

PAY GRADES AND RANKS BELOW THE CENTURIONATE¹

By DAVID J. BREEZE

The career of Tiberius Claudius Maximus, published in the last volume of this *Journal*,² is unique. The relevant portion runs: *militavit eque(s) in leg(ione) VII C(laudia) p(ia) f(ideli)*,³ *factus qu(a)estor equit(um), singularis legati legionis eiusdem, vexillarius equitum*,⁴ *item bello Dacico ob virtute(m) donis donatus ab imp(eratore) Domitiano, factus dupli(carius) a divo Troiano in ala secu(n)d(a) Pannoniorum, a quo et fa(c)tus explorator in bello Dacico et ob virtute(m) bis donis donatus bello Dacico et Parthico, et ab eode(m) factus decurio in ala eade(m), quod cepisset Decebalu(m) et caput eius pertulisset ei Ranisstoru, missus voluntarius honesta missione a Terent[io Scau]rriano, consulare [exerci]tus provinciae nov[ae] . . .*⁵

His career not only contains two otherwise unattested posts, *quaestor equitum*⁶ and *singularis legati legionis*,⁷ but is unparalleled in the promotion from *principalis* in a legion to *duplicarius*, an alternative title for *optio*, in an auxiliary unit.⁸ Speidel assumes that this latter move involved a pay rise, since transfer from a legion to an *ala* would usually be accompanied by an increase in pay. This assumption if correct has such far reaching implications that it requires detailed examination.

¹ The normal abbreviations are used. Domaszewski-Dobson refers to A. von Domaszewski, *Die Rangordnung des römischen Heeres*, 2nd edn. by Dr. Brian Dobson (Köln 1967). Reference to the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* is by volume and inscription number alone, thus: II, 2554.

² M. Speidel, 'The Captor of Decebalus, a New Inscription from Philippi', *JRS* LX (1970), 142-153.

³ Speidel considered that, as the career is so detailed, earlier positions as *miles* and *discens equitum* had not been omitted from the stone, and Maximus accordingly had enlisted as an *eques* (l.c., 143). The lowest recorded *stipendia* of a legionary *eques* is four years (*AE* 1902, 41 = *ILS* 9090) and seven is the next lowest (v, 896 = *ILS* 2332), while only one auxiliary *eques* is certainly known to have enlisted as such (*BGU* 696, 28-32); cf. J. F. Gilliam, 'Dura Rosters and the *Constitutio Antoniniana*', *Historia* 14 (1965), 74-81, where the suggestion is made that *equites* had normally served as *pedites* for about ten years before promotion, though recruits when of sufficient merit and influence could enlist as *equites*. Many quite detailed careers, on the other hand, omit the lower posts, e.g. Florus must have held one or more posts between being made a *principalis* in A.D. 209 and his promotion, probably to *tesserarius*, in 213 (IX, 1609). It is therefore not certain that there are no omissions from the career of Maximus and that he had enlisted as an *eques*.

⁴ Speidel considered that these four posts could hardly have been held in less than five years (l.c., 143). This indeed would have been a minimum. Petronius Fortunatus at present stands alone in being promoted centurion after only four years service (VIII, 217 with p. 2353 = *ILS* 2658); the next lowest is thirteen years (XII, 2234 = *ILS* 2342), while the other two lowest *stipendia* known for *optiones* and *signiferi* are 6 and 8 (III, 2716; 4375; 5976 and 10525). It is therefore likely that Maximus had rather more than five years' service before being decorated as a *vexillarius equitum* (probably in 89), especially if he had enlisted as a *pedes*. If the *dona* awarded by Domitian are not placed in their correct position in the career but at the end of his service in the legion, which is not impossible, Maximus would have had ample time from before 89 to after 101, when he was appointed *duplicarius*, to hold the four posts.

⁵ When Maximus reached the rank of decurion, the rule of automatic retirement for *milites* after 25 (or 26) years service would cease to apply to him; centurions and decurions served for far longer than

this term. For long serving centurions see E. Birley 'Promotions and Transfers in the Roman Army, II: the Centurionate', *Carnuntum Jahrbuch* 8 (1963/4), 33. Presumably they could apply for discharge at any time after the completion of 25 years service. There are centurions who receive *honesta missio* like Maximus. It is unlikely that *missus voluntarius honesta missione* means more than this. For a discussion of the problem in relation to legionary centurions see B. Dobson, 'The Centurionate and Social Mobility during the Principate', *Recherches sur les Structures Sociales dans l'Antiquité Classique* ed. C. Nicolet (Paris 1971), 101 f.

