

**ARCTOS**

**ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA**

**VOL. XXII**

**HELSINKI 1988 HELSINGFORS**

## INDEX

Antti Arjava	Divorce in Later Roman Law.....	5
Christer Bruun	<i>Caligatus, tubicen, optio carceris</i> , and the Centurions' Positions; Some Remarks on An Inscription in ZPE 71 (1988).....	23
Edward Courtney	Five Notes on the Appendix Vergiliana.....	41
Siegfried Jäkel	Philosophisch orientierte Ansätze einer Sprachtheorie bei Gorgias, Isokrates und Epikur.....	43
Iiro Kajanto	The Idea of Fate in Poggio Bracciolini.....	59
Mika Kajava	A New Catalogue of Roman Upper-Class Women....	75
Bengt Löfstedt	Zu Bedas Predigten.....	95
Outi Merisalo	Aspects of the Textual History of Poggio Bracciolini's <i>De varietate fortunae</i> .....	99
Olli Salomies	Epigraphische Beiträge.....	113
Karl-Gustav Sandelin	Mithras = Auriga?.....	133
Timo Sironen	Un obolo di Fistelia da Fregellae.....	137
Heikki Solin	Analecta epigraphica.....	141
Leena Talvio	Iohannis Lemouicensis <i>Morale Somnium</i> Pharaonis. Problemi di datazione.....	163
Toivo Viljamaa	From Grammar to Rhetoric. First Exercises in Composition According to Quintilian, inst. 1, 9.....	179
	De novis libris iudicia.....	203
	Index librorum in hoc volumine recensorum.....	263
	Libri nobis missi.....	267

# *Caligatus, tubicen, optio carceris*, and the Centurions' Positions; Some Remarks on an Inscription in ZPE 71 (1988)\*

CHRISTER BRUUN

In one of this year's issues of the ZPE some new inscriptions from Asia Minor were presented by T. B. Mitford.<sup>1</sup> Among them there is one that records the military career of a praetorian soldier who died as a legionary centurion after having served for 27 years. This inscription from Pazar in Cappadocia contains several interesting features which have a certain importance for the Rangordnung of the Roman army. It runs as follows:

*M. Caesius / M. f. Pol(lia tribu) Verus / Pollentia, (centurio) / leg(ionis) V Mac(edonicae). Militavit in coh(orte) IX / praetoria ann(is) XVI. Ordinatus tubi- / cem (sic), item optio at car- / carem factus est. Mili- / tavit evocatus annis / VII. Centurio factus / est in leg(ione) V Mac(edonica). Fuit or- / dine in sexta hastatus / posterior. Stipendia ac- / cepit caligata XVI, evo- / cativa VII, centurioni- / ca III. Militavit annis / XXVII. Vixit annis XXXXI. / M. Caesius Atimetus et / M. Caesius Limen liberti et / heredes eius ex testamento f(aciundum) c(uraverunt).*

(ZPE 71 [1988] 176f. no. 12)

---

\* I would like to thank Prof. Heikki Solin and Mr. Mika Kajava who read the manuscript, as well as Mr. Olli Salomies for many useful suggestions. Any errors are my own.

<sup>1</sup> T. Mitford, Further Inscriptions from the Cappadocian Limes, ZPE 71 (1988) 167-78 and plate XVI for the inscription treated here.

In his comment on the inscription Mitford deals with several questions, namely the *gens Caesia* and possible family connections of the soldier, the movements and whereabouts of the *legio V Macedonica*, and the ranks of *optio* and *evocatus*.<sup>2</sup> However, I think there is still more to be said about the two latter questions, as well as on others that Mitford did not touch upon.

### 1. *Caligatus*

There can be no doubt about the strict hierarchy in the Roman army, or of the great difference in rank between the common soldier and the legionary centurion.<sup>3</sup> Still, authoritative scholars have advanced arguments, mostly based on epigraphic evidence, that the term *caligatus* was used as a common denomination for both soldiers and centurions (derived from the Roman military boot, the *caliga*, which gave the emperor Gaius his nickname). If this were true, it would have at least some consequences for the hierarchy of the army, as the latest advocate of this theory, J. F. Gilliam, has pointed out.<sup>4</sup>

Scholars of the same opinion include Mommsen and De Ruggiero,<sup>5</sup> while von Domaszewski and Dobson among others have thought that *caligatus* referred only to soldiers below the rank of centurion.<sup>6</sup> The question whether centurions could be called *caligati* or not has not yet been definitively settled. This is due to ambiguous evidence, and here epigraphy

---

<sup>2</sup> Mitford 177f. He tentatively dates the inscription to the reign of M. Aurelius and L. Verus, but on this see below.

<sup>3</sup> See e.g. G. Alföldy, *Das Heer in der Sozialstruktur des römischen Kaiserreiches*, *Römische Heeresgeschichte*, Amsterdam 1987, 29-31; E. Sander, *Zur Rangordnung des römischen Heeres: die gradus ex caliga*, *Historia* 3 (1954/55) 96.

<sup>4</sup> J. Gilliam, *Milites caligati*, *TAPA* 77 (1946) 183-91, especially 183 (= *Idem*, *Roman Army Papers*, Amsterdam 1986, 43-51).

