94 and *cos. II* in 105.

³⁰ *CIL* 3.5517 (*CBFIR* 263; Thomasson, 104, no. 33). Alternatively, this could be a *beneficiarius* of his son, also named M. Pontius Laelianus, who was governor of Moesia inferior under Marcus Aurelius (Thomasson 137-138, no. 99). The text is heavily restored, reading *b(ene)f(iciario) Pont[i(i) Laeliani co(n)sularis]*, but plainly incorporates the governor's personal name. Since the governors' personal names dropped out of titulature between 155 and 170, either man is possible, but it is marginally more likely, since governors' names were in universal use in *beneficiarius* titulature during the 140s, that the Pontius Laelianus indicated here is the elder.

[*CBFIR* 643]; Histria: *AE* 1927, 59 [*CBFIR* 633]), and Cappadocia (Tyana: *IGRR* 3.130 [*CBFIR* 691]). Furthermore, during the 150s the altar evidence from Celeia also increased sharply, with no fewer than seven altars being dedicated;³¹ patterns at Sirmium are harder to establish, but dedications there also seem to have risen from 157 on (Mirković, 252). Evidence for the expansion of *beneficiarius* operational activity remains plentiful through the 160s. Despite the closing of Celeia in or shortly before 160,³² and the disruptions caused along the middle Danube by the outbreak of the Marcomannic wars, nine altars can be dated to the period 161-170, not counting any from Sirmium.³³ These altars come from seven sites in six provinces: Germania inferior (Nettersheim: *CIL* 13.11990 [*CBFIR* 77]), Germania superior,³⁴ Noricum (Meclara: *AE* 1977, 605 [*CBFIR* 267]), Pannonia inferior (Mursa: *AE* 1973, 448 [*CBFIR* 413]), Cappadocia (Dazimon: *AE* 1968, 505 [*CBFIR* 695]), and Africa proconsularis.³⁵ This surge in the number of *beneficiarius* altars between 150 and 170 marks the beginning of a veritable flood of altars that continues through the late second century and on down to the middle of the third.

As in the early part of the second century, some of these altars are isolated finds and therefore in all likelihood represent only brief activity by gubernatorial *beneficarii* at their findspots, but five of the *stationes* which opened in the years between 150 and 170 have site *corpora* which show that they became lasting elements of the administrative infrastructure. One was in the mining area of Montana in Moesia inferior.³⁶ The other four were located in the two Germanies. In Germania inferior, the *statio* at Nettersheim has dated altars that continue down to 227;³⁷ at Rigomagus the dated series extends to 242.³⁸ Both *stationes* in Germania superior were situated in the *agri decumates*: Stockstadt, where the first dated altar was set up in 166, was active at least until 208;³⁹ at Jagsthausen, the altar series extends from 167 to 186.⁴⁰

While altars become much more numerous in the 150s and 160s, funerary monuments remain scarce. Only two *beneficarii* who served during these years are commemorated on funerary texts, one of them a *beneficiarius* of the procurator Usenius Secundus, governor of Noricum *ca.* 158-160,⁴¹ the other a *beneficiarius* of M. Valerius Etruscus, governor of Moesia superior, probably during the mid-160s.⁴² The absence of any significant increase in the quantity of funerary evidence in the face of the dramatic increase in the number of altars adds weight to the suggestion that increases in altar evidence

³¹ *CIL* 3.5172 (*CBFIR* 224), 5164 (*CBFIR* 243), 5169 (*CBFIR* 234), 5161 (*CBFIR* 220), 5166 (*CBFIR* 242), 5162 (*CBFIR* 221), and 5171 (*CBFIR* 241).

