

BRITANNO-ROMAN INSCRIPTIONS,

WITH CRITICAL NOTES,

BY THE REV. JOHN MCCAUL, LL.D.,

PRESIDENT OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, TORONTO, &C.



TORONTO: HENRY ROWSELL.

LONDON : LONGMAN, GREEN, LONGMAN, ROBERTS, & GREEN.

MDCCCLXIII.

Entered according to Act of Provincial Legislature, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-three, by HENRY ROWSELL, in the office of the Registrar of the Province of Canada.

ROWSELL & ELLIS, PRINTERS, KING STREET, TORONTO.

PREFACE.

During the last five years I occasionally contributed to the *Canadian Journal* some articles on Britanno-Roman Epigraphy, under the designation, "Notes on Latin Inscriptions found in Britain." The favour, with which those papers were received, has induced me to believe, that they might be more acceptable and more generally useful, if they were presented in the more convenient form of a separate volume. Acting on this belief, I have collected in the following pages all my published notes on the subject, and have added many more which have hitherto never appeared in print.

I have availed myself of the opportunity to revise the articles, and with a view to facility of reference have distributed the notes, according to the counties in which the stones were found, and have arranged the inscriptions themselves, according to their subjects. I have also added an index, and have found it necessary to subjoin additions and corrections. For the number of the items thus subjoined, and of others of the same class which may have escaped my observation, a sufficient excuse may, I trust, be found in the disadvantages, under which I have prosecuted the investigations and have prepared the work, for in this young country we are as yet without some of those aids and appliances, which are commonly found in older communities. I have especially felt the want of books for reference. Our University Library is a valuable collection, but the number of volumes is small; and although it is well supplied with works on Epigraphy, it is deficient in some of those adjuncts, that are required in the local researches which I have been pursuing, such as county histories and topographical descriptions. I have, consequently, been obliged in some cases, much against my will, to accept the quotations of others without verification.

As my object has been to discuss only those inscriptions, which seemed not to have been satisfactorily explained, I have necessarily called in question the readings or interpretations proposed by those who had previously examined them. In thus impugning the opinions or statements of Antiquaries of the highest authority in British Archaeology, it is far from being my wish to detract from their well-earned reputation : I have simply felt it to be a duty both to them and to myself, not to reject their views without stating my objections to them. In this, as in all other such enquiries, whether scientific or literary, it is of comparatively little consequence who is right or who is wrong : the great objects are the advancement of knowledge and the attainment of truth.

Univ. Coll., Toronto,

February 14th, 1863.

CONTENTS.

INSCRIPTIONS IX-XLVI	11.
Altars, Votive Tablets, and Offerings IX-XXII.	•
Commemorative Tablets	XXII.
Sepulchral Stones xxx111-	-xxxix.
Centurial Stones xL-XLL.	
Pigs of Lead XLII-XL	
Miscellaneous XLIV-XI	LVII.
NOTES	
NOTES	3-263
ENGLAND:	
Cheshire	3-11
Cumberland	12-31
Derbyshire	32-55
Durham	56-61
Gloucestershire	62-76
Hampshire	77
Lancashire	78-85
Leicestershire	86-87
Lincolnshire	88-96
Middlesex	97,98
Monmouthshire	99-132
Northumberland 1	133-166
Shropshire 1	167-175
Somersetshire 1	176-200
Staffordshire	201
Sussex	202
Wiltshire	203-208
	209-224

WALES :	
Caernarvonshire	225-228
Scotland:	
Dumbartonshire	229-236
Dumfriesshire	237-250
Mid-Lothian	251-254
Perthshire	255-256
Roxburghshire	257-258
Stirlingshire	259-263
INDEX	265-276
ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS	277-290

٧ı.

INSCRIPTIONS.

ALTARS, VOTIVE TABLETS, AND OFFERINGS.

*I.

I·O·M·TANARO T·ELVPIVSGALER PRAESENS·GVNTIA PRI·LEG·XXVV COMMODO ET LATERANO COS VS·L·M P. 3. II. ... O·SALDOMIN M·NNINVI SIMORVM AVGG·GENIOLOCI FLAVIVS·LONG .. TRIBMIL·LEG XX * * LONGINVS·FIL . VS·DOMO SAMOSATA V S P. 4, note.

IV.

III.

 * · · · ΗΡΣΙΝ
 DEAEM

 · · ΕΡΜΕΝΕΣΙΝ
 NERVA

 ΕΡΜΟΓΕΝΗΣ·
 FVRIV

 ΙΑΤΡΟΣ ΒΩΜΟΝ
 FORTV

 ΤΟΝΔΑΝΕΘΗΚΑ
 NATVS

 P. 9.
 MAG

 V
 P. 10.

