

XVII.—*Milites Caligati*

J. F. GILLIAM

YALE UNIVERSITY

Scholars have been unable to agree whether centurions were included among the *milites caligati*. New evidence is now available which proves that auxiliary centurions were *caligati* at the time of Severus Alexander. The other evidence, however, when collected and examined raises a number of problems, which require study in detail before conclusions can be reached.

Both in literary texts and in inscriptions one finds certain soldiers described as *caligati* or as serving *in caliga*. It is clear that a *signifer*, for example, was included in their number and that an *evocatus* was not. But whether centurions were *caligati* remains a problem, and one of some interest in connection with the position of centurions in general. For if they did serve *in caliga*, this fact would indicate that in a fundamental classification of military personnel they were grouped with the ordinary soldier in the ranks. On the other hand, if they were not *caligati*, their status was expressly recognized as quite distinct from that of those inferior to them in rank. Evidence has recently appeared which makes possible and necessary a new study of the question.<sup>1</sup>

A number of scholars have had occasion to define *caligatus* and related terms. Mommsen in an article on the *Evocati Augusti* concluded that *militia in caliga* was opposed not to the centurionate but only to the *evocatio*. Centurions as well as *gregales* were *caligati*.<sup>2</sup> This was also the view of De Ruggiero.<sup>3</sup> Marquardt, without reference to *evocati*, regarded *militia caligati* as the service of the common soldier, including that of centurions. A distinction from *militia equestris* was implied.<sup>4</sup> A similar position was maintained by Saglio,

<sup>1</sup> *Dura Papyrus* 3, quoted below, cf. note 46. The fullest collections of evidence, though none is complete, are those in *TLL*, Marquardt, and the articles of Mau and Saglio (below, notes 4-6).

<sup>2</sup> *Eph. epigr.* 5 (1884) 152, 154 = *Gesammelte Schriften*, 8 (Berlin, 1913) 459, 461. He confined himself to epigraphical evidence.

<sup>3</sup> *Dizionario epigrafico* 2.31.

<sup>4</sup> J. Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, 2<sup>2</sup> (Leipzig, 1884) 543-544. This edition was revised by A. von Domaszewski, but he retained the wording of the edition of 1876 in the passage cited.

apparently quite independently.<sup>5</sup> Despite differences in details, all agreed that centurions were *caligati*.

Mau, on the other hand, stated that *caliga* designated service below that of centurion,<sup>6</sup> and A. von Domaszewski explained *caligatus* as a general term for a soldier under the rank of *evocatus*.<sup>7</sup> The latter view has recently been supported by M. Durry.<sup>8</sup> The weight of authority, therefore, on each side of the question is considerable.

Obviously the character of the evidence available has been responsible for the variety in the conclusions arrived at, for many of the texts are indecisive and capable of more than one interpretation. For this reason they require close examination. The evidence can be divided into four classes: literary, juristic, epigraphical, and papyrological.

The literary evidence<sup>9</sup> in particular is rather inconclusive. In several passages Marius is said to have risen to the consulship *a caliga*, or the like.<sup>10</sup> Whatever the truth of the matter may be,<sup>11</sup> one can conclude nothing more than that *caliga* was used for service in the lower ranks of the army.<sup>12</sup> None of the authors cited is earlier than the middle of the first century A.D., but in all probability

<sup>5</sup> DS 1.849–850. Saglio stressed the importance of Josephus, *BJ* 6.85. Among those who have stated that centurions were *caligati*, but without discussion or citation of evidence, are H. Furneaux in commenting on Tac. *Ann.* 1.41 in his edition and more recently (1935) Weynand, *RE* Supplementband 6.1370, s.v. "Marius." R. Cagnat and V. Chapot, in a summary of the archaeological evidence, defined *caliga* as "la chaussure militaire romaine, celle qui convenait aux soldats jusqu'au grade de centurion . . .," *Manuel d'archéologie romaine*, 2 (Paris, 1920) 320, cf. 335–337.