⁶ Although the appearance of this post seems to suggest that the *equites legionis* had funds of their own, the existence of these funds is not necessarily evidence that the *equites* had a permanent commander (Speidel l.c., 144). Since the legionary cohort, a tactical unit in battle, did not have a permanent commander, it might have been considered that the *equites* did not need one either.

⁷ VI, 3339 and VI, 3614 each mention a *singularis legionis*, and A. Passerini (*Dizionario Epigrafico* 4, 605) rightly considered that they could equally well have been on the staff of the legionary legate or of the provincial governor. Since it is well-attested that the governors drew their *singulares* from the auxiliary units, it is perhaps probable that the above two soldiers, the only *singulares legionis* recorded apart from Maximus, were on the staff of the legate. C. Iulius Nepos, a *pedes singularis* buried at Lambaesis, may have been a legionary on the staff of the legate of III Augusta, as his brother, a *beneficiarius consularis*, undoubtedly was (VIII, 2911). *AE* 1957, 122, found in the legionary headquarters at Lambaesis, is a dedication by *equites singulares* who are possibly but not certainly legionaries.

⁸ There is only one other recorded promotion from a legion, in this case a *miles*, to *duplicarius* in an auxiliary unit (VIII, 2354 = *ILS* 305), though there are attested a number of promotions of legionaries to centurion (III, 8438 = *ILS* 2597; v, 8185 = *ILS* 9172; probably *P. Mich.* III, 164 and just possibly XII, 3177) and decurion (III, 647 = *ILS* 2538; VIII, 9370 = *ILS* 1357a(?); *AE* 1917/8, 74; *P. Mich.* III, 164 (2)). II, 2554 with *AE* 1910, 1; v, 522; III, 7449; VIII, 9002; 17619; x, 7580 = *ILS* 1358; and *AE* 1958, 156 (cited by Speidel, l.c., 146, n. 43 and 44) include no certain cases of direct promotion from a legion to centurion or decurion in an auxiliary unit.

When he was transferred from the legion VII Claudia to the *ala* II *Pannoniorum*, Maximus was appointed to a post receiving double pay, hence the suggestion that the move involved an increase in pay depends upon the rank and pay grade of the post from which he was transferred, *vexillarius equitum*. There is no evidence from the legions themselves for the position of the *vexillarius equitum*.⁹ Speidel argued,¹⁰ on the basis of a praetorian career (*optio equitum*, *vexillarius equitum*, *fisci curator*, *evocatus*, *centurio*¹¹), that in a legion the *vexillarius equitum* 'must be a rank equal to or higher than *optio equitum*'. Although comparison between the praetorian guard and the legions has to be made with care, in this case the comparison would seem to be valid, in view of the apparently similar positions occupied by the *vexillarii equitum* in both types of units. Speidel also considered that the '*vexillarius* in a legion received almost certainly pay-and-a-half'—and that a *vexillarius equitum* must have received even more—though pointing out that in the *cohors* XX *Palmyrenorum* the *vexillarius* received double pay.¹² In assigning the *vexillarius legionis* to that group of soldiers who received pay-and-a-half, Speidel is following Domaszewski, who placed the post in the second lowest of four pay grades.¹³ It is therefore necessary to examine the validity of this assumption and of Domaszewski's system of pay-grades before any conclusion can be reached concerning the rank and pay grade of the *vexillarius equitum legionis*.