³² The last altar of a *beneficiarius procuratoris Augusti* at Celeia dates to *ca.* 160 (*CIL* 3.5171 [*CBFIR* 241]). In all likelihood, Celeia was to be replaced by a *statio* at Praetorium Latobicorum, on the same route between Italy and the Danube and located nearby, just inside Pannia superior. The first dated altar from that site is consular-dated to 158 (*AE* 1944, 134 [*CBFIR* 338]). The Marcomannic wars thoroughly disrupted life in the area, though, and afterwards, Celeia was reopened, remaining in operation until 217. Praetorium Latobicorum, meanwhile, was closed, but its dated epigraphic series resumes in 217 when, evidently, it again replaced Celeia. See *ZPE* 113 (1996) 288.

³³ Mirković, 252, assigns eighteen to twenty altars to the period 157-185, but only one bears a consular date.

³⁴ Stockstadt: *CIL* 13.6634 (*CBFIR* 193), 6636 (*CBFIR* 194), 6649 (*CBFIR* 184); Jagsthausen: 6556, 11762 (*CBFIR* 115).

³⁵ Hippo Regius: *AE* 1961.24 (*CBFIR* 743); this altar was a joint dedication of two *beneficarii*.

³⁶ *CIL* 3.7449 (*CBFIR* 643). There are five altars from Montana, set up by four *beneficarii*. Of the five, only this one is dated, to 155. For a discussion of activity at Montana, with considerable emphasis on the *beneficarii* there, see N. B. Rankov, "A Contribution" (n. 1, Add. bibl.).

³⁷ Nettersheim has seven altars, five of which can be dated: *CBFIR* nos. 76-82.

³⁸ Rigomagus has seven altars, three of which can be dated: *CBFIR* nos. 84-90.

³⁹ Stockstadt has twenty-one altars dedicated by nineteen *beneficarii*, of which thirteen can be dated with some accuracy: *CBFIR* nos. 178-198.

⁴⁰ There are five altars in the series, of which three are datable: *CBFIR* nos. 111-115.

⁴¹ *CIL* 3.11826 (*CBFIR* 251). The stone was found at Lauriacum. The date of Secundus' governorship is established by *CIL* 3.5166 (*CBFIR* 242), consular-dated to 158.

⁴² *CBFIR* 600. Thomasson, 127, no. 40. For a discussion of the dating of Etruscus' governorship, see *CBFIR*, p. 460.

result from increases in the number of *stationes* and not necessarily from any substantial expansion of the number of *beneficarii* in service.

The organizational dimension of the Antonine reforms represents the most radical element of their activity, but presents greater difficulties than its operational counterpart, because the epigraphic evidence documents internal administrative reorganization less directly than it does relatively straightforward operational measures such as the revival and expansion of the *statio* network. It seems, however, that at the heart of the measures taken by Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius lay an effort to alter in a fundamental way the connection between governors and their *beneficarii*. It is difficult to distinguish measures taken by Pius from those taken by Marcus, but the final result of their efforts was the weakening of the personal bonds between bestower and recipient of the *beneficium* that had existed previously, and the substitution of a relationship that was more institutional in nature, in which *beneficarii* were attached not to individual governors, but rather to the governorship itself, through assignment to a body that by the end of the second century came to be called the *officium consularis*.

The term *officium* first appears in conjunction with a gubernatorial *beneficiarius* on a text from Tyana in Cappadocia, dated to the early 150s (*IGRR* 3.6800[*CBFIR* 691]). It would seem, therefore, that it was *ca.* 150 at the latest that *officium* came into use as a corporate designation for the body within which the governor's *beneficarii* served. That the use of the term was official in nature is suggested by the fact that in this particular inscription the Latin is transliterated into Greek. But at this date the *officium* was still associated personally with the governor, at least in this case, for the *beneficiarius* describes himself as ἐξ ὀφικίου Κασσίου Ἀπολλειναρίου: "from the *officium* of (M.) Cassius Apollinaris,"⁴³ rather than ἐξ ὀφικίου ὑπατικοῦ, "from the *officium* of the governor."