.

* The authorities for the text of the inscriptions, and the emendations of it, are stated in the notes. Where the number of missing letters seemed certain, full points are used to indicate it, and in other cases asterisks are employed to mark deficiencies; but this distinction has not always been observed in the text as given in the notes. X ALTARS, VOTIVE TABLETS AND OFFERINGS.

v .	VI.
DVICI BRIG	* * *
ET NVMM AVGG	ET·NVM * * * *
T AVR AVRELIAN	$N \cdot COH \cdot \overline{11} \cdot TVN$
VS DD PRO SE	$GROR \cdot GOR \cdot \overline{\infty} \cdot EQ$
ET SVIS SMAGS	. L·CVI·PRAE
P. 11.	EST * * * CLAV
	D * * * * * PRA
	EF·INSTANTE
	AELMARTINO
	PRINC·XKAL * * *
	IMPDNG * * AVG·III PO
	MPEIANO COS
	D 10

P. 12.

VII. I O M COH·II·TVNGR COEQ·C·L·CVI PRAEEST·ALB SEVERVS·PR AEF·TVNG·IN STA·VIC·SEVRO PRINCIPI P. 13.

VIII. I O M .OHITVNG. ILEC CLCV . . . AEES.AVRE * * OPTA.VSP * * * FVII STAN . . MESOPSP * * * PI.INC * * * P.14.

ALTARS,	VOTIVE	TABLETS,	AND	OFFERINGS.	XI
---------	--------	----------	-----	------------	----

•

IX.	Х.
I O M	GENIO LOCI
COH·I·AELI	FORTVNAE REDVCI
DAC·ANIO	ROMAE AETERNAE
P. 17.	ET FATO BONO
	G CORNELIVS
	PEREGRINVS
	TRIB COHOR
	EX PROVINCIA
	MAVR CAESA
	DOMOSE * *
	P. 18.

XI. I·O M COH II·GAL EQ T DOMTI VS HERON D NICOMEDIA ·PRAEF

P. 20, and Additions.

XII.

ΙΟΜ

PRO SALVTE IMPERATORIS M·ANTONI GORDIANI P·F· INVICTI AVG ET SABINIAE FVR IAE TRANQVILLE CONIVGI EIVS TO TAQVE DOMV DIVIN·EORVM A LA AVG GORDIA OB VIRTVTEM APPELLATA POSVIT CVI PRAEEST AEMILIVS CRISPINVS PRAEF EQQ NATVS IN PRO AFRICA DE TVSDRO SVB CVR NONNII PHI LIPPI LEG·AVG·PROPRETO ATTICO ET PRAETEXTATO COSS.

P. 20, and Additions.

XIII.	XIV.
ΙΟΜ	I O M
ALA	COHNRVAN
AVG OB VIRTVTE	GERMANORVM
APELATACVI PRAE	MIL EQ
EST IAE IVBISE.	CVI PRAEEST
GIA MAG.VS D	* PIVS CLCLND
MVRSA EX PANON	AIINIANV
INFERIOR PR	IRH V.
APRONINO ET BR	P. 21.
P. 20, and Additions.	

XV.	XVI.
DEO	FORTVNAE
SANCTO	COH•1
COCIDIO	NERVANA
PATERNVS	GERMANOR
MATERNVS	$\overline{\infty} \cdot EQ$
TRIBVNVS C.H	P. 22.
I NERVANE	
EX EVOCATO	
PALATINO	
VSLM	
P. 22.	

XVII.

I O M COH·I·NERVANA GERMANOR · $\infty \cdot EQ$ CVI PRAEEST L FANI VS FELIX TRIB P. 22,

XVIII. MATRIBVS M>NAN IONIVS ORBITOAL VSLM P. 27, note.

XIX.

DEI·HERC VICTI·COI * * * * * TIBVS·PRO·S COMMILITON . . BARBARORV . OB VIRTV ... P·SEXTANTIV •.... TAT.TRAIA * * * * P. 30.

XX.

GENIO PRAETORI CL EPAPHRODITVS **CLAVDIANVS** TRIBVNVS CHO I LING VLPM P. 58.

XIV	ALTARS,	VOTIVE	TABLETS,	AND	OFFERINGS.
XIV	ALIAND,	,			

XXI.	XXII.
$I \cdot O M$	NVMINIB
L.CAMMI	AVGVSTOR
VS MAXI	COH IIII GAL
PREFEC	$\mathbf{E}\mathbf{Q}$
I.HIS.EQ	FEC.
VSLM	The stand Additions
	P. 59, note, and Additions.
P. 59, note, and Additions.	
XXIII.	XXIV.