Domaszewski's proposed four pay grades were: the *milites* and the *immunes*, that is the soldiers rendered immune from fatigues in return for carrying out other duties; the higher *immunes*, such as the junior staff officers, and the 'taktische Chargen', the holders of the posts in the century; the 'Beneficiarchargen', the senior staff officers; and the most senior staff officers, such as the *cornicularii*, the *optio spei* and the *aquilifer*.¹⁴ These four grades were based upon Domaszewski's own division of the posts below the centurionate into three major groups: the *immunes*, the *taktische Chargen* and the *Beneficiarchargen*.¹⁵ The basis of this tripartite division was a study of the careers of *immunes* and *principales* in all units of the army, but in particular the praetorian cohorts. In the guard the *taktische Chargen*—the posts of *tesserarius*, *optio* and *signifer* or *vexillarius*—formed one self-contained group, and to it were promoted soldiers who had held junior staff posts, such as *beneficiarius tribuni*¹⁶ and *singularis praefecti praetorio*,¹⁷ or technical posts, such as *architectus*¹⁸ and *librator*¹⁹; from it soldiers were promoted to senior staff posts, such as *fisci curator*,²⁰ *cornicularius tribuni*,²¹ and *beneficiarius praefecti praetorio*.²² After holding a number of senior staff posts promotion to the centurionate often followed, in most cases after the intervention of a short period of service as *evocatus*.²³ It was very rare, though not impossible, to be promoted from one of the *taktische Chargen*, the posts in the century, to *evocatus* and then to centurion.²⁴ The careers of soldiers in the urban cohorts²⁵ and the *vigiles*²⁶ follow

⁹ VIII, 2562 with *Neue Heidelberger Jahrbücher* 9, 150 is possibly but not certainly in hierarchical order.

¹⁰ o.c. 145.

¹¹ VI, 37191 = *ILS* 9190.

¹² o.c. 147.

¹³ Domaszewski-Dobson, 47 and 71.

¹⁴ *ibid.*, 71.

¹⁵ o.c. 1-6. This division only holds good for the first and second centuries; in the third century a different situation arises—as Domaszewski suggested, though on different grounds.

¹⁶ II, 2610 = *ILS* 2079; III, 2887 = *ILS* 9067; IX, 5809 = *ILS* 2078; XI, 710; *AE* 1933, 87. For a full discussion of the promotion patterns in the guard and other units see my forthcoming paper in *Epigraphische Studien*, 'The Career Structure below the Centurionate'.

¹⁷ III, 7334 = *ILS* 2080; VI, 2794; XI, 5646 = *ILS* 2081.

¹⁸ XI, 20 = *ILS* 2082.

¹⁹ VI, 2454 = *ILS* 2060.

²⁰ II, 2610 = *ILS* 2079; III, 7334 = *ILS* 2080; VI, 3661; 37191 = *ILS* 9190; X, 1763; XI, 5646 = *ILS* 2081.

²¹ VI, 2440 = *ILS* 2077.

²² VI, 2794; IX, 5839 = *ILS* 2085; XI, 20 = *ILS*

2082; XI, 710; XIII, 6728; *AE* 1933, 87.

²³ III, 7334 = *ILS* 2080; VI, 2755 = *ILS* 2145; VI, 2794; VI, 37191 = *ILS* 9190; VI, 32887; IX, 5839 = *ILS* 2085; XI, 20 = *ILS* 2082; XI, 395 = *ILS* 2648; XI, 710; XI, 5960; XIII, 6728; XIII, 6823; XIV, 4626 = *ILS* 2742; *AE* 1933, 87. For direct promotion from *cornicularius praefecti praetorio* to centurion, see II, 2664; III, 3846 = *ILS* 2652; VI, 1645 = *ILS* 2773; X, 1763; XI, 3108; XI, 6055 = *ILS* 2743; Pais 1253. Cf. B. Dobson and D. J. Breeze, 'The Rome Cohorts and the Legionary Centurionate', *Epigraphische Studien* 8 (1969), 100-117.

²⁴ V, 7160 = *ILS* 2086, from *optio* to *evocatus* and then centurion (some posts may have been omitted from this career); VI, 2454 = *ILS* 2060, from *tesserarius* to *evocatus*; V, 3371 and VI, 32520, a, 2, 21, from *signifer* to *evocatus*.

²⁵ VIII, 4874 = *ILS* 2116; IX, 1617 = *ILS* 2117.