It was between the mid-150s and 170 that the personal bonds that linked *beneficarii* and governors were addressed. The earliest text documenting this process is an altar from the mining district of Montana in Moesia inferior, consular-dated to 155 (*CIL* 3.7449 [*CBFIR* 643]). Its dedicator gives his title without a governor's name, describing himself simply as *beneficiarius consularis*. Examples of this generic titulature, which links the *beneficiarius* to the governorship rather than to any particular governor, proliferate rapidly from 155 on. One comes from Praetorium Latobicorum in Pannonia superior, consular-dated to 158 (*AE* 1944, 134 [*CBFIR* 338]), another from Jagsthausen (*CIL* 13.6556, 11762 [*CBFIR* 115]), and three from Stockstadt in Germania superior in the mid-160s;⁴⁴ further examples include altars from Mursa in Pannonia inferior, consular-dated to 164 (*AE* 1973, 448 [*CBFIR* 413]), and from Histria in Moesia inferior, on the latter of which the title was translated into what became its standard Greek form: βενεφιχίριος ὑπατικοῦ (*AE* 1927, 59 [*CBFIR* 633], dated to 159/160). After 170, the generic formula was universal: a total of nearly five hundred examples are known from 155 through the end of the third century.⁴⁵ Most striking of all is the fact that, after 170, only four examples exist of *beneficarii* using the old-fashioned title incorporating the personal names of governors.⁴⁶ Clearly, the *beneficarii* had shed their identification with the individual governors.

⁴³ For the dates of M. Cassius Apollinaris' governorship, see G. Alföldy, *Konsulat* (n. 1, Add. bibl.), 197 and 220 Thomasson, 270, no. 28.

⁴⁴ *CIL* 13.6649 (*CBFIR* 184), 6634 (*CBFIR* 193), 6636 (*CBFIR* 194).

⁴⁵ The figure results from a tally of the indices of *CBFIR*, and probably errs on the low side. It does not include any of the *beneficarii consularis* from the *statio* at Sirmium.

⁴⁶ In chronological order, they are *CBFIR* 759, dated 4 April 210, from Cuicul in Numidia, an altar set up by a *b(ene)ff(iciarius) Subatiani(i) Proculi leg(ati) Aug(ustorum) pr(o) pr(aetore) co(n)s(ulis) desig(nati)*; *CIL* 3.1783 (*CBFIR* 495), sometime after 212, from Narona in Dalmatia, a heavily restored text of a *beneficiar(ius) [Sene]cioni[s] cos*; *AE* 1971, 218 (*CBFIR* 22), dated between 216 and 219, from Eburacum in Britannia inferior, a text of a *b(ene)ff(iciarius) Gordian(i)*; *ILS* 9258 (*AE* 1905, 211; *CBFIR* 722), dated 245-246, from Philadelphia in Arabia, a text of a *b(ene)ff(iciarius) Claudi(i) Capitolini*. Interestingly, all four of these texts come from provinces that either had no legionary garrison but still used large numbers of *beneficarii consularis* (Dalmatia), or that had only single-legion garrisons. Two other mid-third century texts from single-legion Arabia appear in the index to *CBFIR* (nos. 727 and 728, dated 260 and 262 respectively), but I have excluded them here because the governors' names are not used as elements of the men's titulature. Similarly, several texts of

It is particularly difficult to establish how the Antonine reforms affected such internal administrative matters as the length of time for which men were appointed as *beneficarii* and the duration of their assignments at *stationes*. If the reforms that lay behind the new Antonine titulature had the aim of weakening the personal bonds between *beneficarii* and governors, then one of the things they would have sought to change was the appointment system, so that the lengths of *beneficarius* appointments no longer coincided with the lengths of the terms of the governors themselves. There is consensus that in the late second- and third-century *officium*, men appointed as *beneficarii consularis* served terms that were, in effect, permanent, unless they were promoted.⁴⁷ Such terms, of course, would have helped to focus the men's loyalties more on the institution in which they served and less on the transient executives who ran that institution. The Antonine reforms offer a plausible context for the introduction of these open-ended appointments. Permanent appointments also would have made it possible to integrate service as a *beneficarius consularis* into the legionary career scheme. Comparatively few inscriptions exist on which to reconstruct the place which such service occupied, and debate continues on the interpretation of those inscriptions,⁴⁸ but from dated examples of careers it appears that, aside from the first-century example of M. Carantius Macrinus, service as a gubernatorial *beneficarius* only began to figure into the career pattern during the late second century, subsequent to and perhaps as a consequence of the Antonine reforms.⁴⁹

