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Emperor L. Septimius Severus died on 4th February 211 during the Britannic expedition, leaving the rule to his both sons – M. Aurelius Antoninus called Caracalla and P. Septimius Geta. Unfortunately, he did not divide the rule and the state formally between his successors. It is true that both of them bore a title of augustus (Caracalla since 198, Geta since 209), but only the elder one was introduced to the family of Marcus Aurelius and received the name Antoninus. This fact, and late granting of the full share of the rule to Geta, suggests that originally, according to Severus’ idea, Rome’s ruler was supposed to be only the elder one – Caracalla. After the change, it was not specified which issues each of the joint rulers should deal with, which caused unavoidable arguments, and consequently Geta’s death. According to Herodian, attempts to reconcile brothers were made – a territorial division of Imperium Romanum into Europa and Asia was anticipated and allotting one part to each of them. Empress Iulia Domna, who by persuading her sons to keep the integrity and unity of the state practically prevented concluding the agreement, was a great advocate of the concord but an opponent of the division. Finally,

* I have been conducting the research on the senatorial order of the Severan period within the frames of the National Science Centre entitled “The album of senators from the age of Severan dynasty (A.D. 193-235)”. The project has been financed by the funds provided by the National Science Centre granted on the basis of the decision no. DEC-2011/01/B/HS3/01273.

1 The title of augustus in case of Geta is proven for 209 by, for instance, coins (RIC IV/1, p. 323 no. 67 and following) and a military diploma RMD III 191.

2 According to SHA, vita Getae, 1, 5, Geta also got the name Antoninus, which, however, is not confirmed by remaining historiographic and epigraphic sources. A. Mastino, Le titolature di Caracalla e Geta attraverso le iscrizioni (indici), Bologna 1981, p. 37, undermined the interpretation of the inscription: CIL III 5993 = IBR 472 and CIL III 5996 = 11985 = IBR 490, in which Geta is mentioned as Antoninus. The author also drew attention to the fact that after Septimus Severus’ death Caracalla adopted the cognomen Severus (ibidem, p. 35).

3 Herodian., 4, 3, 6-7.

4 Herodian., 4, 3, 8-9.
the agreement between the brothers was not concluded, Geta was murdered\(^5\) and additionally damnum memoriae was imposed on him. The elder son of Septimius Severus became the sole ruler of the Empire.

During Caracalla’s reign (211-217 A.D.) there was a group of collaborators around him (as each emperor) called in the epigraphic and historiographic sources as “comites” and “amici”. J. Crook noticed that they created, like in Septimius Severus’ times, a kind of emperor’s personal council, with a difference that there is no information on the participation of iurisconsulti in the discussed period. According to this author, lawyers should be looked for under a general, functioning in the sources, term “amicus”\(^6\). It should be stressed, though, that among Caracalla’s confidants there were no people with certified legal education (sources attribute legal knowledge expressis verbis only to Macrinus), whereas the Emperor himself, as Cassius Dio stated, avoided sitting in court tribunals\(^7\). A. Ziółkowski noted that at the beginning of the 3\(^{rd}\) century, the Imperial Chancellery won the primacy over the council in the creation of law\(^8\). Thus, the significance of the council in the respect of legislation was diminished, which can be an explanation of the above missing information in the sources.

The group of known companions and friends of Caracalla included: (P?) Aelius Coeranus, M. Antonius Gordianus Sempronianus Romanus Africanus, M. Antonius Iuvenis, Aurelianus, [...] T. f. Quir. Aurelianus, D. Caelius (Calvinus) Balbinus, L. (Claudius) Cassius Dio Cocceianus (?), P. Catius Sabinus, C. Iulius Avitus Alexianus, C. Iulius Septimius Castinus, C. Octavius Appius Suetrius Sabinus, the praetorians prefects: Q. Maecius Laetus, T. Messius Extricatus, M. Oclatinius Adventus, and M. Opellius Macrinus. It is possible that the list should be extended but there is no information for further additions\(^9\).

\(^5\) The date of the murder is not precisely determined (XII 211-II 212 A.D.), and there is a heated argument about it in the subject’s literature. It was mentioned for instance by: G. Alföldy, Der Sturz des Kaisers Geta und die antike Geschichtsschreibung, BHAC 1970, Bonn 1972, p. 19; M.L. Meckler, Caracalla and his late-antique biographer: a historical commentary on the „Vita Caracalli” in the „Historia Augusta”, Michigan 1994, p. 108 ff.