DIS	SANCTO CO
MOVNTI	CIDEO TAVRVNC
BVSIVL	FELICISSI
FIRMIN	MVS•TRIBVN
VSDECE.	EX EVOCATO
P. 61.	$V.S \cdot L \cdot M$
	P. 64.
XXV.	XXVI.
DEAE	. MANDVS
SETLO	EX·C·FRIS·
CENIAE	VINOVIE
L •ABAR	$V \cdot S \cdot L \cdot M$
EVSCE	P. 65.
$V \cdot S \cdot L \cdot M \cdot$	
P. 65, note.	
XXVII.	XXVIII.
D·M·NODONTI	PECTILLVS
FL·BLANDINVS	VOTVMQVOD
ARMATVRA	PROMISSIT
$V \cdot S \cdot L \cdot M$	DEO NVDENTE
P. 66.	M DEDIT

P. 67.

XXIX.	XXX.
DIVO	SEOESAM
NODENTI SILVIANVS	ROLNASON
ANVLVM PERDEDIT	OSALVEDN
DEMEDIAM PARTEM	$AL \cdot Q \cdot Q \cdot SAR$
DONAVIT NODENTI	BREVENM
INTER QVIBVS NOMEN	BEDIANIS
SENICIANI NVLLIS	ANTONI
PERMITTAS SANITA	VS MEG·VI
TEM DONEC PERF.RA	IC DOMV
VSQVE TEMPLVM NO	ELITER
DENTIS.	P. 78.
• P. 67.	

XXXI. PRO SALVTE AVGG N·N· SEVERI ET ANTONI NI ET GETÆ CÆS P·SALTIENVS P·F·MAE CIA THALAMVS HADRI • PRAEF·LEG·II·AVG C·VAMPEIANO ET LVCILIAN *** P. 101.

XXXII. SALVTI RE GINAE·P·SAL LIENIVS·P·F· MAECIA ET . . . MVS HAD * * PRAEF·LEG·II . . . CVM FILIIS SVIS AMPEIANO ET LV CILIANO D·D· P. 101.

XXXIII.XXXIV.* NCTO... TVNE ETBON°EVE... HRAENTOCORNEL¹·CASTVSETIVL¹***SFVSTVSBELISIM.VS CONIVGES... IIAVGPOS · · RM·FP. 107.P. 106.P. 107.

XVI	ALTARS,	VOTIVE	TABLETS,	AND	OFFERINGS.

XXXV.	XXXVI.
DEO SOLINVIC	NN
TIBCLDECMVS	AVGG
CORNELANTO	GENIO
NIVS·PRAEF	LEG
TEMPL·RESTIT	II AVG
P. 111.	IN H ^o N ^o
	RENMIºT
	M VA
	FII
	IV
	\mathbf{LE}
	LE SC
	sc

XXXVII.	XXXVII. a				
VICTORIAE	DEO				
· ·GG AIFE	ANTENOCITICO				
NSSENECIO	ET NVMINIB.				
N COS FELIX	AVGVSTOR .				
$\Lambda L\Lambda I\Lambda ST^{0}$	AEL·VIBIVS				
M PRA	>LEG·XX·V·V·				
P. 133.	V·S·L·M·				
	Additions to p. 134.				

ALTARS, VOTIVE TABLETS, AND OFFERINGS. XVII

ΧΧΧΥΙΙ. β	XXXVIII.
DEO ANOCITICO	M·MARI
IVDICIIS OPTIMO	VS VELLI
RVM MAXIMORVM	A LONG
QVE IMPP·N·SVBVIB·	VS·AQVI
MARCELLO COS·TINE	S HANC
IVS LONGVS IN PRAE	POSVIT
FECTVRA EQVITV.	$V \cdot S \cdot L \cdot M$
LATO CLAVO EXORN.	P. 135.
TVS ET Q.D.	

Additions to p. 134.

XXXIX. ******* MILC.. PRAEEST·M PEREGRINIV SVPER·TRIB P. 137.

XLI.

G D N ET SIGNORVM COHIVARDVL ETNEXPLORA TORBREMCOR EGNATLVCILI ANVSLEGAVGPRPR CVRANTECASSIO SABINIANOTRIB

P. 189.

3

DRS **DVPL**·N·EXPLOR BREMENARAM INSTITUERVNT N.EIVS C.CAEP CHARITINO TRIB VSLM P. 137. XLII. SILVANO PANTHEO PRO·SAL RVFIN·TR1B·ET LVCILLAE · EIVS **EVTYCHVS** LIB·COS V·S·L·M· P. 140.