<sup>6</sup> *RE* s.v. "Caliga."

<sup>7</sup> "Die Rangordnung des römischen Heeres," *Bonner Jahrbücher*, 117 (1908) 2, note 5. He did not argue the point, but doubtless the statement was not made without consideration. Domaszewski had such a detailed knowledge of the Roman army that his opinions deserve the greatest attention.

<sup>8</sup> *REL* 13 (1935) 103 and again in his excellent study, *Les cohortes prétorienne* (Paris, 1938) 95, 121 note 4, 129 note 1; cf. index, 416.

<sup>9</sup> I have not seen *Comment. Lucan.* 6.144, to which *TLL* refers, s.v. "caligatus." For *calceus* and *centurio* in Iuv. 16, see Durry, *REL* 13 (1935) 102–104.

<sup>10</sup> Sen. *Dial.* 10.17.6: Marius caliga dimisit: consulatus exercet; Sen. *Benef.* 5.16.2: Ingratus C. Marius ad consulatus a caliga perductus; Ampel. 18.15: Gaius Marius qui in Africa Numidis in Gallia Cimbris Teutonibusque superatis a caliga pervenit usque septimum consulatum; Ps.-Quint. *Decl.* 3.19: (Marius is being addressed) commendem tibi ordinem caligati militis quem velut incrementorum tuorum natalem libenter ab alto respici?

<sup>11</sup> Marius was probably of equestrian origin and likely began his military service in an equestrian post; see Weynand, *RE* Supplementband 6.1369–1370.

<sup>12</sup> For extravagant statements in political propaganda during the Republic, cf., e.g., Syme, *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford, 1939) 78–79. In any case, to his senatorial enemies a fine distinction between centurion and *gregalis* would be of little consequence.

*caliga* was used in their sources. Essentially the same statement as to his origin was made by the enemies of P. Ventidius,<sup>13</sup> and that the term was in common use at that time may also be gathered from the description of the Senate in 41 B.C. as *βουλή καλιγᾶτα*.<sup>14</sup>

It is well known that Caligula derived his nick-name from *caliga*. The point seems to have been two-fold: that as a young child he was dressed in military rather than in civilian fashion<sup>15</sup> and that he wore the costume of a common soldier.<sup>16</sup> But even from the latter point of view, his *gregalis* or *manipularis habitus* would seem to be in contrast not to the uniform of a centurion but to that of a general and a Caesar, such as his father Germanicus.

*Caligatus* appears twice in Suetonius where it can be rendered as "common soldier."<sup>17</sup> Tertullian writes of *militia* . . . *etiam caligata* with the same connotation,<sup>18</sup> and the same can be said of pseudo-Quintilian also.<sup>19</sup> A passage in Josephus is more precise. A certain centurion is described as wearing *caligae* during the war in Judaea.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>13</sup> Plin. *Nat.* 7.135: triumphare P. Ventidium de Parthis voluit quidem solum, sed eundem in triumpho Asculano Cn. Pompei duxit puerum, quamquam Masurius auctor est bis in triumpho ductum, Cicero mulionem castrensis furnariae fuisse, plurimi iuventam inopem in caliga militari tolerasse. Cf. Syme, *PBSR* 14 (1938) 21; *Roman Revolution* 71, 92.

<sup>14</sup> Dio Cassius 48.12.3. He adds, ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν στρατιωτικῶν ὑποδημάτων χρήσεως.

<sup>15</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 1.41: quem militari vocabulo Caligulam appellabant; Suet. *Cal.* 9.1: Caligulae cognomen castrensi ioco traxit, quia manipulario habitu inter milites educabatur; Dio Cassius 57.5.6: ὃν Γάιον Καλιγόλαν, ὅτι ἐν τῷ στρατοπέδῳ τὸ πλεῖστον τραφεῖς τοῖς στρατιωτικοῖς ὑποδήμασιν ἀντὶ τῶν ἀστικῶν ἐχρήτο, προσωνόμαζον; Suidas s.v. Καλλιγόλας, who also has the phrase τοῖς στρατιωτικοῖς ἐχρήτο ὑποδήμασιν; Aur. Vict. *Caes.* 3.4: quia natus in exercitu, unde cognomentum calceamento militari quaesiverat.