<sup>5</sup> See bibliography in Gilliam 43, also A. Passerini, *DE IV* (1949), s. v. *legio 590*, who is only partly convinced.

<sup>6</sup> A. v. Domaszewski - B. Dobson, *Die Rangordnung des römischen Heeres*<sup>2</sup>, Köln 1967, 2; also Sander 96; Durry, *Les cohortes prétoriennes*, Paris 1938, 95.

plays a key role.<sup>7</sup> There are twelve cases listed by Gilliam in which *caligatus, officia in caliga* and the like are encountered, and the present inscription can now be considered an additional example (since Gilliam's paper was first published, other cases of *caligatus* have appeared, too. For them see below).

The period of service of Caesius Verus is described in a detailed, tripartite way which has, in fact, never been encountered before in inscriptions: 16 years of *stipendia caligata* are followed by 7 years of *stipendia evocativa* and 4 of *stipendia centurionica*. This formulation seems to indicate that centurions did not belong to the *caligatus* category.

But perhaps this conclusion can be contradicted by pointing to the fact that the service was interrupted by seven years as *evocatus* (and the *evocati* could not be called *caligati*, as they served *in calceo*, not *in caliga*<sup>8</sup>). Therefore, it would only be natural to list the years as centurion separately, under another denomination.

Be that as it may, it might be useful to proceed and briefly survey the evidence concerning attestations for *caligatus* that Gilliam singled out as being of crucial importance for his case.<sup>9</sup>

We shall deal with two inscriptions, the first of which reads as follows:

*L. Cornelio Catoni (centurioni) leg(ionis) III Aug(ustae) qui et caligatus stip(endiorum) XIII ...*

(CIL VIII 2848)

---

<sup>7</sup> The unresolved state of the question is indicated by the reprinting of Gilliam's paper (n. 4 above) with Addendum p. 442. Gilliam's opinion is also cited by R. Fink, *Roman Military Records on Papyrus*, Ann Arbor 1971, 184 and 213. The epigraphic evidence is dealt with by Gilliam 187f. He also carefully scrutinizes the literary evidence on *caligatus*, and shows that it is inconclusive concerning our issue (pp. 184-87).

<sup>8</sup> Gilliam 190.

<sup>9</sup> Gilliam 189f. Mention is also made of CIL VI 37264, which I will not discuss here. As Gilliam states himself, the textual tradition is uncertain. Moreover, the inscription seems rather to demonstrate that there was a difference between *caligatus* and *centurio*, cf. Passerini 594.

There has been some discussion over the meaning of *caligatus* in this inscription. Many scholars have treated the word as a supernomen, Kajanto among them.<sup>10</sup> To Gilliam, however, it seemed possible that *caligatus* denoted Cornelius Cato's military position; here was a centurion who also called himself *caligatus*, *centurio qui et caligatus*.<sup>11</sup>

But surely, if we deal with a term denoting military status and not with a name, as I think is the case (it would e.g. be very uncommon to list the agnomen after the military rank), the interpretation preferred by Gilliam cannot be correct. The meaning of *qui et caligatus* must refer to Cato's earlier career, meaning "who once served as a common soldier, a *caligatus*". If we understand the expression as *qui et (fuit) caligatus*, it corresponds to a normal pattern in Roman inscriptions. It hardly needs stressing how common it is in these kinds of inscriptions to indicate the stages of advancement the person in question has passed through. The idea in this case seems to have been to point out that Cornelius Cato had worked his way up from the lower ranks, rather than being immediately awarded a centurion's commission as was often the case for an *eques Romanus*. I think this argument can be made more plausible by an epigraphic parallel. From Rome comes an inscription, dating roughly from the same period, around AD 200<sup>12</sup>, which gives :

*T. Ael(io) Malco tectori eq(uitum) praetorian(orum) coh(ortis) III  
pr(aetoriae) qui et urb., antistes ...*

(CIL VI 2256 = VI 32456 = D 2090)

This inscription has, admittedly, caused some perplexity, too<sup>13</sup>, but nobody has seriously considered the word *urb.* as a supernomen, and generally

---

<sup>10</sup> I. Kajanto, *Supernomina. A Study in Latin Epigraphy*, Helsinki 1966, 18 regards *caligatus* as an agnomen alluding to social position, "the rank where he began his career". For earlier views see Gilliam 188.

<sup>11</sup> Gilliam 188 and 190.

<sup>12</sup> CIL VIII 2848 is dated by Gilliam 188 to around AD 250, which is perhaps a little too late (cf. praenomen), while the inscription from Rome belongs to the end of the II century (H. Solin, *ANRW II. 29, 2* [1983] 680).