²⁶ VI, 414b; VI, 2987 = *ILS* 2169; VI, 37295; X, 3880 = *ILS* 2171; XI, 1438; XI, 5693 = *ILS* 2666; VI, 1057 (1) 3 and VI, 1058 (4) 7; VI, 1057 (6) 13 and VI, 1058 (3) 6; VI, 1057 (2) 10 and VI, 1058 (3) 5; VI, 1057 (3) 3 and VI, 1058 (3) 3; VI, 1057 (6) 4 and VI, 1058 (4) 4.

a similar pattern, and Domaszewski considered that the same was also true of the legions.²⁷ However, in the legions the relationship between the *taktische Chargen* and the *Beneficiar-chargen* was not as simple as appears to be the case in the Rome cohorts, for not all the senior staff posts ranked above the posts in the century, as is clearly illustrated by the post of *optio*.

In the legions the post of *optio spei* or *optio ad spem ordinis* clearly was senior to many of the senior staff posts,²⁸ and promotion from it was, in every known instance, directly to the centurionate.²⁹ The post of *optio centuriae*, on the other hand, was of lower status than *signifer*, itself lower than *optio spei*.³⁰ It therefore has been argued that the two posts, *optio spei* and *optio centuriae*, differed in function and rank.³¹ This has been challenged by Passerini, who argued on the basis of the regulations of the *schola* of *optiones* at Lambaesis, which mentions *optiones ad spem* in the preamble but not in the list itself, that the function of the *optio spei* was the same as that of the *optio centuriae*.³² All *optiones* were hopeful of promotion to the centurionate, but the former had already been nominated and would be promoted at the earliest opportunity. It may also be noted that no *optio spei* is known to have previously served as a simple *optio centuriae*. It is not possible to argue that the post of *optio centuriae* was always held before the senior staff posts, for two soldiers are known to have been *optiones* after holding senior staff posts and yet were not entitled *optiones spei*.³³ Although it is possible that both these soldiers were really *optiones spei*, it is not necessary to assume that they were; there is probably another explanation. In the legions there seems to have been an attempt, from at least the end of the first century to the end of the Severan dynasty,³⁴ to increase the all-round experience of prospective centurions by promoting them successively through the post of *optio*, where they would have gained some experience of century command and organization, and a number of senior staff posts, where they would have been able to observe the administration in action, including the post of *signifer* (which entailed some paper-work) before advancing them to the centurionate.³⁵ Sometimes the prospective centurion would be an *optio* before holding senior staff posts, sometimes after, in which case having almost completed his training he would usually be placed upon the promotion lists and given the title *optio spei*. Promotion to the legionary centurionate was thus possible from one of the senior staff posts or *signifer* having previously been *optio*, or from *optio* having previously held one of the senior staff posts or *signifer*. It seems probable therefore that all the posts above and including the rank of *optio*, if not of the same status,³⁶ were of the same pay grade, especially since promotion from *optio* and more senior posts directly to the legionary centurionate was possible,³⁷ but not apparently from posts of lower

²⁷ Domaszewski-Dobson, 43.

²⁸ III, 12411 = *ILS* 2666b; *AE* 1937, 101; cf. III, 11135 = *ILS* 4311.

²⁹ III, 12411 = *ILS* 2666b; v, 7872; *AE* 1937, 101.

³⁰ III, 1124; III, 1202; VIII, 217 = *ILS* 2658; XII, 2029, demonstrate that *optio* was held before *signifer*; *AE* 1937, 101 shows the sequence *signifer, cornicularius, optio ad spem ordinis*.

³¹ Domaszewski-Dobson, 42; H. M. D. Parker, *The Roman Legions* (1958), 207.

³² Passerini, o.c. 595, on the basis of VIII, 2554.

³³ v, 7004; *AE* 1951, 194. The soldier in the latter inscription, after being *benefic(iarius) leg(ati)* and *cornicularius leg(ati)*, became *optio coh(ortis) I*, which may have been equivalent to *optio spei*.

³⁴ The career recorded in III, 12411, dating to the late first century, is the earliest corresponding to this pattern; that of III, 11135 = *ILS* 4311, probably dated to 235–238, the latest.