If the Antonines did introduce open-ended appointments as a way of weakening the ties between the *beneficarii* and the governors, they may have tried initially, as a companion measure, to regulate the lengths of *beneficarius* assignments to *stationes* as well, even though this would have involved them in micromanagement of the details of provincial administration, similar to Trajan's dictation of the number of *beneficarii* that Pliny was to assign to Gavius Bassus and Viridius Gemellinus. Still, there is some evidence that Antoninus Pius, at least, acted to mandate the terms of *beneficarii*. The evidence comes from Celeia, the only *statio* with a sufficiently large *corpus* of altars from this period to make discussion and comparison of the lengths of assignments possible across the period between 110 and 160. During the years from the founding of the post *ca.* 110 to *ca.* 150, eight praesidial procurators are named by *beneficarii* serving at Celeia.⁵⁰ Six of these procurators are named only by single *beneficarii*,⁵¹ which suggests that the assignments of the *beneficarii* during this period normally coincided with the governorships of the procurators, lasting about three years.⁵² During the 150s, however, four procurators are named, three of them by two *beneficarii* each;⁵³ only the fourth and last is named by a single *benefi-*

Severan date use the term *beneficarius eius* but avoid actually including the governors' names in the men's titulature (e.g., *AE* 1985, 725 [CBFIR 642] and *CIL* 13.11801 [CBFIR 132]).

⁴⁷ Jones, *JRS* 39 (1949) 45. They were *principales* and apparently received double pay (Breeze, *BJ* 174 [1974] 269).

⁴⁸ Ott discusses the *cursus* of the *beneficarii* on pp. 39-48 of his book and schematizes it in Appendix 1, pp.167-173, and Appendix 4, pp. 178-179. Important earlier discussions of the legionary career include *RO2* 33-34, and Breeze, *BJ* 174 (1974) 263ff. Whether service as a *beneficarius* formed a stepping stone to the centurionate has been questioned by M. P. Speidel, *ZPE* 91 (1992) 229-232, challenging the readings of two Syrian inscriptions used as evidence for such promotions (*AE* 1932.88 [CBFIR 701]; *CBFIR* 705). Breeze notes that promotion from *beneficarius consularis* was impeded by the small number of posts above that rank, and concludes that service as a *beneficarius consularis* acted as an "efficiency bar" (*BJ* 174 [1974] 275-276).

⁴⁹ See the chronologically arranged career examples in Ott, Appendix 1.4, 170-172. His dating is often vague, assigning men only to the second century, for example, but clearly, the more closely dated examples of *beneficarii consularis* that appear in his list (aside from the first, *CBFIR* 327, discussed in note 28 above) all fall in the late second or third centuries.

⁵⁰ For a full discussion of this material, see R. Dise, "The *Beneficarii* (n. 1, Add. bibl.).

⁵¹ *CIL* 3.5179 (*CBFIR* 222), 5163 (*CBFIR* 238), 5177 (*CBFIR* 239), 5165 (*CBFIR* 226), 5170 (*CBFIR* 244), *CIL* 5173 (*CBFIR* 231).

⁵² Alföldy's estimate of the average term of a procurator in Noricum: *Noricum* 79.