<sup>13</sup> See e.g. comments by Henzen (on CIL VI 2256) and Dessau (D 2090).

it is believed that *qui et urb.* should mean *qui et urb(anicianus)*, i.e. the soldier had begun his career in the urban cohorts.<sup>14</sup>

The other important piece of evidence that Gilliam points to is a morning report of the *cohors XX Palmyrenorum* from Dura Europos (PDur. 82). This list written on papyrus records the strength of the Roman forces on the premises. Among some 900 *mil(ites) cal(igati)* are specifically listed 9 *ord(inarii)*, 7 *dupl(icarii)* and 1 *sesq(uiplicarius)*. As the common opinion is that the 9 *ord(inarii)* were centurions, Gilliam states that they are thus marked as *caligati* without a doubt. They are, of course, centurions of an auxiliary cohort, and Gilliam therefore considers the possibility that this conclusion would not be valid for legionary centurions. But he is inclined to believe that no differences in terminology existed.<sup>15</sup>

On this point new evidence does not shed any new light (the other occurrences of *caligatus* in Fink, Roman Military Records on Papyrus, are inconclusive<sup>16</sup>), but all the same I think the case of PDur. 82 could be reconsidered. As Gilliam duly remarks in a note, what PDur. 82 col. i lines 1-3 actually list are men of three different service branches, namely infantry, camel riders, and normal cavalry:

*vi. Kal. Apriles n(umerus) p(urus) mil(itum) cal(igatorum) dccccxxiii  
in his ord(inarii) viiii dupl(icarii) viiii sesq(uiplicarius) i. drom(edarii)  
xxxiiii in his sesq(uiplicarius) i. eq(uites) ccxxiii in his dec(uriones)*

---

<sup>14</sup> Dessau, loc. cit.; M. Durry, *Les cohortes prétoriennes*, Paris 1938, 110 n. 9; D. Breeze, *The Organization of the career structure of the immunes and principales in the Roman army*, BJ 174 (1974) 253; N. Blanc, *Gardes du corps ou stucateurs? Les tectores dans l'armée romaine*, MEFRA 96 (1984) 729f. This inscription is not mentioned by H. Freis, *Die cohortes urbanae*, Köln 1967.

<sup>15</sup> Gilliam 187-91. The document is easily accessible in R. Fink, RMP no. 47 p. 183ff.

<sup>16</sup> *Caligatus* occurs in several of the papyri published by Fink, namely no. 47 ii, 50, 54, 59, 61 and 73. Perhaps of interest is no. 59 (= PSI XIII 1308, commented upon by Gilliam, CPh 47 [1952] 30 = RAP 70), called by Fink a "Monthly Summary of a Naval Century" from the middle of the II century. It seems to be a list of *immunes* (*gubernator, faber, ascita*), followed by *caligati*. This could be a new indication that *caligatus* is used in opposition to higher ranks, but the papyrus is too damaged to permit a sure conclusion.

*v dupl(icarii) vii sesq(uipticarii) iiii. / coh. XX Palmyrenorum Severianae Alexandrianae ...*

It was clearly the intention of the list to give a distinctive nomination for each of the three service branches. For the infantry not many possibilities existed. To use *pedites* would have been the only other possibility I can think of, but whatever term is used, the commanding centurions would have been grouped together with the common soldiers, just as the decurions were listed together with all the other *equites*.

The point I wish to make is that the wording we find in PDur. 82 and other similar documents is only the result of the special circumstances in which they originated. From these documents it does not follow, in my opinion, that a legionary centurion, nor an auxiliary one from Dura Europos, would have cared to call himself *caligatus* in an inscription, nor count his service years as *stipendia caligata*. To my mind, such a proposition does indeed seem somewhat far-fetched, considering the hierarchical stratification of the Roman army. Perhaps now the new inscription from Cappadocia does make it easier to accept the fact that centurions were not classified as *caligati* unless under very special circumstances.

## 2. Recruitment

The stone set up by the heirs of Caesius Verus informs us that he died at the age of 41 after having served for 27 years. This means that he was enlisted in the praetorian cohorts at the age of 14, which constitutes something of a record; Durry mentions 5 men who enlisted at the age of 16, one as young as 15.<sup>17</sup> (We may compare the available evidence for legionaries: Forni lists 513 soldiers for whom the recruiting age is known. Only 6 of them went into the army below the age of 15<sup>18</sup>).

The normal age of enlistment in the praetorian cohorts was between 18 and 20.<sup>19</sup> Our case is all the more strange as the praetorians were an elite

---

<sup>17</sup> Durry 262. A further praetorian enlisted at 15 in AE 1984, 59.

<sup>18</sup> G. Forni, *Il reclutamento delle legioni da Augusto a Diocleziano*, Milano-Roma 1953, 135-41.

<sup>19</sup> Durry 262.



force; some soldiers became members of this unit only as the result of a promotion from the legions.<sup>20</sup> It is possible to think that the inscription is an error, but this is not very profitable, and the text contains other peculiarities, too, that cannot be explained away in the same way (e.g. the promotion from *optio carceris* to *evocatus*, see below).

If an explanation for Caesius Verus' early recruitment is needed, it might be provided by assuming a recommendation of some sort. It is well known that patronage was important in the Roman army, not least for new recruits.<sup>21</sup>

### 3. Rangordnung: *tubicen, optio carceris*

During his service as praetorian, Caesius Verus was twice promoted, first to *tubicen* (trumpeter), then to *optio carceris* (camp prisonguard): *ordinatus tubicem item optio at carcarem factus est*. Mitford states that the rank of *optio* belonged to the highest grades below the centurionate, and often eventually led to a promotion to centurion.<sup>22</sup>

It is true that our man later became a centurion, but all the same the preceding rank is not correctly understood. Caesius was *optio carceris*, which is quite another thing than the much higher *optio*. The latter rank belongs to the *principales*, the "ranks in the century" („taktische Chargen"), whereas the *optio carceris* until now has been considered a junior staff officer with pay-and-a-half (or perhaps even normal pay. The authorities give different hierarchies for the lower grades of non commissioned officers).<sup>23</sup> The term

---

<sup>20</sup> Durry 245-50. 262. Inscriptions that testify to advancements from other units are e.g.: CIL VI 210. 1609. 2759. 9391. 32549. 32578. AE 1927, 120.