³⁵ III, 11135 = *ILS* 4311: *librari[u]s numeris, cus(tos) arm(orum), signif(er), optio o[cta]v[a] (?) pr(incipis) pr(ioris), candidatus*; III, 12411: *p(ene)f(iciarius) lega(ti), opt(io) ad spe(m) ordin(is), (centurio) leg(ionis)*; v, 7004: *[b(ene)f(iciarius)] legat(i), a comment(arius) [...].f., optio, centurio [leg]ionis*; VIII, 217 = *ILS* 2658: *librar(ius), tesser(arius), optio, signif(er), (centurio) factus ex suffragio leg(ionis)*; *AE* 1937, 101: *signif(ero), corn[icular]io), optio[n]i ad spe[m] ordi[n]is, (centurioni) leg(ionis)*; *AE* 1951, 194: *benefic(iarius) leg(ati), cornicularius leg(ati), optio coh(ortis) I. ILS* 8880—β(ενε)φ(ικιάριος)

καὶ ἀκομενταρῆσις καὶ κορνικουλάριος καὶ (ἐκατοντάρχος) γενόμενος τῆς ἡγεμ(ονίας)—is in a sense the exception which proves the rule, for this soldier held three posts on the staff of the governor of Arabia and none in the century, and went on to be a centurion on the same staff. (The soldiers recorded in III, 14178; v, 742 = *ILS* 2670 and VIII, 12128, whose careers do not follow the above pattern, probably date to the third century.) The only group of careers which do not fit into the system in this period are those of the *aquiliferi*. *Aquiliferi* are known to have been promoted from the ranks of the *signiferi* (v, 3375 = *ILS* 2339; v, 5832 = *ILS* 2338; and possibly VIII, 2568, 81 with VIII, 2796) and even from *miles* (XII, 2234 = *ILS* 2342), and advanced directly to the legionary centurionate (XII, 2234 = *ILS* 2342; XIII, 6646 and 6952), but no *aquilifer* is known to have served as an *optio*.

³⁶ The letter of Iulius Apollinaris, *P. Mich.* VIII, 466, 18 ff., demonstrates the subtle differences between apparently similar posts.

³⁷ Promotion from *optio* to legionary centurion: III, 14178; v, 942 = *ILS* 2670; v, 7004; VIII, 2554 and 18048, b, 22 = *ILS* 2445 with VIII, 2848; *optio spei*: III, 12411 = *ILS* 2666 b; v, 7872; *AE* 1937, 101; *signifer*: VIII, 217 = *ILS* 2658 and possibly XII, 3177 with XII, 3178; *aquilifer*: XII, 2234 = *ILS* 2342; XIII 6646; 6952; *beneficiarius consularis*: VIII, 17626; *cornicularius legat(i)*: VIII, 12128; *cornicularius consularis*: III, 6542 with 6543 with 6598; XIII 6803; *ILS* 8880; *cornicularius*: XIII, 1832.

rank.³⁸ Domaszewski's three groups of posts clearly do not define stages in the legionary *cursus* though they do retain their general usefulness in dividing the posts below the centurionate into natural groups.

The conclusion that the posts of the rank of *optio* and above in the legions may all have belonged to the same pay grade is directly opposed to Domaszewski's scheme of pay grades. In his scheme, the *milites* and the *immunes* received basic pay, the higher *immunes* and the *taktische Chargen* pay-and-a-half, the *Beneficiarchargen* double pay, and the most senior staff officers treble pay. However, the fourth pay grade, treble pay, has never been attested in the legions.³⁹ In the *auxilia*, on the other hand, it is clear that there were only three pay grades: basic, pay-and-a-half, and double pay.⁴⁰ The terms *sesquuplicarius* and *duplicarius*, while indicative of pay, were also apparently used as alternatives for *tesserarius*, the third-in-command of a century or *turma*, and *optio*, the second-in-command. Thus in 219, in the *turma Zebida* of *cohors xx Palmyrenorum*, five soldiers received double pay: two *duplicarii* or *optiones*, a *signifer*, a *vexillarius* and a *cornicularius*.⁴¹ Why there should be two *duplicarii* is uncertain, but this does not discredit the valuable information that the *signifer*, the *vexillarius* and the *cornicularius* all received double pay. Elsewhere on the two rosters of 219 and 222, Ulpius Severus appears in a century, and his rank the editors of the documents plausibly restore as *actuaris*.⁴² It is probable that this soldier also received double pay though the fragmentary state of the documents prevent certainty on this point. Assuming that he was a *duplicarius* an interesting situation arises, for the *actarius* was therefore a *duplicarius* and a *pedes*,⁴³ while the *cornicularius*, his senior,⁴⁴ was a *duplicarius* and an *eques*. Other *cornicularii* are known to have been *equites*. M. Caranthius Macrinus, when promoted *cornicularius* of the governor of Lugdunensis in 83, received the *stipendia* of an *eques*,⁴⁵ while Domaszewski pointed out that the relief on the tombstone of a *cornicularius praefecti praetorio* revealed that this soldier was also mounted.⁴⁶ There seems to be no special reason why these *cornicularii* should be *equites*. But three separate cases suggest that this is more than coincidental, and that these *cornicularii* of senior officers besides being *duplicarii* were also *equites*, probably simply as a means of increasing their pay. This would explain why no treble pay grade or 'triplicarius' has ever been attested. There was no need for such a grade; the senior *principales* could receive both double pay and extra pay as *equites*. In each unit there may, therefore, have been from three to six different rates of pay, the number depending on how much more the *equites* were paid than the *pedites*.⁴⁷ Thus in the legions the group of *principales* of the rank of *optio* and above, on the basis of analogy with the *auxilia*, would appear to be *duplicarii*; mostly *pedites*, but the most senior possibly *equites*.