\(^7\) Cass. Dio, 77, 17, 1.

\(^8\) A. Ziółkowski, Historia Rzymu, Poznań 2004, p. 448.

\(^9\) W. Eck, Der Kaiser und seine Ratgeber. Überlegungen zum inneren Zusammenhang von amici, comites und consiliarii am römischen Kaiserhof [in:] Herrschaftsstrukturen und Herrschaftspraxis. Konzepte, Prinzipien und Strategien der Administration im römischen Kaiserreich, Berlin 2006, p. 77 made some interesting deliberations on the possible membership of L. Egnatius Victor Lollianus and C. Sallius Aristaenetus of Caracalla’s comites. However, the inscription AE 1947, 182, which was the basis for this suggestion, attests both
The best example of an exceptional promotion in the group of Caracalla’s certified comites and amici was (P?) Aelius Coeranus. He became a consul in 212 although he had been repressed before in relation to the case of Plautianus. Despite coming from an equestrian province and dislike of Aegyptians in Rome, he managed to achieve such a significant advance and it is worth stressing here that he was the first Aegyptian who received the mentioned position. It is unknown what he owed the imperial favour to but he used it and became the young princeps’ advisor.

The next of the listed above, M. Antonius Gordianus Sempronianus Romanus Africanus (later Emperor Gordian I), may be called a friend of the imperial house. Presumably, he was Caracalla’s comes and also enjoyed Iulia Domna’s support, and probably he got a consulate because of that. He also held the posts of: proconsul of Achaia, legate of Syria, and legate of Britannia.

of them only as advocati and the fact of their presence in Antioch (where a trail in which they participated took place before the Emperor), in my opinion, is not enough to unquestionably consider them comites of the Emperor.

10 As an inhabitant of a province governed by the equites, in which senators were not allowed to live, he had no chance to find an appropriate patron from amplissimus ordo. It seems that in his case an occasion to make appropriate acquaintances was a stay of the Emperor with his family and friends in Aegyptus, which was a starting point for the whole family’s careers. More details on this subject see: D. Okoń, Pierwsi „Egipcjanie” w senacie rzymskim, [in:] Grecy, Rzymianie i ich sąsiedzi, Wrocław 2007, p. 517 ff.

11 See: J. Crook, Consilium, p. 85 and 149.


13 See: K. Dietz, Senatus, p. 65 f.

14 According to E. Groag, Die römischen Reichsbeamten von Achaia bis auf Diokletian, Wien 1939, col. 87 f., identical with proconsul Gordian mentioned in praefatio Vitae sophistarum by Philostratos.

15 See: Praefatio Vitae sophistarum by Philostratos. Discussion on the subject of possible post held in Syria was mentioned by K. Dietz, Senatus, p. 66.

16 Four inscriptions (EE VII 986 = RIB 1049, CIL VII 1043 = RIB 1279, CIL VII 226 = RIB 590, and AE 1971, 218) confirm that in 216 [Gor?]dianus Se(m)pr[...] was leg(atus)
M. Antonius Iuvenis stands out among the listed persons by age and experience. The sources attest him already in 176 as a frater Arvalis\textsuperscript{17}, so he was a much older man than the Emperor. Probably because of that he did not hold any important public positions during Caracalla’s reign.

A casus of two Emperor’s comites named Aurelianus is quite unclear. One was attested by Cassius Dio as Caracalla’s consul suffectus and sentenced to death by Macrinus on the army’s request\textsuperscript{18}, the other, with retained father’s forename, tribus and cognomen […] T. f. Quir. Aurelianus, is known as [com]es expeditionis Orientalis\textsuperscript{19}. It is possible that both Aureliani were actually the same person, but due to the lack of sources allowing to ascertain their identity, I will consider them as two separate senators in this work.

D. Caelius (Calvinus) Balbinus, later emperor, descendant of a consular family from Baetica, made a great career during Caracalla’s rule\textsuperscript{20}. After taking over the independent rule, princeps appointed him the ordinary consul in 213. That was already the second consulate for Balbinus (he had received the first one as early as during Septimius Severus’ rule), additionally held together with the new ruler. It strengthened his position and emphasised the friendly relationship with the Emperor. According to SHA, Balbinus governed Asia, Africa, Bithynia, Galatia, Pontus, Thracia, and Gallia\textsuperscript{21}. Considering his relationship with Caracalla, he could have received some of those functions already during Severus’ time. He was the proconsul of Asia probably after the second consulate\textsuperscript{22}. Taking into account Balbinus’ consular and patrician origin, we can assume that if he had not been friends with the Emperor, he would have finished his career as an ex-consul sitting in the Senate until the end of his life without prospects to receive such administrative functions as proconsulates and legations of provinces. Another issue is whether Balbinus was Aug(usti) pr(o) pr(aetore) in Britannia Inferior. It is uncertain if we can identify him with later Gordian I. For more see: K. Dietz, Senatus, p. 62 f.