<sup>21</sup> G. Watson, *The Roman Soldier*, Bristol 1969, 37f.; Idem, ANRW II. 1 (1974) 496.

<sup>22</sup> Mitford 177f.

<sup>23</sup> Von Domaszewski - Dobson 2. 27 and VI-VII. (the *op. carceris* is a *principalis* among the lowest ranks); Sander 96-100 seems to consider posts like *op. carceris* as no real *principales*, but just *immunes*; Breeze, *Organization* 245f. uses the term junior staff officers for ranks like *op. carceris*; in his scheme they are *principales* with pay-and-a-half, thus already in D. Breeze, *Pay Grades and Ranks below the Centurionate*, JRS 61 (1971) 130-35. But later he seems to have changed his opinion: the *op. carceris* was

*optio* was used for a number of posts, such as *optio valetudi(nari)* (CIL IX 1617) or *optio convalescentium* (CIL VI 1058), and there can be no doubt that they differ in rank from a true *optio*.<sup>24</sup>

Actually Caesius Verus is the fourth *optio carceris* from the praetorian cohorts that we know of. To v. Domaszewski only one was known (AE 1894, 33 = D 9069), and as their existence seems to have gone unnoticed by authoritative works on the *immunes* and *principales* of the Guard in recent times,<sup>25</sup> they shall briefly be listed here:<sup>26</sup>

1. C. Vedinacus Dexter, *mil. coh. II pr., optio carcaris* (D 9069)

2. Aurelius Titus, *mil. coh. VII pr. (centuria ) Victoris, opt(io) garcaris* (sic) (Eranos 12 [1912] 190 = AE 1914, 253) evidently III century<sup>27</sup>

---

possibly just an *immunis* with normal pay (D. Breeze, Note on the use of the Titles *optio* and *magister* below the Centurionate during the Principate, *Britannia* 7 [1976] 129).

<sup>24</sup> Breeze, Titles *optio* and *magister* 127-29.

<sup>25</sup> Explicitly on their absence from the praetorian cohorts see Breeze, The Career Structure below the Centurionate during the Principate, ANRW II. 1 (1974) 439; cf. Breeze, Titles *optio* and *magister* 128.

<sup>26</sup> It seems unwarranted to include the fragmentary CIL X 1763, cited by Sander 99: *-ninus / [mil.] chort. VI / [pr. ta]b. tesser(arius) / [carc]er fisci / [cur.]* etc. The emendation to *[carc]er* is by no means certain. [*Signif]er* is a better alternative, and such an emendation is also possible considering the layout of the inscription, as I have verified from a photograph kindly provided by Heikki Solin from his files for the Supplement of CIL X.

<sup>27</sup> The inscription has been tentatively dated to the I century by B. Mattson, who recently re-edited it though not in a very satisfactory way (*Opusc. Rom.* 11 [1976] 120 no. 31). The existence of a *centuria Victoris* in the I century is not a strong argument for such an early date, especially when considering that the *coniunx* of Aurelius Titus is named Aurelia Ursa. The *gentilium* speaks in favour of a dating to the III century, as does the cognomen *Titus* (see O. Salomies, *Die römischen Vornamen*, Helsinki 1987, 164-66).

3. Aelius Florus, *mil. coh. V pr. (centuria) Vitalis, op(tio) kark(eris)* (II lapidario Zeri di Mentana 87 nr. 34 = AE 1983, 48) first half of III century<sup>28</sup>

4. M. Caesius M.f. Pol. Verus, *mil. coh. IX pr., ordinatus tubicen, optio ad carcarem, evocatus, centurio leg. V Mac.* (ZPE 71 [1988] 176 no. 12) II century

It might be added that three *optiones carceris* are known from the urban cohorts, some from the *vigiles* as well (but the abbreviations OPCA, OPC, OPTC etc. have not convinced everybody), while in the legions soldiers are called *carcerarii legionis*.<sup>29</sup>

One of the interesting features of our inscription is that it lists two lower ranks of *principales*, both *tubicen* and *optio carceris*, in the same career. They are obviously listed in order of promotion. In the classic Rangordnung of v. Domaszewski the two ranks are listed as belonging to the same group, but preference is given to the *tubicen*.<sup>30</sup> At first glance, then, the present inscription would make it possible to improve the Rangordnung on a minor point.

However, the situation is more complicated than this, because the relevance of the structures and patterns in the Rangordnung has been questioned from various quarters since it was first published in 1905. According to Sander, the posts of *tesserarius*, *optio* and *signifer* (the „taktische Chargen“) were basically equivalent in rank, and this conclusion should perhaps also be applied to lower grades, although Sander is not very explicit on that point.<sup>31</sup> On the other hand, Breeze has tried to bring the discussion of the NCO-posts onto a new footing by bringing the distinction

---

<sup>28</sup> As suggested by L. Polverini, who first published the text.