<sup>16</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 1.69: ambitiose filium ducis gregali habitu circumferat Caesaremque Caligulam appellari velit; cf. the passage from Suetonius cited in the previous note.

<sup>17</sup> Aug. 25.3: vallares ac murales coronas . . . quam parcissime et sine ambitione ac saepe etiam caligatis tribuit; Vit. 7.3: Vitellius . . . tota via caligatorum quoque militum obvios exosculans.

<sup>18</sup> *Idol.* 19: at nunc de isto quaeritur, an fidelis ad militiam converti possit, et an militia ad fidem admitti etiam caligata, vel inferior quaeque, cui non sit necessitas immolationum vel capitalium iudiciorum. Neither necessity would ordinarily fall upon a centurion. Cf. A. S. Hoey, *Yale Classical Studies*, 7 (1940) 201-202.

<sup>19</sup> *Decl.* 3.15: tribunus fuit; et hic miles. fuit tribunus. hoc dicis, cui parere caligatum lex iubet qui non solum militibus, sed centurionibus praepositus partem quandam imperatoriae potestatis obtinet.

<sup>20</sup> BJ 6.81: 'Ιουλιανὸς δὲ τις ἑκατοντάρχης τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς Βιβυλίας; and 6.85: τὰ γὰρ ὑποδήματα πεπαρμένα πυκνοῖς καὶ ὀξεσιν ἡλούς ἔχων, ὥσπερ τῶν ἄλλων στρατιωτῶν ἕκαστος. Julianus' foot-gear is mentioned because he had the misfortune to slip. Zonar. 6.22 gives merely an abridgment of Josephus' text.

It does not necessarily follow that all centurions wore *caligae* at all times,<sup>21</sup> but still the evidence is valuable.<sup>22</sup>

*Caligatus* or an equivalent occurs four times in the *Digest* and once each in the *Codex* of Justinian and in the *Novels*. It was therefore a technical term at the end of the second century and in the first half of the third,<sup>23</sup> and it could still be used as such as late as the time of Justinian.<sup>24</sup> Unfortunately, however, the jurists do not define *caligatus*, and for the most part it is not clear whether more than *miles* is meant by it.<sup>25</sup> The exception is a citation from Ulpian,<sup>26</sup> which reads as follows: Quod ait praetor: 'qui ab exercitu dimissus erit': dimissum accipere debemus militem caligatum, vel si quis alius usque ad centurionem, vel praefectum cohortis vel alae vel legionis, vel tribunum sive cohortis sive legionis dimissus est. Here *centurio* seems to be distinguished from *miles caligatus*, but the fact

<sup>21</sup> Durry regards this instance as an exception, "Iulianus ayant pu pour le combat se contenter de brodequins de troupe": *REL* 13 (1935) 103, note 5. This is possible, if one assumes that centurions ordinarily did not wear shoes fit for combat. It is unfortunate that Josephus does not identify Julianus' unit. The phrase *ἐκατοντάρχης τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς Βιθυνίας* seems to indicate an auxiliary cohort, for it can hardly apply to any of the legions at Jerusalem. Pliny mentions *cohortes* in his province of Bithynia and Pontus (*Epist.* 10.21), one by name: the *cohors sexta equestris* (*Epist.* 10.106 and 107).

<sup>22</sup> Josephus knew Julianus personally, witnessed the incident he describes, and is, as is generally agreed, the best authority we have for the army of the early Empire.

<sup>23</sup> Venuleius Saturninus wrote in the time of the Antonines; the others in the first half of the third century.