XL.

XVIII ALTARS, VOTIVE TABLETS, AND OFFERINGS.

XLIII.	XLIV.
LEG·A * * *	* * PVMCVMBAS
Q.CALPVRNIVS	ET TEMPLVM
CONCESSINI	FECIT CIV
VS·PRAEF·EQ	MAXIMINVS
CAESA·CORI	LEG VI VI
ONOTOTAR	EX VOTO
VM·MANVPR	P. 144.
AESENTISSIMI	
NVMINIS DEI VS	
P. 142.	

XLV.

MOGONT CAD
ET·N·D·N AVG
M·G·SECVNDINVS
BF •COS•HABITA
NCI PRIMASTA
PRO SE ET SVIS POS
P. 147.

XLVI.

DIISDEABVSQVESE CVNDVMINTERPRE TATIONEMORACV LICLARIAPOLLINIS COH·I·TVNGRORVM

P. 154.

XLVII. SOLI APOLLINI ANICERO P. 160.

ΑΣΤΑΡΤΗΣ ΒΩΜΟΝ Μ' ΕΣΟΡΑΣ ΠΟΥΛΧΕΡ Μ' ΑΝΕΘΗΚΕΝ

XLVIII.

P. 165.

XLIX.	L.
ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙ	PEREGRINVS
ΤΙΡΡΙΩ	SECVNDI FIL
ΔΙΟΔΩΡΑ	CIVIS·TREVER
APXIEPEIA	IOVCETIO
P. 165.	MARTIET
	NEMETONA
	$\mathbf{V} \cdot \mathbf{S} \cdot \mathbf{L} \cdot \mathbf{M}$

P. 184.

LI. SVLEVIS SVLINVS SCVLTOR BRVCETI•F SACRVM•F•L•M P. 190. LII. DEAE SVLIMI NERVAE SVLINVS MATV RIFIL VSLM P. 191.

. .

LIII.	LIV.
RVM CAES	DEAE
AVG.	FORTVNAE
ANTONINI	SOSIA
ET VERI	IVNCINA
IOVI DILECTI	$Q \cdot ANTONII$
CAECILIVS	ISAVRICI
LVCAN.S	LEG·AVG
PRAEF COH	P. 216.
P. 212.	

XX ALTARS, VOTIVE TABLETS, AND OFFERINGS.

LV.

LVI.

• • • • • • • •	MAT·A ? ? IA·? A
OMNIVM	M ? I ? ? ? ? DE
GENTIVM	MIL·LEG·VIVIC
TEMPLVM	GVBER·LEG·VI
OLIMVETVS	$V \cdot S \cdot L \cdot LM$
TATECONIAB	P. 221.
SVMG·IVL·	
PITANVS	
P ·P·RESTITVIT	

.T. WEGTITAL

P. 219,

MATRIB ITALIS GER MANIS· GAL...BRIT .NTONIVS ..CRETIANVS .F·COS·REST

LVII.

P. 223.

LVIII.

BRIGANTIE·S·AMANDVS ARCITECTVS EX IMPERIO·IMP·I·

P. 237.

	1.201.
LIX.	LX.
DEAE	DEAE VIRADES
HARIMEL	THI PAGVS CON
LAE·SACGA	DRVSTIS MILI
MIDIAHVS.	IN COH II TVN
ARCXVSL ^M	GR·SVB SIVO
P. 239.	DAVSPICE PR
	AEFE

P. 240.

ALTARS, VOTIVE TABLETS, AND OFFERINGS. XXI

*LXI. DEAE RICAG^M BEDAE PAGV^S VELLAVS MILIT COH II TVNG V S L M P. 240.

*LXII.

MARTI ET VICT^o RIAE·AVG·C·R^{AE} TIMILIT·IN·COH II TVNGR·CVI· PRAEEST SILVIVS AVSPEX·PRÆF· V·S·L.M P. 244.

LXIII.

DEAE MINERVAE COH II TVN GRORVM MIL EQ CL CVI PRAEEST CS.L AVSPEX PRAEF P. 245. LXIV.

FORTVNAE R * * * SALVTE P CAM * * ITALICI PRAEF CO * * TVNCELER LIBER LLM P. 246.

LXV. LXVI. MATRIBALA VICTORIAE **TERVIS** · ET COH VI NER MATRIBCAM VIORVM . . . PESTRIBCOHI A·BELIO>IEG. TVNGRINS XX VV VERSCARM V·S·LL·M OIS. SXXVV P. 252. P. 251.