³⁸ The only known promotion to a legionary centurionate from a post below *optio* was from *eques* (*AE* 1902, 41 = *ILS* 9090), but this took place in the first half of the first century before the promotion system became more formalized.

³⁹ Note, e.g., the caveat of G. R. Watson, *The Roman Soldier* (1969), 92. Domaszewski had supposed that the amount of money given to soldiers on their retirement, as recorded in the records of the *scholae* at Lambaesis, all dated to the period 198 to 211, was equal to a year's pay. The *cornicines* were thus *immunes* (VIII, 2557 = *ILS* 2354); the *librarii* and the *exacti, sesquuplicarii* (*AE* 1898, 108-9 = *ILS* 9100); the *armorum custodes*, the *cornicularii praefecti* and the *cornicularii* and *actarii legati legionis, duplicarii* (*AE* 1902, 147a = *ILS* 9097; *AE* 1899, 60 = *ILS* 9099; *AE* 1898, 108-9 = *ILS* 9100). G. R. Watson has suggested to me that the large sum given to the *optio spei*, not on his retirement but on his promotion to the centurionate, was equal to four times the basic pay, or twice his own, while the unsuccessful *optio* received upon his retirement three times the basic, or one-and-a-half times his own, by way of compensation for not getting promoted (VIII, 2554 = *ILS* 2445). If this is the case, Watson suggests, on the basis of his

calculations of pay in the period Severus to Caracalla, that the amounts will have been rounded up slightly (cf. o.c., 91).

⁴⁰ J. F. Gilliam, 'The Moesian Pridianum', *Hommages à A. Grenier* (Collection Latomus LVIII, 1962), 755-6. Cf. R. O. Fink in *The Excavations at Dura-Europos*, ed. A. Perkins, *Final Report* v, 1: *The Parchments and Papyri* (1959), 32-33.

⁴¹ *P. Dura* 100, xxxi, 24; 26; xxxii, 16; 21; 29; xxxiii, 20; cf. R. O. Fink, l.c.

⁴² *P. Dura* 100, xvii, 3 and 101, xxii, 13.

⁴³ *ILS* 9107, apparently recording a list of legionaries in hierarchical order, places the *actarius* above the *optio* but below the *signifer*. The presence of an *actarius* among the *equites* of VII Gemina can be explained if the suggestion of Speidel, that this soldier served in the *tabularium equitum* and not the *tabularium legionis*, is accepted (l.c. 144, n. 20).

⁴⁴ Cf. xiv, 2255; *AE* 1895, 204 and *AE* 1898, 108, for the seniority of the *cornicularius* to the *actarius* in the legions.

⁴⁵ XII, 2602 = *ILS* 2118.

⁴⁶ VI, 2776; Domaszewski-Dobson, 21.

⁴⁷ It is, of course, uncertain what happened in a *cohors peditata* and an *ala*.