<sup>24</sup> *Cod. Iust.* 5.4.21 (A.D. 426) contains the phrase *a caligato milite usque ad protectoris personam* and in *Novell. Iust.* 74.4.3 (A.D. 538) one finds *militēs armatos, quos lex caligatos appellat, hoc est viliores et obscuriores*. They are contrasted with those in *militiis honestioribus* (74.4.1). These two passages are interesting as showing the survival of the term *caligatus*, but since the *centurio* had disappeared in the fourth century, they do not bear directly on the question being discussed here; for the end of the centurionate see R. Grosse, *Römische Militärgeschichte von Gallienus bis zum Beginn der byzantinischen Themenverfassung* (Berlin, 1920) 115–116.

<sup>25</sup> *Dig.* 48.3.9 (Venuleius Saturninus): de militibus ita servatur, ut ad eum remittantur, si quid deliquerint, sub quo militabant: is autem, qui exercitum accipit, etiam ius animadvertendi in milites caligatos habet; *Dig.* 49.16.6.5: sed et caligatus, qui metu hostium languorem simulavit, in pari causa eis est (i.e., capite puniendus est); cf. *pr.*, omne delictum est militis . . .; *Dig.* 27.1.10. *pr.* (Modestinus): οὐ μόνον δὲ οἱ τὰς ἀπὸ καλῆς στρατείας καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς πριμιπλᾶριοι στρατευόμενοι, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ ὁπωσούν χρεῖας δημοσίας δῆμον Ῥωμαίων ἐνεκα ἀποδημήσαντες; πριμιπλᾶριοι should be deleted, as suggested by Mommsen. They are mentioned in adjoining passages. The subject of the title is *excusationes*. Two classes of soldiers are mentioned: those in *caliga* and those not. The limits of neither class are indicated, but the latter apparently includes those of equestrian and senatorial rank, as they are not covered elsewhere.

<sup>26</sup> *Dig.* 3.2.2. The work of Ulpian was probably written in the reign of Caracalla; Jörs, *RE*, s.v. "Domitius (88)," 1439–1440, 1505–1507. *Praefectum* . . . *legionis* is rather striking, as nearly all legions in Ulpian's time were commanded by *legati*.

that the two terms are listed separately does not necessarily mean that one could not be included in the other.<sup>27</sup>

In inscriptions *caligatus* and *in caliga* appear, to my knowledge, twelve times.<sup>28</sup> Some texts are so fragmentary or so questionable in their interpretation that they prove little more than that the terms were used in such remote areas as Dacia and Mauretania Tingitana.<sup>29</sup> Of the more complete texts, however, six involve *evocati*,<sup>30</sup> a fact which can hardly be explained as a result of mere chance. In one an *evoc(atus) Aug(usti)* dedicates an altar *quam caligatus voverat*,<sup>31</sup> and in four others service *in caliga* and as *evocatus* is also distinguished and plainly contrasted.<sup>32</sup> In another inscription a praetorian is described as *omnibus officiis in caliga functus* before becoming in turn *b(eneficiarius) pr(aefectorum) pr(aetorio)*, *evoc(atus) Aug(usti) ab act(is) fori*, centurion in two legions, and finally a *primipilaris*.<sup>33</sup> By comparison with an earlier account of the same man's career it is evident that *omnia officia* were in fact those of *tesserarius*, *optio*, and *signifer*.<sup>34</sup> *Omnia officia in caliga*, one may suspect, is perhaps merely a convenient and fine-sounding phrase to cover such routine offices held before the *evocatio* as the writer felt it tedious to

<sup>27</sup> One finds the phrase, e.g., *primi ordines et centuriones*, though the former are themselves centurions; *ILS 2452 = CIL 8.18065* (Lambaesis, A.D. 162); *ILS 2487 = CIL 8.2532 = 18042* (Lambaesis, the *adlocutio* of Hadrian). See also the examples of *milites et centuriones* in *TLL* s.v. "centurio" 838.