^{*} Here, and in a few other instances, I have indicated the different sizes of the letters as they appear in the originals. It is impossible, however, with ordinary type to give an exact representation of the ligatures or shapes and sizes of the letters.

XXII ALTARS, VOTIVE TABLETS, AND OFFERINGS.

1

LXVII. APOLLINI GRANNO Q LVSIVS SABINIA NVS PROC AVG V·SS·L·V·M P. 253. LXVIII. CAMPESTR SACRVM AEL MARCVS DEC·ALAE AVG VOCONTIO V·S·L·L·M P. 258.

LXX.

DEAE SVRI AESVBCALP VRNIO AGR ICOLALEG · AVG **PR**•**PR**•**A**•**LICINIVS** CLEMENS PRAEF III.A.IOR P. 259. LXXII. MARTI MINERVAE CAMPESTRI BVS HERO ** EPONA VICTORIAE M·COCCEI FIRMVS **OLEG**.II.AVG P. 261.

LXIX. DEO SILVA NO PROSA LVTE·SVA·ET SVORVM CAR RIVS DOMITI ANVS C LEGXX VV·VS·LL·M P. 258.

LXXI.

FORTVNAE·AVG· PRO·SALVTE·L·AELI CAESARIS·EX·VISV T·FLA·SECVNDVS PRAEF·COH·I·HAM IORVM·SAGITTAR V·S·L·M P. 260.

LXXIII.	LXXIV.
IV *********	SVB·MODIOIV
M * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	LIOLEGAVGPR
CVPA L**********	PRCOHIAELDC
$\mathbf{LEG}: \mathbf{AVG}: \mathbf{PP}: \mathbf{COH}: \mathbf{I}:$	CVIPRAEESTM
TVNG POSVIT	CLMENANDER
P. 17.	TRIB .
	P. 26.

LXXV.

IMP·CÆS·M·ANT·GORDIA NVS·P·F·AVG·BALNEVM·CVM BASILICA A SOLO INSTRVXIT PREGNLVCILIANVM·LEG AVG PR·PR CVRANTE M·AVR QVIRINO PRE COHILGOR

P. 56.

LXXVI.

IMP·CÆSAR·M·ANTONIVS GORDIANVS·P·F·AVG PRINCIPIA ET ARMAMEN TARIA CONLAPSA RESTITV IT PER MAECILIVM FVSCVM LEG AVG·PR·PR·CVRANTE·M·AVR QVIRINO PR·COH I·L·GOR.

P. 56.

LXXVII.

$IMP \cdot CAES \cdot T \cdot AELIO$ $HAD \cdot ANTONINO \cdot AVG \cdot PIO PP$ $SVB \cdot Q \quad LOLVRBICO$ $LEG \cdot AVG \cdot PRO \cdot PRAE$ $COH \ \overline{I} \ LING$ $E \quad Q \quad F$ P. 58.

LXXVIII.

D. A... FLAVIVS·SENILIS·PR·REL·EX·STEPIBVS· POSSVIT O....ANTE ·VICTORINO · INTER...ATE. P. 73.

LXXIX.

IMPP·VALERIANVS ET GALLIENVS AVGG·ET VALERIANVS NOBILISSIMVS CAES·COHORTI VII·CENTVRIAS·A SO LO RESTITVERVNT·PER·DESTICIVM IVBAM VC·LEGATVM AVGG·PR·PR·ET VITVLASIVM LAETINIANVM LEG.LEG II·AVG·CVRANTE·DOMIT·POTENTINO PRAEF·LEG EIVSDEM

P. 104.

LXXX.	LXXXI.				
\mathbf{LEG}	$\widetilde{\mathrm{LII}}$ AVG				
$\overline{\Pi}$	CHO VIII				
AVG	FEC				
FEC	P. 116.				
P. 116.					

XXIV

LXXXII. COH·I·BAT AVORVM F P. 116.

LXXXIII. IMp M AVrelio ANTOnino AVG SEVER Lucii FILIO LEG II Aug p. P. 123. XXV

LXXXIV. DEDICATV VRF OG ES VE NIO MAXIMOIE FVRPAN° COS P. 124. LXXXV. DD VIIII OCCB PRCR EIML COS CVR VRSO AGTæ EI : IVS. P. 124.

LXXXVI. CAESARES·L·SEPTI VG...SEPTIMIVS ORRVPTVM P. 129.

4

LXXXVII.