\textsuperscript{17} CIL VI 2099; CIL VI 2100; CIL VI 2102 v. 12.
\textsuperscript{18} Cass. Dio, 78, 12, 2. 4; 78, 19, 1.
\textsuperscript{21} SHA, vita Max. et Balb., 7, 2.
\textsuperscript{22} AE 1909, 175.
actually granted so many offices although he did not need them for the consular promotion. It is possible that this list is not a very reliable creation of SHA biographer used to emphasise great experience of the characterised person\textsuperscript{23}.

A well-known historian, L. (Claudius) Cassius Dio Cocceianus (?), a representative of a consular family from Asia Minor\textsuperscript{24}, was designated to a praetor by Pertinax\textsuperscript{25} and received a suffect consulate from Septimius Severus. He also won Caracalla’s favours, whom he accompanied in 214-215 in Nicomedia\textsuperscript{26}. After his death, he received a high position in the subsequent emperors’ circles, which may prove an excellent skill to survive hard times and make friends with rulers.

The next of the mentioned, P. Catius Sabinus, also helped his career by being on familiar terms with the young Emperor, who promoted him to the second consulate in 216. Sabinus held that office with P. Cornelius Anullinus, son of Septimius Severus’ collaborator. That was a special distinction, the more valuable because it was awarded to few people even from the circle of confidants.

For instance C. Iulius Avitus Alexianus did not receive it, although he was not only a collaborator but also Caracalla’s relative. The Emperor entrusted him with an office of a prefect responsible for provisioning and then he appointed him legate of Dalmatia, proconsul of Asia\textsuperscript{27}, and proconsul of Cyprus\textsuperscript{28}. Avitus also accompanied the ruler in one of the military expeditions, probably to Germania\textsuperscript{29}. It is possible that he missed the second consulate because of a premature death of the ruler.

The situation of C. Iulius Septimius Castinus, presumably a remote cousin of the imperial family and the Emperor’s friend, was similar\textsuperscript{30}. At the beginning of his rule, he held an office of legate of Pannonia Inferior, so he was still an officer of a praetorian rank. The new Emperor designated him to a consul (212-213) and then

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{23} Epigraphic sources confirm that he was a salius Palatinus (CIL VI 1981) and proconsul of Asia (AE 1909, 175).

\textsuperscript{24} Son of a consul from about 184-188 Cassius Apronianus from Nicaea in Bithynia (see: Cass. Dio, 75, 15, 3).


\textsuperscript{26} Cass. Dio, 77, 17, 2-3; 77, 18, 4; 78, 8, 4-5.

\textsuperscript{27} Cass. Dio, 78, 30, 2. 4.

\textsuperscript{28} During the Severi rule, special officers on Cyprus were for example: procurator T. Caesernius Sta[t]i[u][s Quint]ianus and consular (P. or Ti.) Claudius Attalus Paterculianus. Thus, it is unknown if the mission on Cyprus was evidence for Avitus’ disfavour during Caracalla’s reign, as it was interpreted by H.-G. Pflaum, La carrière de C. Iulius Avitus Alexianus, grand’père de deux empereurs, REL 57, 1979 (1980), 314, or a consular special mission. See also: H. Halfmann, Zwei syrische Verwandte des severischen Kaiserhauses, Chiron 12, 1982, p. 217 ff.

\textsuperscript{29} Career according to: AE 1962, 229; AE 1921, 64 = AE 1963, 42 = AE 1979, 450.

\textsuperscript{30} Cass. Dio, 78, 13, 2.}
entrusted the government of III Daciae\(^{31}\). The imperial relative did not receive the second consulate, probably for similar reasons as the predecessor.

C. Octavius Appius Suetrius Sabinus was also among reliable friends of Caracalla\(^ {32} \). As a proof of trust, he was sent on the Rhine where he later accompanied the ruler in the Germanic campaign as a *praepositus vexillariis*. Friendship and mutual campaign resulted in granting the government of Raetia to the young senator, and soon after that in an ordinary consulate in 214. After the consulate, Sabinus held responsible functions in the state administration\(^ {33} \) until 217 when he was recalled from the office in Pannonia Inferior by Macrinus.