<sup>28</sup> I may mention here inscriptions from Ostia in which members of a *collegium fabrum tignuvariorum* are termed *numerus militum caligatorum*: *ILS 615 = CIL 6.1116 = 14.128* (A.D. 285); *ILS 1428 = CIL 14.160*; *ILS 6165 = CIL 14.374*.

<sup>29</sup> *CIL 9.5647* (Trea): om[ni] ho[nore in] caliga [functo?]; *CIL 8.21836* (Volubilis): ]caligatus[ and nothing more of significance; *CIL 3.12546* (Patavissa, Dacia): also very fragmentary but c]aligat is read; *CIL 6.33061* (Rome): ]in calceo et caliga[, presumably referring to an *evocatus*; *CIL 6.3053* (Rome): Mommsen interpreted the phrase *oleum in caligas* as follows: *caligae in hoc videntur esse ipsi milites gregarii*. The soldiers were *vigiles*.

<sup>30</sup> As probably also does *CIL 6.33061* (see note 29). *CIL 3.3484* (Aquincum, A.D. 219) as copied reads in part: quot clavi vovit vet(eranus) p[o]s(uit) leg(ionis) II Ad(iutricis) Anto(niniana). Mommsen remarked that for *clavi* either *in caliga* or *caligatus* is required.

<sup>31</sup> *ILS 2152 = CIL 11.3057* (Horta).

<sup>32</sup> *ILS 2077 = CIL 6.2440* (Rome): militavit in caliga ann(is) XVI evocatus fuit ann(is) III; *ILS 2149 = CIL 3.7108* (Smyrna): evocatus Aug(usti) militavit an(nis) in cal(iga) XVII in cal(ceo) VII; see M. Durry *REL* 13 (1935) 103, note 7; *CIL 6.37245a* (Rome): militavit . . . caligatus ann[is] . . . evocat[us] ann(is) IIII; *CIL 14.2288* (Ager Albanus): evo(catus) q(ui) vix(it) an(nis) LV cal(igatus) XVIII.

<sup>33</sup> *ILS 2085 = CIL 9.5840* (Auximum).

<sup>34</sup> *ILS 2084 = CIL 9.5839* (Auximum, A.D. 137).

enumerate.<sup>35</sup> If the soldier was *in caliga* when he was *beneficiarius*, as was almost certainly the case,<sup>36</sup> it is quite possible that he was *in caliga* again when centurion.<sup>37</sup> Most, if not all, of the inscriptions cited which give evidence of their date probably belong to the first two centuries of the Empire.<sup>38</sup>

In one or two inscriptions *caligatus* seems to be opposed to *centurio*. One, which probably dates ca. 250 A.D., reads in part: L. Cornelio Catoni (centurioni) leg(ionis) III Aug(ustae) qui et caligatus stip(endiorum) XIII.<sup>39</sup> *Qui et caligatus* was understood by the editor in the *Corpus*, G. Wilmanns, as a *signum*,<sup>40</sup> but this interpretation was rejected by Domaszewski<sup>41</sup> and is at least doubtful. Another funerary inscription, probably of a member of the *legio II Parthica*, seems to read: mil(itavit) calig(atu)s [a]n(nis) XXIII, (centurio) ann[i]s III.<sup>42</sup> It also is a third century document.<sup>43</sup> If the reading (centurio) is accepted,<sup>44</sup> it is clear that whoever drew up the text<sup>45</sup> distinguished between service as *caligatus* and as *centurio*.

New and important evidence for the meaning of *caligatus* is found in *Dura Papyrus* 3 recto.<sup>46</sup> This text, written in the reign of Severus

<sup>35</sup> Cf. *CIL* 9.5647: om[ni] ho[nore] in] caliga [functo, if the restorations are correct. Domaszewski discussed these two inscriptions in "Rangordnung" (see note 7) 2-3.

<sup>36</sup> Under no theory yet advanced would he not be; cf. Durry, *Les cohortes prétorienne* 95.

<sup>37</sup> In other words, the phrase *omnia officia in caliga* does not mean that all ranks held later were necessarily not *in caliga*.