*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	G.	ALI	OR
*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	vo	TAI	NV	
											* *	
FVNDAMEN * * *ERVNT SVB												
CL·XENEPHO * * * .EG AV PR CVRANTE * * * * * * * * * *												
C	VR.	AN?	ſE	*	*	*	*	¥	*	* *	*	*

P. 136.

LXXXVIII.

B.NOGENERIS HVMAN·IMPE RANTE·C * * * * * * * * * * * * * * AVG·PR·PR·POSVIT AC·DEDICAVIT C·A·ACIL * * * P. 140.

LXXXIX.

* * * * * * * * ICOMAXI COSIII ET M AVRELANTONINOPIO COS II AVG * * * * * * * * PORTAMCVMMVRISVETVSTATE DI LAPSISIVSSVALFENSENECINIS VO COSCVRANTE COLANITI ADVENTO PRO AVGG NN C.I.I.VANGON O PF S CVMAEMI SALVIANO TRIB SVOASOLO RESTI.

P. 147.

XXVI

-

XXVII

XC.

IMP·CÆSMAVR SEVE RVSALEXANDERPIE AVG HORREVMVETV STATECONIABSVMM COH ITASTVRVM S·A ASOLORESTITVERVNT PROVINCIA REG * * * MAXIMO LEG * * * * * AIMARTI * * *

P. 154.

XCI.

IMP·CAES·M AVRELIO SEVERO·ANTONINO PIO·FELICI AVG·PARTHIC MAX·BRIT·MAX·GERM MAX·PONTIFICI MAXIM TRIB·POTEST XVIIII IMP·II COS IIII PROCOS PP COHĪ FIDA VARDVL CREQ ∞ ANTO NINIANAFECIT SVBCVRA * * * * * * * LEGAVGPRP

P. 157.

XCII.

P. 160.

XCIII.

IMP·CAES·M·AV *** ******PIO·F*** TRIB·POT ***COS*** P·P·BALLIST·A SO * VARDVL ****** TIB·CL·PAVL **** PR·PR·FEC. **** P·AEL ******

P. 161.

XCIV.

(1.) .LAVDIVS·LIGVR E;NIMIA·VETVST

(2.) OLEGIO·LONGA·SERIA VNIA·REFICI·ET·REPINGI·CVR P. 186.

xcv.

PRO-SALVTE IMP-CES-M-AVR ANTONINIPIIFELICISINVIC TIAVG..NAEVIVS AVG LIBADIVTPROCCPR...I PIARVINAOPRESS-ASOLORES TITVIT.

P. 193.

XXIX

XCVI.

*	**		EI.	PT۰	SEV	VΕ	RV	′S∙:	PIV	$\mathbf{S} \cdot \mathbf{J}$	PEF	\ **	: *
*	*.	•	VR	\mathbf{EL}	AN	T	ON	IN	v.	*	*	*	*
• 1	AQV	A	ED	UC	ΤIV	7M	V	ET	vs.	••	• *	* *	
*	* *	*	BS	۶۰C	0H	۰I	SV	VN (C•RI	ESI	т.	•	
			*	*	*	*	*	VI	\mathbf{PF}	*	*		
			*	٠	*	*	IV	\mathbf{L}	*	*	*		
						n	005						

P. 225.

XCVIII. XCVII. IMP · C .MP·C·T·AE T·AE·HADRIA .ADRIANO .NTONINO **NO·ANTONINO·AVG·PIO·P·P** . . G.PIO.P.P. VEX .EG·XXVV LEG·XX * * * DXI VV·FE CDXI PPIIII P. 229. P. 229.

XCIX.	С.
IMP·C·T·AELIO	\mathbf{LEG}
HADRIANO·ANTO	ĪĪ
NINO·AVG·P·P·	AVG·F·
$VEX \cdot LEG \cdot \overline{VI} \cdot VIC$	PIIIICXI
$\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{P} \cdot \mathbf{F} \cdot \mathbf{O} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{V} \mathbf{S} \cdot \mathbf{V} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{L} \mathbf{L} \mathbf{I} \\ \mathbf{P} \cdot \boldsymbol{\infty} \boldsymbol{\infty} \boldsymbol{\infty} \boldsymbol{\infty} \boldsymbol{\infty} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{X} \mathbf{L} \mathbf{I} \end{array}$	P. 231.
T 000	

P. 230.

	CI.	CII.		
IMP	ANTON	IMP·C		
AVG	PIO	T.AE.HADRIANO		
P	Р	ANTONINO		
	LEG	PIO·P·P·VEX LEG XX VV·FEC		
	ĪĪ			
	ΛVG	Р.		
\mathbf{FPI}	IIICCLXX	P. 231.		
	P. 231.			