<sup>29</sup> *Optiones carceris* in the urban cohorts: D 2117. 2126. 3739. Generally on the titles used DE II. 1 (1900) 113 s.v. carcer; F. Lammert, RE XVIII (1939) 808. A new *miles car(cerarius) leg(ionis)* in AE 1978, 730.

<sup>30</sup> Von Domaszewski - Dobson 27.

<sup>31</sup> Sander 100, commented upon by Dobson in v. Domaszewski - Dobson VI-VII, who above all stresses the importance of applying chronological criteria to the Rangordnung. This is done in the present paper, as much as all the inscriptions studied belong to the period II century – end of the Severan dynasty.

of pay grades to bear in this question. On v. Domaszewski's three stages of junior staff officers, „taktische Chargen”, and senior staff officers he writes: “...the three groups of posts do not constitute separate stages on the *cursus*, but only have the general usefulness of grouping together posts of similar status and/or function. Separate stages, if any indeed formally existed, are more likely to be found in the pay grades.”<sup>32</sup>

Before dealing with the possible consequences that the Cappadocian inscription has concerning our picture of the Rangordnung, it is necessary to say something about the other rank in the text, the *tubicen*. *Tubicines* are generally far better known than *optiones carceris*, and this is true for the praetorian cohorts as well: they appear for instance in some *laterculi* (CIL VI 2375. 2379. 2382).<sup>33</sup> Concerning the rank of *tubicen*, it has always been thought that it was the highest rank of the three different kinds of trumpeters in the Roman army, the *tubicines*, the *cornicines*, and the *bucinatores*.<sup>34</sup> Vegetius, for example, writes *Tubicines, cornicines et bucinatores qui tuba vel aere curvo vel bucina committere proelium solent* (Veg. 2. 7) and *Habet praeterea legio tubicines, cornicines, bucinatores* (Veg. 2. 22). Furthermore, we have two official lists where *principales* of different rank are listed, presumably in hierarchical order (CIL III 7449 from AD 155; VIII 2564 from late Severan times, cf. D 470). In these inscriptions the *tubicen* always precedes the *cornicen*.

Now, however, a recent discovery gives a different order: in a list of more than one hundred naval soldiers from Ravenna ten different classes of *principales* and *immunes* can be discerned. Among them is a group of two *cornicines*, which ranks higher than three *tubicines*.<sup>35</sup>

The contradiction cannot be explained by chronological factors, as all the evidence, including the inscription from Ravenna, belongs to a period

<sup>32</sup> Breeze, *Organization* 245; cf. *Idem*, *Pay Grades* 131. 134.

<sup>33</sup> F. Lammert, RE VII A (1939) 754f. s.v. *tubicen*. The largest survey of *tubicines* is in Cauer, 'de muneribus militaribus centurionatu inferioribus', Eph. Ep. IV, 377f.

<sup>34</sup> Most recently the question has been treated by M. Speidel, who also provides a thorough treatment of the *bucinatores*, see M. Speidel, *Eagle-Bearer and Trumpeter*, BJ 176 (1976) 123-63 (= *Roman Army Papers I*, 1984, 3-43), espec. 160 for the hierarchy.

<sup>35</sup> G. Susini, *Un catalogo classario ravennate*, StudRomagn 19 (1968) 291-307 = AE 1985, 401.

from the mid II / early III century. The navy might of course have adopted a somewhat different Rangordnung for its trumpeters, as it did for some ranks.<sup>36</sup>

It would therefore seem wise primarily to regard the new Ravennate evidence as pertaining to the navy. But it might have some bearing on the legions and the Rome cohorts.<sup>37</sup> As stated above, Sander has argued that the „taktische Chargen” and the senior staff officers constituted groups of soldiers who were equal in rank. Von Domaszewski himself depicts a similar situation for the lower ranks among the *principales* of the *vigiles*: there were no fixed Rangunterschiede for the *immunis tribuni*, *secutor*, *codicillarius*, *exceptor* and *librarius*.<sup>38</sup> Perhaps there is reason to question a strict Rangordnung among *aeneatores* in the legions and Rome cohorts, too.

Should we also consider the *optio carceris* as belonging to the same category? Our inscription places this rank above that of *tubicen*, while for the urban cohorts we know that in one case the *optio carceris* ranked above the *secutor* and *optio valetudinari*, but below such low posts as *singularis* and *beneficiarius tribuni* in the early II century (CIL IX 1617 = D 2117). It has recently been thought that the rank of *optio carceris* varied according to the military unit. He is sometimes considered an *immunis* with a normal pay (D 2117), sometimes a *principalis* with pay-and-a-half.<sup>39</sup> This again may be taken as an indication of a fluctuating Rangordnung.

In our case, considering also Caesius Verus' further advancement to *evocatus*, the rank of *optio carceris* would certainly seem to belong to the *principales sesquiplicarii*.

#### 4. *Evocatus*

After serving for 16 years in the Guard, our man continued his

---

<sup>36</sup> Ch. Starr, *The Roman Imperial Navy 31 B.C. - A.D. 324<sup>2</sup>*, London 1969, 56-61.

<sup>37</sup> Susini 304f. writes «Secondo alcuni l'ordine seguito da Vegezio nel nominare i suonatori rispetterebbe una gerarchia, che peraltro il catalogo ravennate modificherebbe antepoendo i cornicines ai tubicines». But such a definite conclusion is hardly warranted.