<sup>38</sup> In particular those cited in notes 31-34. Most of these *evocati* were certainly praetorians; cf. Durry, *op. cit.* (see note 8) 118-120.

<sup>39</sup> *CIL* 8.2848 (Lambaesis): for the date see Mommsen in *Eph. epigr.* 5 (1884) 393. L. Cornelius Cato also appears in *CIL* 8.2554, which he mentions there.

<sup>40</sup> Wilmanns wrote: Hominem in castris adolevisse Caligati signo comprobari videtur. This explanation was accepted by M. Lambert, *Glotta* 4 (1913) 101 and L. R. Dean, *A Study of the Cognomina of Soldiers in the Roman Legions* (Princeton, 1916) 153.

<sup>41</sup> "Rangordnung," 2, 231. He does not explain what the point was in adding *qui et caligatus*.

<sup>42</sup> *CIL* 6.37264 (Rome). It has not been cited in discussions of *caligatus*.

<sup>43</sup> See Ritterling in *RE* s.v. "Legio," 1477 (the inscription is cited as *Ephem. epigr.* ix n. 662).

<sup>44</sup> The text of the inscription depends on two copies, neither of which is quite satisfactory. A. Bevignani copied what was interpreted later as a centurion sign; *NBAC* 10 (1904) 275. This was omitted entirely, and with no indication of a lacuna, by G. Schneider, *NBAC* 12 (1906) 157. There seems, however, hardly to be space for an abbreviation of *evocatus* or *salararius*.

<sup>45</sup> It is dedicated by the soldier's widow.

<sup>46</sup> Unpublished, but see *The Excavations at Dura-Europos . . . Preliminary Report of Fifth Season of Work* (New Haven, 1934) 296-297; M. Rostovtzeff, *Münchener Beiträge*, 19 (1934) 367-370.

Alexander,<sup>47</sup> is a sort of morning report or daily record of important data and events. The unit is the *cohors XX Palmyrenorum*, a *cohors miliaria equitata*. One piece of information given each day is the strength of the unit, presented in the following form: date, n(umerus) p( ) mil(itum) cal(igatorum) DCCCCXIIII in his ord(inati or inarii) VIIII dupl(icarii) VIII sesq(uiplicarius) I . . .<sup>48</sup> Neither the reading *p* nor its expansion, if accepted, is certain,<sup>49</sup> but this point does not seem of interest for the present discussion. It will be noticed, however, that among the *mil(ites) cal(igati)* are included the nine *ord.*, i.e. the centurions of the cohort.<sup>50</sup>

The importance of this information hardly needs to be stressed. *DP 3* is an official document drawn up in the orderly room of a unit and is beyond question the most weighty and clearest piece of evidence for the meaning of *caligatus* we have. It shows that centurions in auxiliary cohorts at the time of Severus Alexander were *caligati*, as was everyone in the cohort except the tribune.<sup>51</sup> *Militia caligata* here at least is contrasted simply with *militia equestris*.<sup>52</sup> Furthermore it seems a reasonable assumption that if auxiliary centurions were *caligati* at this time, they had always been.<sup>53</sup> But when this is said, the other evidence still must be considered. For, in view of *DP 3*, the question now is whether all centurions were at all periods *caligati*. With this in mind, the evidence presented above may be summarized and reviewed.

*Caligati* seem to have been found in every part of the army: among legionaries, praetorians, auxiliaries and *vigiles*.<sup>54</sup> None of the literary or juristic texts which speak of this class of soldier suggests that its members varied according to the type of unit. This is of course merely negative evidence, and by no means conclusive. But in the absence of definite proof to the contrary one may begin by assuming that what is known to be true in one part of the army also held in other divisions.<sup>55</sup>

<sup>47</sup> A.D. 223–235, as it cannot belong to the first year of his reign.

<sup>48</sup> Figures for the *dromedarii* and *equites* are also given.

<sup>49</sup> *P(erfectus)* is one possibility, as suggested by R. O. Fink, *AJPh* 63 (1942) 65.