The suggested ranks, pay grades and posts, in the period from Hadrian to Severus,⁴⁸ may be set down as follows:

Rank	Pay	Post
<i>miles</i>	} basic	technicians and specialists ⁴⁹
<i>immunis</i>		
<i>principalis</i> ⁵⁰	pay and a half (<i>sesquiplicarius</i>)	junior staff officers, ⁵¹ <i>tesserarius</i> , ⁵² and possibly <i>armorum custos</i> . ⁵³ (In the third century some <i>librarii</i> and <i>exacti</i> . ⁵⁴)
	double pay (<i>duplicarius</i>)	<i>optio</i> , <i>signifer</i> , standard bearers, ⁵⁵ senior staff officers (some of whom may have been <i>equites</i> ⁵⁶).

To return to the career of Tiberius Claudius Maximus and the post of *vexillarius equitum legionis*. In the early third century it is clear that in the *cohors xx Palmyrenorum* the post of *vexillarius* was held by a soldier receiving double pay.⁵⁷ In the later second or early third century the *vexillarius equitum* in the guard ranked above the *optio equitum*,⁵⁸ and therefore on the basis of the table of pay grades and posts outlined above would also receive double pay. It would therefore seem probable that at this time the *vexillarius equitum legionis* was also a *duplicarius*, as were the other standard bearers, the *aquilifer*, the *imaginifer*

⁴⁸ This period is chosen because under Hadrian the distinction between *immunis* and *principalis* was formalized, while by the time of Severus changes were taking place in the status of certain posts. Cf. G. R. Watson, 'Immunis librarius,' *Britain and Rome* (eds. M. G. Jarrett and B. Dobson (1966)), 51, and *The Roman Soldier* (1969), 75-79.

⁴⁹ Cf. Tarruntenus Paternus' list of *immunes*, dating to this period: *Digest* 50, 6, 7.

⁵⁰ The difference between the *immunis* and the *principalis* after the time of Hadrian was presumably based upon pay.

⁵¹ In the guard a *beneficiarius tribuni* is described as a *principalis*, though the inscription may date to before the time of Hadrian (ix, 5809 = *ILS* 2078). The *singularis praefecti praetorio* had a higher status than an *equus* and therefore was presumably a *sesquiplicarius* (xi, 5646 = *ILS* 2081), as was probably the *beneficiarius tribuni*, who ranked just below the *singularis praefecti praetorio* (iii, 7334 = *ILS* 2080). vi, 221 listing junior staff officers in the *vigiles* as *principales* dates to 113, that is before the distinction between the *immunes* and the *principales* was formalized. However, in the *vigiles* also the *optio carceris* ranked a little below the *optio centuriae* and was probably a *sesquiplicarius* (vi, 1057 (2) 10 with vi, 1058 (3) 5). The *beneficiarius tribuni* and the *optio co(n)ualescentium*, ranking just below *tesserarius*, were probably also *sesquiplicarii* (vi, 1057 (1) 3 with vi, 1058 (4) 7; vi, 1057 (6) 13 with vi, 1058 (3) 6). On the basis of analogy with the guard and the *vigiles*, the posts of *optio valetudinarii*, *optio carceris*, *singularis*, *beneficiarius tribuni* and a *quaestionibus* in the urban cohorts may have fallen into this category (ix, 1617 = *ILS* 2117). The *haruspex* and the *beneficiarius acil.* in the legions, according to *ILS* 9107, seem to have ranked above *tesserarius* but below *optio* and may have been *sesquiplicarii*. Probably the *beneficiarii* of all junior officers belonged to this group.

⁵² The *tesserarius* was clearly a *sesquiplicarius* in the *auxilia*, and a *principalis* in the guard (ix, 1609 and probably xiii, 6728) and in the *vigiles* (vi, 220). In the legions he was apparently below *duplicarius*, for three *tesserarii* appear on a list of soldiers of III Augusta made *duplicarii* by Elagabalus (viii, 2564 with 18052 = *ILS* 470).