<sup>38</sup> Sander 96-100; v. Domaszewski - Dobson 13.

<sup>39</sup> Breeze, *Titles optio and magister* 129.

service as an *evocatus*, i.e. a member of a special force that did not belong to any of the normal army branches.<sup>40</sup> One distinction has already been noted above: the *evocati* served *in calceo*, not *in caliga*. Furthermore, the *evocati* received *salaria*, not *stipendia* like the regular soldiers and centurions. There are, however, exceptions to be found on this point, i.e. *evocati* who speak of *stipendia*.<sup>41</sup> Our inscription provides one more such case.

There is a further detail in connection with the *evocatio* of Caesius Verus that does not correspond to normal practice, and one that is of greater relevance. Caesius was chosen from the praetorian cohorts, and this is indeed almost the only way to join the *evocati*. But his rank when receiving the *evocatio* was surprisingly and unprecedentedly low.

D. Breeze has studied the promotion from *principalis* of the praetorian cohorts to *evocatus*, and states that this usually took place among holders of senior staff posts, such as *beneficiarii praefecti praetorio*, *cornicularii tribuni* etc., posts that were many steps higher than the junior staff post held by Caesius. Exceptions are to be found, though: during the I century two cases of promotion from the „taktische Chargen“ (*optio*, *signifer*) to *evocatus* are recorded. Later, although the material is much richer, only one similar case is known.<sup>42</sup>

But even a *signifer* or a true *optio* were of much higher standing than an *optio carceris*.

How should this baffling situation be interpreted? Perhaps Mitford in the ZPE was right after all when he equated the *optio carceris* with the true *optio*? But against such an assumption stands the evidence for the existence of the *optio carceris* as a separate, distinctive post, not to speak of the common use of *optio* for other tasks. Clearly, these ranks were not equivalent to a true *optio*.

One consideration must be to take notice of the chronological aspect. Perhaps the inscription is much earlier than has been thought and belongs to the I century, when irregularities in promotions were more frequent?<sup>43</sup>

<sup>40</sup> DE II. 3 (1922) 2173-76 s.v. *evocatio*; Durry, 117-26.

<sup>41</sup> Listed in DE II. 3 (1922) 2175.

<sup>42</sup> Breeze, *Organization* 247. The exceptions are D 2060. 2086. 2143.

<sup>43</sup> The full nomenclature of Caesius Verus might also point to an earlier date, cf. the results achieved by M. Clauss, *Zur Datierung stadtrömischer Inschriften: tituli militum praetorianorum*, *Epigraphica* 35 (1973) 55-95. The fact that Caesius Verus died as a centurion of the V Macedonica in Cappadocia could be

But another tentative explanation comes to one's mind when remembering the unusual beginning of Caesius Verus' career. If he benefited from a recommendation at the outset, perhaps a similar act of patronage might explain his unprecedented entry into the *evocati* later on.

Nor did his advance stop there. Seven years later he became a centurion of a legion. Such a promotion is often regarded as nothing unusual for an *evocatus*. Still, it is far from being the rule. According to E. Birley, for about 280 known *evocati*, a promotion to centurion is known for about 12%.<sup>44</sup>

### 5. *Fuit ordine* ; general remarks on the career of the centurions

The last part of Caesius Verus' career is described by the sentence *centurio factus est in leg(ione) (quinta) Mac(edonica)*. Then his position among the centurions is specified: *Fuit ordine in sexta hastatus posterior*. *Ordo* is a synonym for *centuria*, and *esse ordine* in this case means serving as a centurion, an expression hitherto unknown, as far as I know. The meaning of the whole sentence is that Caesius Verus was the lowest ranking of the six centurions in the sixth cohort of the legion.

The formula used to express Caesius' position as centurion provides the incentive for some minor comments on a recent work by M. P. Speidel. In short, Speidel shows that besides the complete expression *centurio legionis X cohorte sexta hastatus posterior* there existed a more idiomatic way of expressing the centurion's position among his 60 colleagues or so in the legion: *centurio legionis X sextus hastatus posterior*. Therefore, when numerals appear in inscriptions, one should read e.g. *VI (sextus) hast. post.* and not *VI (sexta) (cohorte) hast. post.*, an explanation once proposed by Mommsen and often subscribed to.<sup>45</sup>

---

fitted in with earlier known operations of that legion in the east (see Mitford 178). But, on the other hand, his detailed *cursus* as *immunis (principalis)* speaks against a dating to the I century; Sander 88f. and 95f. points out that the first complete career inscription which includes the NCO posts is from the early II century. Probably the present inscription is to be dated to that period, too, rather than to the eastern campaign of L. Verus as Mitford suggested.

<sup>44</sup> E. Birley, *Evocati Aug.: A Review*, ZPE 43 (1981) 29.

<sup>45</sup> M. Speidel, *The Centurions' Titles*, Epigraphische Studien 13 (1983) 43-46.

Speidel's explanation is most welcome, because it has important consequences for many cases where misinterpretations of complicated military titularity has caused confusion until now.<sup>46</sup> However, it would seem that Speidel's theory is not applicable to all the cases he lists, a fact that is suggested in the light of the present inscription. The formula *in sexta (cohorte) hastatus posterior* makes it certain that Mommsen's hypothesis holds true in some cases. Speidel mentions three inscriptions where we find similar constructions with *in* + numeral; I suggest we fill in (*cohorte*) rather than accept expressions like *militavit in secundo principe posteriore*:<sup>47</sup>

CIL VI 3584 = D 2656: ...*militavit (centurio) in II (secunda) (cohorte) pr(inceps) post(erior)*).