CIII. IMP·C·TAELIO·HADR IANO ANTONINO·AVG P·P·VEX·LEG· $\overline{\text{VI}}$ VICTRICS·P·F·

OPVS·VALLI·P·

 $\infty \infty \infty CCXT \cdot b$

CIV." IMP C T AELIO HADRIANO ANTONINO AVG·PIO P·P VEX·LEG·XX·V P·P III P. 231.

~**

cv.

P. 231.

CVI.

IMP CAES TITO AELIOIMP·CAESAR·T·AELIOHADRIANO ANTONINOHADRIANO ANTONINOAVG·PIO PP LEG IIAVG PIO PPVEXILLATIOAVG·PERMP IIIDCLEG VI·VICTR·P·FLXVI·SPER·M·P IIIDCLXVISP. 231.P. 231.

XXX

XXXI

CVII.	CVIII.
IMP·CAES·T	IMP CAES TITO AELIO
AELIO HADRI	HADRIANO <u></u> ANTONINO
ANTONIN·AVG	AVG PIO·P·P·LEG II AVG
PIO P·P VEXILLA	PERMPHIDCLXVIS
LEG·VI·VICPF	P . 232.
PER·M P IIIDCL	
P. 232.	

CIX. LEX XX V V FEC MPIIIP IIICCCIV P. 232 CX. IMP·CAESARIT· AELIO·HADRINO ANTONINO·AVG PIO·P·P·VEXILLA LEG·VI·VIC·P·F· PERM·

P. 232.

CXI. IMP CAES TAE HADRI ANTONINO AVG PIO PP VEXILATIVS P. 232.

CXII. VEXILLATIONS LEG·II·AVG·ET LEGXXVVF P. 232.

XXXII

CXIII. IMP·CAESARI T·AELIO HADRI ANO ANTONINO AVG PIO PP VEXILLATIO LEGXXVALVICF PER·MIL·P III P. 232.

IMP·CAES·TÆLANT AVG·PIO PP· COH I TVNGRO RVM FECIT ∞ P. 232.

CXIV.

CXV.

*.P·LEG·II A.. Q·LOLLIO VR.... LEG AVG·PR·PR P. 261.

SEPULCHRAL STONES.

.....

CXVI.

* * * .ILSER . QVINANAT * * GALATIA · DEC. BVIT GALA *** XIT ANN * * * * MORITV * * * * * DESIDER * * * * RIS · INT * * * * P. 25. CXVII.

D M S NEMMONTANVS DEC VIXITANN·XL·NEM SANCTVSFR·ET·COHERR EX TESTAMENTO FECERT

P. 60.

CXVIII.

RVFVS·SITA·EQVES·CHO VI TRACVM·ANN·XL STIPXXII HEREDES·EXS·TEST·F·CVRAVE H S E

пов

P. 76.

CXIX.	CXX.
L·SEMPRONI·FLA	$\mathbf{D} \boldsymbol{\cdot} \mathbf{M}$
VINI·MILTIS·LEGVIIII	FL·HELIVSNATI
Q (?) ALAVDISEVERI	ONEGRECVS VI
AERVIIANORXXX	XITANNOSXXXX
ISPANICALERIA	FL ·INGENVACO
CIVIMA ·	NIVGIPOSVIT
P. 88.	P. 90.

-

CXXI. DISMNIBVS NOMINI SACRI BRVSCI-FNI CIVIS SENONI · HCARSS NAE CONIVGIS **.** . . . P. 91.

CXXII.

I.VALERIVS.I.F CLA · PVDENS · SAV · MIL·LEG·II·A·P·F· > · DOSSENNI PROCVLI·A·XXX AERA * I $D \cdot SP$ H·S·E· P. 92.

CXXIII.

* * * * * AELIVS. * * * VS·M·AVRE * * * VM·ILIB * * * CINO· * * * * XXV• * * * * ENIVS·VE * * * EX·LEG·XIIII * * * H E·TEST·P· P. 93.

CXXV. D·M· **IVL**·VALIVS MIL·LEG·XXVV AN·XL·H·S·E· C·A·FLAVIO **ATTIO·HER** P. 97.

CXXIV. **DHS**•MANIB C IVLI GAL CALEN.F LVC VET EX·LEG·VI VIC-PF NASEMF

P. 94.

CXXVI. D·M IVLIA VENERI A·AN·XXII I.ALESAN.CON PIENTISSIMA **ET·I·BELICIANVS F** · MONIME FC P. 99.

XXXIV

SEPULCHRAL STONES.