The prefects of the Praetorians were also included in the circle of the Emperor’s collaborators. During Caracalla’s rule, the guard commanders usually received consular distinctions (*ornamenta consularia*) – in this manner the Emperor increased their personal prestige without limiting possibilities in holding offices.

Q. Maecius Laetus, prefect of the praetorians in office from 205, contrary to his colleague Aemilius Papinianus, kept his office after Septimius Severus’ death. He certainly enjoyed the ruler’s trust because he received an ordinary consulate in 215. As it was considered the second one\(^ {34} \), he must have received a suffect consulate or *ornamenta consularia* before. From that moment on, Laetus formally belonged to the senatorial order, which did not interfere with further command of the Praetorian guard.

T. Messius Extricatus’ career was similar to Laetus\(^ {35} \). He started as an eques holding various civil offices\(^ {36} \). He received *ornamenta consularia* probably as the Praetorians’ prefect. The circumstances of this appointment are unknown but apparently Caracalla valued Messius specially because in 217 he appointed him the ordinary consul, which, as a rule, was treated as the second consulate.

\(^ {31} \) Career according to: *CIL* III 3480; *CIL* III 10269; *CIL* III 10471; *CIL* III 10472; *CIL* III 10473 = *ILS* 1153; *CIL* III 10360.

\(^ {32} \) Cass. Dio, 78, 13, 2. In epigraphy also attested as the Emperor’s *comes* (eg. *CIL* X 5398 = *ILS* 1159).


\(^ {34} \) E.g.: *CIL* III 1063; *CIL* III 5185; *CIL* VI 2130; *CIL* VI 3002; *CIL* IX 1972; *CIL* XIV 122.

\(^ {35} \) Following B. Salway, *A Fragment of Severan History: The Unusual Career of ...atus, Praetorian Prefect of Elagabalus*, Chiron 27, 1997, p. 127 ff. and W. Eck, *DNP*, Messius, [II 1] I reject his identification with [...]atus Praetorian prefect from the times of Elagabalus. Gentilicum Messius is of Italic origin; in the period of the Empire the Messii occurred in the Latin speaking part of the Empire (e.g. Africa, Italia, Hispania, Pannonia).

\(^ {36} \) AE 1977, 171 attests him in the office of *praefectus annonae* in 210.
Subsequent commanders of the imperial guard during Caracalla’s rule were: an Italic M. Oclatinius Adventus and M. Opellius Macrinus from Mauretania. They came from low-status families and performed various equestrian functions during the rule of Septimius Severus\(^{37}\). His successor nominated them as Praetorians prefects and granted *ornamenta consularia*. Both accompanied the Emperor in the expedition to the Parthians which proved to be disastrous for him.

In my opinion, however, Q. Hedius Rufus Lollianus Gentianus and C. Ovinius Tertullus should not be included in the group of the Emperor’s *comites* and *amici*. The former was mentioned in inscriptions as a triple emperor’s *comes*. As the sources say exactly: “comes Severi et Antonini Augustorum ter”\(^{38}\) and then they list such functions as a censor legate of Gallia and proconsul of Asia, performed already during the mutual rule of Septimius Severus and Caracalla, it should be assumed that he was a companion of both emperors also in the period of their mutual reign. It cannot be rather assumed (as J. Crook did in his work on the imperial council\(^{39}\)) that Q. Hedius Rufus Lollianus Gentianus was only *comes* of Caracalla.

The latter, C. Ovinius Tertullus, in an inscription from the times of his governing in Moesia Inferior (i.e. between 198 and 202) is mentioned as “legatus et amicus noster”\(^{40}\). In view of the lack of information about the course of his further career, placing him by J. Crook among the members of Caracalla’s council seems unjustified\(^{41}\).