CIL XIII 6728: ...*ab imperatore o]rdinibu[s adscriptus ?] in X (decima) (cohorte) pil (us) p[r(ior)]*).

IGLS 9187: ...*militavit an(nos) XXI usqu(e) in IV (quarta) (cohorte) hast(atu)s post(erior)*).

These changes in no way diminish the general value of Speidel's theory.

Caesius' inscription thus has some significance for the understanding of the centurions' titles and ranks. Of greater importance, however, would seem to be another inscription published by T. Mitford in the same issue of the ZPE:

*D(is) M(anibus) / P. Turrano / P. f. Papir(ia tribu) Be-lluno Severo.  
/ (Centurioni) leg(ionis) XV Apol(linaris) VI (sexto) h(astato)  
pr(iori) et leg(ionis) / IIII F(laviae) V (quinto) pr(incipi) pos(teriori).  
/ Vix(it) ann(is) XLI. / Ex heredum / cur(avit) Turranos /  
Epaphrodeitos lib(ertus) eius.*

(ZPE 71 [1988] 171 no. 2 from Satala)

---

<sup>46</sup> See Speidel, *The Centurions' Titles* passim, e.g. among the inscriptions in need of revision no. 2 (CIL III 195), no. 3 (CIL III 263), no. 6 (D 4311), no. 32 (BRGK 27 [1937] 107).

<sup>47</sup> The following three inscriptions are no. 8, 12, and 20 in Speidel, *The Centurions' Titles*. Speidel argues for his solution citing Cic. ad Brut. 1, 8, 2: *octavum principem duxit* (p. 53).



Mitford correctly expands most of the abbreviations for Turranius' rank (but it is incomprehensible why he writes that Turranius was *h(astati) pr(ioris) (optio)* of the leg. XV Apollinaris.<sup>48</sup> This soldier had been a centurion in two legions: (*centurio*) leg. XV Apol. VI (*sextus*) *h(astatus) pr(ior)* and (*centurio*) leg. IV *F(laviae) V (quintus) pr(inceps) pos(terior)*, indeed a fine example of how Speidel's theory worked in actuality.

What is most noteworthy in this inscription is that both centurionates are specified. When Turranius was transferred to his new legion, he was moved to a centuria of another order, from the sixth to the fifth. He was also given a new place among the centurions of his cohort, the fifth place rather than the third place that he had held in his previous cohort.

The present inscription is virtually unique in the way it specifies this transfer, and has considerable importance for the discussion of the Rangordnung of the centurions. It is clear that the centurions of the first cohort constituted the highest level, led by the *primus pilus* (usually it is assumed that they could collectively be called the *primi ordines*. But the scarceness of our material has not permitted unanimity to be reached regarding the hierarchy among the other centurions and it has even been suggested that the centurions of cohortes II-X in the legion were of equal rank, differing only in seniority.<sup>49</sup>

Assuming that the transfer from the command of one centuria to another was a promotion, which has not been proven, many elaborate schemes have been suggested for these supposed promotions. A common feature of all these theories is that they are mostly proven wrong by our inscription because they assume too strict a scheme.<sup>50</sup> In the case of Turranius, the transfer seems indeed to have meant a promotion, as he is moved upwards, in the direction of the I cohort. But there seems to be no

---

<sup>48</sup> Mitford 172.

<sup>49</sup> See Dobson's comment in von Domaszewski - Dobson XXIII-XXV; Idem, ANRW II. 1 (1974) 407f.; also Passerini, DE IV (1949) 591-94; E. Birley, Carnuntum Jahrbuch 1963/64, 21-33.

<sup>50</sup> The various suggestions are presented in detail in the literature mentioned in n. 49. There is now a very recent contribution by K. Strobel, Bemerkungen zur Laufbahn des Ti. Claudius Vitalis, Tyche 2 (1987) 203-09, who discusses CIL VI 3586 = D 2656. He proposes a modified version of von Domaszewski's theory of „Stufenavancement“ and „Staffelavancement“. Even if the scheme might still be too complicated, the case of Caesius Verus does fit into it.

special relation between the centuria he belonged to, and the new one he is posted to; Turranius moves from *hastatus* to *princeps*, and from one of the *priores* to one of the *posteriores*. The only rule that seems to impose itself is that every post in a higher cohort ranked over the post in a lower cohort (perhaps with the exception of the *primi pili* of cohorts II-X), and that transfers, when they were intended as promotions, were made accordingly.

#### 6. *Ordinatus*. Conclusions regarding the career of Caesius Verus

In this final section we return to the career of Caesius Verus. There is one more item in his inscription that might be worth paying attention to, namely the expression used for the first promotion: he was *ordinatus tubicen*. The term *ordinatus* might be a mere participle, a synonym of *factus est*, but I suggest that it has some further significance, that it is used as a technical term.