⁵³ T. Flavius Titianus, *ca.* 153: *CIL* 3.5172 (*CBFIR* 224), 5164 (*CBFIR* 243); Ulpianus Victor, *ca.* 156: 5161 (*CBFIR* 220), 5169 (*CBFIR* 234); Usienus Secundus, *ca.* 158: *CIL* 3.5162 (*CBFIR* 221), 5166 (*CBFIR* 242). The procurators' dates are taken from *Noricum*, Appendix V. Thomasson's dates agree substantially with Alföldy's (84-85, nos. 16-19). Winkler's dates differ, but only slightly (53-59).

ciarius (M. Bassaeus Rufus *ca.* 160: *CIL* 3.5171 [CBFIR 241]), probably because the post ceased operation part of the way through his governorship. Since *beneficarii* serving together appear generally to have dedicated a single altar jointly rather than two individual altars (Ott 111-113; Mirković 253), this phenomenon at Celeia more likely represents a halving in the lengths of *beneficarius* assignments than a doubling in manpower at the *statio*. In the absence of similarly detailed data from other *stationes* for this period, it is impossible to know whether this abrupt change in assignment lengths at Celeia took place elsewhere, too, and therefore reflects imperial mandate. But several of its features raise the possibility. First, it coincided with the inception of the Antonine reforms at the beginning of the 150s. Second, the reduction in assignment lengths was maintained by three successive procurators. Finally, the reduction was regular across those three procurators' governorships, that is, under each of them two, and only two, *beneficarii* served at Celeia. Had the reduction originated in the initiative of one of the procurators themselves, it need not have been maintained, and certainly not maintained so scrupulously, by his successors.

If Antoninus Pius did attempt to micromanage internal administrative practices in this way, Marcus Aurelius soon abandoned the effort. The evidence is plain that during the late second and third centuries the lengths of *statio* assignments and similar administrative details varied extensively from province to province and even, in some provinces, from decade to decade.⁵⁴ Clearly, variation of this sort indicates that by this time the *minutiae* of day-to-day internal administration were left to the discretion of the governors or their chiefs of staff. Reasons for returning authority over matters of day-to-day administrative matters to the governors are not hard to find. On the one hand, Marcus faced chronic and severe military crises throughout most of his principate, and petty administrative matters would have been a waste of efforts desperately needed on other fronts. It is also possible that the weakening by 170 of the personal bonds between individual *beneficarii* and individual governors, as proposed above, rendered further micromanagement unnecessary. Recent scholarship has suggested, and the evidence indicates that in the main it does so correctly, that during the late second and third centuries, governors even enjoyed the authority to establish or close *stationes* as local needs dictated (Ott 103-104); their receipt of such authority probably also came under Marcus.

The use of seconded soldiers to assist the governors in their many duties had its roots in late Republican practice, and continued to reflect those Republican roots well into the Principate, service to the governor being personal and recruitment *ad hoc*. Trajan devised a new role for these *beneficarii*, using them to man his *stationes*, a role that was official rather than personal in nature. But it was the Antonine reforms that marked the great watershed in the evolution of the governor's staff away from its informal Republican past and towards its institutional imperial future. The Antonine revival of the *statio* network inaugurated a century-long era during which these posts, each manned by one or two *beneficarii consularis*, proliferated rapidly until they became a frequent presence in the towns and along the roads of the provinces of the imperial frontiers, and an important element in the administrative infrastructure of the empire. Of greatest significance, however, is the Antonines' reconfiguration of the relationship between the seconded soldiers who manned that infrastructure and the aristocrats who formed its executive echelon. By attaching those soldiers to the governorship rather than to the governor himself, the Antonines strengthened the institutional structure of the administrative apparatus and laid the basis of the careerist and functionally specialized *officium consularis* of the third century.

The University of Northern Iowa

Robert L. Dise, Jr.

⁵⁴ See two recent articles by the present author: "The Recruitment" (n. 1, Add. bibl.) and "Variation in Roman Administrative Practice" (below, pp. 284-299). I differ sharply from the traditional interpretations on these matters, most recently advanced by Ott, 82-85 and 105-106.