⁵³ Tarruntenus Paternus includes the *armorum custos* in his list of *immunes* (*Digest* 50, 6, 7), but the regulations of the *schola* at Lambaesis would suggest that there at least the *armorum custodes* were *duplicarii* about 200 (*AE* 1902, 147a = *ILS* 9097). The list of soldiers made *duplicarii* by Elagabalus includes one *armorum custos*, suggesting that he was either an *immunis* or a *sesquiplicarius* (viii, 2564 with 18052 = *ILS* 470). Finally one of a series of dedications erected by members of a vexillation of v Macedonica and xiii Gemina in the reign of Gallienus couples together the *tesserarii* and the *armorum custodes* as if they were similar in rank (*AE* 1936, 55).

⁵⁴ The *librarii* were included in Paternus' list of *immunes* and also Vegetius' list of *principales* (ii, 7). It is possible that their status had risen in the intervening years, and in support of this it may be noted that *librarii* and *exacti* receive 800 *denarii* on retirement according to the regulations of their *schola* at Lambaesis, suggesting they were *sesquiplicarii* (*AE* 1898, 108-9 = *ILS* 9100). Earlier the *librarii* had certainly been *immunes*, cf. G. R. Watson, 'Immunis librarius', l.c. 45-55.

⁵⁵ The *aquilifer* clearly belongs to this category, and to it may be added the *imaginifer*, who is placed on a list of legionaries apparently in hierarchical order between the *optio* and the *signifer* (*ILS* 9107). Vegetius (ii, 7) included the post in his list of *principales*. If *imaginifer* has been restored correctly on the roster of 219 he was probably a *duplicarius* in xx *Palmyrenorum* (*P. Dura* 100, xxviii, 21; xxxi 19; cf. R. O. Fink, l.c. 32).

⁵⁶ In addition to the *cornicularii* cited above note also the career of M. Aurelius Augustianus (vi, 2977 = *ILS* 2173): 7 *coh. v vig.*, *vix. an.* xxxiiii, *provitus ann.* xvii, *exceptor presidi provincies M.S. ann.* iii, *lectus in praetoriae eques sive tabularius ann. v, factus 7 in Syria, vixit ann.* viii. Augustianus apparently was an *equus* and a *tabularius* simultaneously. He was advanced from the latter post directly to the centurionate; hence *tabularius* was probably a senior staff post and might therefore merit the extra pay of an *equus*. *Tabularius* was a senior staff post in the *vigiles* (vi, 37295).

⁵⁷ See n. 41.

⁵⁸ vi, 37191 = *ILS* 9190.

and the *signifer*.⁵⁹ But this does not necessarily mean that the *vexillarius equitum* also received double pay in the period of Domitian. It does, however, seem unlikely that the rank and pay grade of the post had risen between the late first century and the early third century. The group of posts, the standard bearers, to which the *vexillarius* belonged, contained some of the oldest and most important posts in the army below the centurionate,⁶⁰ and there is no reason to suppose that they had not long been held by *duplicarii*. If this is the case Maximus cannot have had a pay rise when he was appointed to the post of *duplicarius alae II Pannoniorum*, since it is highly unlikely that an *eques duplicarius legionis* would be paid less than his equivalent in an *ala*, a more junior branch of the army, and this inscription therefore has no bearing upon the pay of the auxiliary forces generally. In particular, Speidel's suggestion⁶¹ that the transfer supports the theory that basic auxiliary pay was five-sixths of legionary pay and not one-third must be discarded. The transfer of Maximus apparently took place in a time of warfare when abnormal conditions could pertain, while Maximus himself may have been prepared to accept a reduction in pay in return for better promotion prospects.⁶²

*Inspectorate of Ancient Monuments,
Argyle House, Edinburgh*

⁵⁹ The career of Maximus itself offers no help. The nearly contemporary *singularis praefecti praetorio* was probably a *sesquuplicarius* (see n. 51), and the *singularis legati legionis* may also have been; but this in itself would not prevent the post next held, *vexillarius equitum*, being of the same pay grade.

⁶⁰ Cf. Polybius VI, 24, 6; Caesar, *BG* II, 25; *BG* v,

37; v, 5832; XII, 2234 = *ILS* 2342; v, 3375 = *ILS* 2339; v, 8185 = *ILS* 9172.

⁶¹ o.c. 147.

⁶² Dr. Brian Dobson and Mr. G. R. Watson read this paper in typescript and made several useful suggestions, which I have gratefully incorporated.