The significance of the terms *ordinatus* and *ordinarius* in connection with the status of centurions and other soldiers has been much discussed.<sup>51</sup> It is not possible in this paper to cover all the aspects of this question, it must suffice to discuss the cases where *ordinatus* is used for soldiers below the rank of centurions.<sup>52</sup> We know some cases where *ordinatus* is combined with a special rank (the cases where *ordinatus* stands alone will not concern us here, as those cases are thought to be centurions):

CIL XI 20 ...*miles coh. XII urb. et coh. IIII pr., ordinatus architec(tus)*...

---

<sup>51</sup> The best study is still F. Gilliam's, *The ordinarii and ordinati of the Roman Army*, TAPA 71 (1940) 127-48, now in *Idem, Roman Army Papers*, 1-22 with Additions p. 442. It also contains a full bibliography on this question. Among others Gilliam 134f. points to some inscriptions where he holds that *ordinatus* is used as a mere participle, e.g. (*centurio*) ... *ordinatus ex eq. Rom. ab domino Imp.* (CIL V 7865. 7866).

<sup>52</sup> I hope to be able to return to this whole question soon in the future. I now think that the categories that should be distinguished are a) centurions called *ordinarii*, b) soldiers with special posts called *ordinarii*; actually only *medici* are known, c) centurions called *ordinati*, d) soldiers with special posts called *ordinati* (the group treated here), e) *ordinati* without further specification.

CIL VI 30715 [-] *ordinatus*

CIL VI 130 *ord. custos vivari coh. praet.*

CIL VI 2379 = VI 32520 list of praetorians with several cases of MO, expanded by some to stand for *m(ensor o(rdinatus)* <sup>53</sup>

As can be seen, only two cases are certain *ordinati*, while for two the expansion is not sure. To this group can be added a new inscription<sup>54</sup> :

AE 1979, 89 ...*mil. coh. III pr. ...plumba(rius) ordina(tus/rius)*

Even if the expansion in the new case is not sure, it fits well into the current explanation for the use of the epithet *ordinatus*: it was used in order to distinguish members of the army's technical specialists from their civilian counterparts.<sup>55</sup> In support of this theory one can point to many *architecti, mensores* as well as *plumbarii* outside the army; however, I would still like to question this explanation strongly. Firstly, for a *tubicen* there seems considerably less risk of being confused with a civilian counterpart, even though some ceremonial *tubicines* actually did exist in Rome (D 2707a = CIL IX 3609, D 6285 = CIL X 6101, D 6286 = CIL X 5393). Secondly, only a very small minority of the technicians in the army used the epithet *ordinatus*. Why is that if it was thought a necessary mark of distinction? Thirdly, *ordinatus* is mostly encountered in epigraphic circumstances, where nobody would think of the task as being civilian, and no distinction would therefore be needed.<sup>56</sup> This also goes for Caesius Verus' epitaph, where surely *ordinatus* is not needed in order to point out that he was a *tubicen* in the army!

If the present explanation for the use of *ordinatus* is not accepted,

---

<sup>53</sup> Expansion in v. Domaszewski - Dobson 25, but doubted by Gilliam, *The ordinarii* 147f.

<sup>54</sup> Published by S. Panciera, *Actes du VII<sup>e</sup> Congrès International d' Epigraphie Greque et Latine*, Bucuresti-Paris 1979, 432.

<sup>55</sup> Gilliam, *The ordinarii* 147f.

<sup>56</sup> This point is made by Gilliam, *The ordinarii* 146 n. 79.

what then was the reason for its use? I would tentatively suggest that it might have been a mark of distinction of some kind, or indicated a recommendation or the working of the mechanism that led to the appointment or promotion. Among the mechanisms in the administration of the Roman army, a special process might have existed, still unknown to us, an *ordinatio* that led to the epithet *ordinatus* being used for various posts in the lower ranks.<sup>57</sup>

It might even be that *tubicen ordinatus* was the rank Caesius Verus received when he was recruited, and that the hypothetical *ordinatio* referred to this special and, considering his age, rather unusual event.

I think this explanation for the meaning of *ordinatus* can be strengthened by the other extreme features encountered in Caesius' career. He was enlisted at 14, perhaps already then *ordinatus tubicen*, or, benefiting from some kind of protection, reached that stage later on. He did not hold any of the higher ranks *in caliga*, that must be admitted (if indeed the *optio ad carcerem* is equal to the *optio carceris*). But he had not fallen out of favour in high places when he was picked as an *evocatus*, nor did his career stop before he reached a legionary centuriate.

Taken all together, the indications of patronage help explain his cursus, his promotions and, perhaps, the epithet *ordinatus*.

\* \* \*

A last minute discovery turns up the epitaph NSA 1916, 105 no. 104 from Rome: *D(is) M(anibus) L. Magio Marcellino mil. coh. III pr. (centuria) Herenni, tubice (sic) ordinato, M. Volusius Maximinus h. f. c.* This second case of a *tubicen ordinatus* should be added to the short list on pp. 38f. and it strengthens the argument that we are dealing with a technical term (and not with a participle) in the case of Caesius Verus.

---

<sup>57</sup> *Ordinatio* is found for instance in Vegetius, where it has meanings like “arrangement” or “battle order” (cf. 1. 26, 2. 1, 2. 4, 2. 7, 2. 9, 2. 17, 2. 23, 3. 14, 3. 15, 3. 19, 4. 2, 4. 45).