However, not all Emperor’s relatives were automatically entitled to the title of *amicus*, but family ties played an important role in the personal policy of the ruler, so Caracalla introduced the second husband of Iulia Avita Mammaea, eques Gessius Marcianus, to the Senate. The husband of the elder cousin Iulia Soemias Bassiana, Sex. Varius Marcellus, became a senator at an unknown time, but certainly he was nominated as the legate of Numidia by Caracalla\(^{42}\). The third Emperor’s relative included in the collegium *fratres Arvales* in 213 was M. Iulius Gessius

---

\(^{37}\) M. Oclatinius Adventus, according to historical (Cass. Dio, 78, 14, 1; Herodian., 4, 12, 1) and epigraphic sources (for instance: *CIL* VII 1003 = *ILS* 2618 = *RIB* 1234, *CIL* VII 1346 + *EE* VII 1020 + *EE* VII 1028 = *RIB* 1462), was in his career: *speculator*, *centurio frumentarii*, *princeps peregrinorum*, *procurator Augustorum in Britannia*. M. Opellius Macrinus, according to historiographic sources (Cass. Dio, 78, 11, 2-3; 78, 34, 2; SHA, vita Macr., 2, 1; 4, 4, 6; 7, 2) performed functions: *advocatus fisci*, *praefectus vehiculorum per Flaminiam* (*centenarius*), *procurator aerarii maioris*, *procurator privatae*, *scriba pontificis* or *pontifex minor*.

\(^{38}\) *CIL* II 4121 = *ILS* 1145 = *RIT* 139, *CIL* II 4122 = *RIT* 140.

\(^{39}\) J. Crook, *Consilium*, p. 172.

\(^{40}\) *CIL* III 781 = *ILS* 423 = *IGR* 1, 598.

\(^{41}\) J. Crook, *Consilium*, p. 85 and 176.

\(^{42}\) Career according to *CIL* X 6569 = *ILS* 478 = *IG* 14, 911 = *IG* 1, 402: *procurator aquarium centenarius*, *procurator aquarium*, *procurator provinciae Britanniae ducenarius*, *procurator rationis privatae trecentarius*, *vice praefectorum praetorio et urbi functus*, in
Bassianus. The lack of confirmation in the sources that the relatives mentioned participated in the Emperor’s expeditions allows to assume that they did not bear the title of *comes*.

The group of Caracalla’s confidants consisted of people who started their career already during his father’s reign. Many of them were supported on the way to promotion by the young princeps and thanks to his protection reached the highest ranks in the Roman state. An especially titled and influential group in the Empire was created in this way, but it was much smaller than in the times of Septimius Severus. Above all, the friendship with the ruler and loyalty showed to him in hard moments decided about the participation in the group. It was more difficult, however, for those included in its composition to stand out with special talents and abilities because Caracalla, as it seems, showed advanced independence in governing the Empire and he did not give them many opportunities to distinguish themselves. None of the companions and friends had a frequent chance at his side to achieve such a position as Cilo, Laetus, or Plautianus had with Septimius Severus. For this reason, Caracalla’s *comites* and *amici*, due to the scope of their independence, should rather be called advisors than collaborators, as it was the case with the people surrounding his father.

Social and territorial origin of the mentioned senators from the circle close to the Emperor is mostly known: it is established in 73.3% for social origin and in 66.6% for territorial origin. Out of 15 *comites* and *amici*, only 4 belonged to the old aristocracy, 7 were *hominès novi*, and the status of the others is unknown. A slight majority of new senators is visible, but it is not so clear as during Septimius Severus’ reign.

The Emperor’s collaborators came from various regions: 3 of them were Italics, 2 came from Africa, 1 was from the West, 3 from the East, and one can be

*senatum adlectus, praefectus aerarii militaris, legatus legionis III Augustae, praeses provinciae Numidiae.*


45 (P?) Aelius Coeranus, C. Iulius Avitus Alexianus, C. Iulius Septimius Castinus, Q. Maecius Laetus, T. Messius Exticatus, M. Oclatinius Adventus, M. Opellius Macrinus.

46 P. Catius Sabinus, C. Octavius Appius Suetrius Sabinus, M. Oclatinius Adventus.

47 C. Iulius Septimius Castinus, M. Opellius Macrinus.

48 D. Caelius (Calvinus) Balbinus.

49 (P?) Aelius Coeranus, L. (Claudius) Cassius Dio Cocceianus (?), C. Iulius Avitus Alexianus.
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considered to come from the Latin speaking part of the Empire. In comparison with the times of Caracalla’s father, no domination of any region is visible, thus, the majority of Africans over the representatives of other parts of the state is disappearing. 7 people (46.6%) out of the ruler’s confidants had military offices in their cursus, the others, if we can draw conclusions from fragmentary information, belonged to a group of civil professionals. The group of military people was quite numerous, which is understandable in the context of wars fought by the princeps, but the situation during the rule of Septimius Severus, who carried out many war campaigns, was similar.
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