<sup>50</sup> Whether *ord* is expanded as *ord(inati)* or *ord(inarii)*, it is quite certain from other texts that centurions are meant; see J. F. Gilliam, *TAPhA* 71 (1940) 139.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. the *pridiani*, in which the commander of the unit is not included in its strength: *BGU* 696 and that first published by A. S. Hunt in *Raccolta di scritti in onore di Giacomo Lumbroso (1844–1925)*, (Milan, 1925) 265–272.

<sup>52</sup> There would be no *evocati* in such a unit.

<sup>53</sup> There is no reason to believe that the status of centurions had ever been lowered.

<sup>54</sup> If Mommsen's explanation of *CIL* 6.3053 is correct (see note 29).

<sup>55</sup> The assumption has been made by all who have discussed the problem.

A significantly large proportion of inscriptions concern *evocati*, who were, as was seen above, a group distinct from the *caligati*. But it does not follow that the centurions, as their superiors, were also not *in caliga*. *Evocati* had a peculiar, quasi-civilian status, different from that of centurion and of *gregalis* alike. They not only served *in calceo* and not *in caliga*; they also served *salaria* and not *stipendia*.<sup>56</sup> As it is well known that centurions regularly served *stipendia* just as did *gregales*, it appears rash to assume that centurions served *in calceo* simply because *evocati* did. The reason — and some explanation is certainly necessary<sup>57</sup> — why *evocati* appear in so many of the *caligati* inscriptions is that definition of type of service would chiefly concern those whose careers included more than one kind. From the general absence of reference to *caliga* or *calceus* in the exceedingly numerous inscriptions of centurions of all types one may doubt that there was any distinction to be made in their case.

There are three pieces of evidence for the view that certain centurions were *caligati*: *Dig.* 3.2.2,<sup>58</sup> *CIL* 8.2848,<sup>59</sup> and *CIL* 6.37264.<sup>60</sup> The *Digest* citation is actually inconclusive.<sup>61</sup> Of the two inscriptions, one is capable of another interpretation<sup>62</sup> and the text of the other is not beyond suspicion.<sup>63</sup> In any event they are funerary texts set up privately, inaccuracies in which would not be astonishing. Still, though each of the three texts is in itself more or less questionable evidence, taken together they support one another.

In conclusion, one may state with assurance that auxiliary centurions were *caligati*, at least until the time of Alexander. Beyond this there seem to be three possibilities. First, all centurions may have been *caligati* as long as their rank existed. Second, all cen-

<sup>56</sup> See Mommsen, *Gesammelte Schriften* 8.451–461; Durry, *Les cohortes prétorienne* 121, note 4. Centurions and *gregales* also shared certain decorations not received by *evocati*.

<sup>57</sup> Durry suggests, "l'évocat étant le premier gradé qui ait eu droit au *calceus*, on peut dire que le *calceus* lui-même était la caractéristique de l'évocat," *REL* 13 (1935) 103. But in most units, aside from the praetorian cohorts, there would be very few *evocati* and perhaps more often none at all. If one accepts Durry's definition of *caligatus*, therefore, the centurions would generally be the first in their unit to receive the right to the *calceus*.

<sup>58</sup> Cited above, cf. note 26.

<sup>59</sup> Above, cf. note 39.

<sup>60</sup> Above, cf. note 42.

<sup>61</sup> Above, and note 27.

<sup>62</sup> Above, and notes 40 and 41.

<sup>63</sup> See note 44.



turions may have been *caligati*, until the middle of the third century, when legionary and perhaps other centurions changed their status. Third, while auxiliary centurions were *caligati*, legionary and presumably praetorian centurions were never so described. Of the three possibilities the first and the second, which is simply the first slightly modified, seem to me most probable in the light of the present evidence.<sup>64</sup>

<sup>64</sup> To conclude that centurions were *caligati* is not to deny the distinction between *gregalis* and *centurio*, which is supported by abundant evidence of every type.