XXX∀

CXXVII.

D M Q·IVLI·SEVERI· **DINIA**·VETERANI LEG·II·AVG·CONIVX·F·C·

P. 111.

CXXVIII. * * * * AIBERNAVX · S

TANNOSXVIMESSEXF

CFLAFLAVINAMATER

P. 122.

CXXIX. * * AL * .EG·II·AVG * E'RO·SE**IV * ECIANVS F· C· P. 122.

CXXX.

CXXXI.

. M	D	Μ		
ORVI	TADIA·VAL	LAVNIVS·VIXIT		
NISXVII	ANN·LXV·ET·T	ADIVS·EXVPERTVS		
P. 123.	FILIVS.VIXIT.AN	IN•XXXVIII•DEFVN		
	TVS·EXPEDITI(ONEGERMANICA		
	TADIAEXVPE	RATA·FILIA		
	MATRI·ETFR.	ATRI·PIISSIMA		
	SECVSTVMVLVM			
	PATRIS	POSVIT		

P. 127.

CXXXII.

CXXXIII.

... IS NORICIAN ESSORIVS · MAGNVS RATEREIVSDVPLALVE SABINIANAE

C.VALERIVS.C.VOL. IVLLVS·VIAN·MIL LEG·XX·V·V

P. 158.

P. 134.

CXXXIV. • • • • • • • • • ALAE • • II ASTVR[VM] P. 164.	CXXXV.
	DM
	AEL·MERCV
	RIALICORNICVL
	VACIA·SOROR
	FECIT

P. 164.

CXXXVI.

D·M PLACIDA AN·LV CVR·AG CONIA XXX	D·M DEVCCV S·ANXV CVR ^A G RATRE·	
---	---	--

P. 167.

CXXXVII.	CXXXVIII.
C.MANNIVS.	M PETRONIVS
C·F POL·SECV	L · F · MEN
NDVS·POLLEN	VIC·ANN
$\mathrm{MILLEG}\cdot\overline{\mathrm{XX}}$	XXXVIII
ANORV·LII	MIL·LEG
STIP·XXXI	XIIII GEM
BEN·LEG·PR	MILITAVIT
H S E	ANN•XVIII
P. 170.	SIGN·FVIT
	$\mathbf{H} \cdot \mathbf{S} \cdot \mathbf{E}$
	P. 171.

XXXVI

XXXVI.

CXXXIX.

....MINIVS T.POLIA ...ORVMXXXXVSTIPXXIIMIL·LEG *IIGEMMILITAVIAQNVNCHICS.. *LEGITEETFELICES.VITAIIVS.?IN?? ??????AQVAII ?IIII ?????? ?????ADITISVIVITED.MS ???? ?????AEDATEMPVS.HONES..

P. 172.

CXL.

C·MVRRIVS C·F·ARNIENSIS FORO·IVLI·MO DESTVS·MIL· .EG·ĪĪ·AD·P·F IVLI·SECVNDI ANNXXVSTI.* H.. P. 180. DIS MANIBVS M·VALERIVS·M FILLATINVS C·EQ MILES LEG·XX·AN XXXV STIPENXX. H· S· E P. 181.

CXLI.

CXLII.

D

М

SVCC·PETRONIAE VIX ANN·III·M·IIII·D·IX·V3^{,0} MVLVS·ETVICTSAPINA FIL·KAR·FEC

P. 182.

SEPULCHRAL STONES.

CXLIII. L·VITELLIVS·MA NIAI·F·TANCINVS CIVES·HISP·CAVRIESIS EQ·ALAE·VETTONUM·CR ANN·XXXXVI·STIP·XXVI H·S·E· P. 183.

XXXVIII

CXLIV.

IVLIVS VITA LIS FABRICIES IS·LEG·XX·V·V· STIPENDIOR VMIX ANNOR XX IX·NATIONE BE LGAEX·COLEGIO FABRICE·ELATV S·H S E

P. 187.

CXLV. D·M C.CALPVRNVS [R]ECEPTVS SACER DOS DEAE SV LIS·VIXAN·LXXV CA[LP]VRNIATRIFO SA * * EPTE CONIVNX F·C· P. 191.

CXLVI. DMS CADIEDI .IAE FO. TVNA* PIA·V·AX* P. 209.

CXLVII.

MEI * * AL·THEODORI ANI.OMEN·VIXIT·ANN· XXX.V·M·VI·EMI·THEO DO.A·MATER·E·C·

P. 213.

XXXIX

CXLVIIII.

D·M· FLAVIAE·AVGVSTINAE VIXIT·AN·XXXVIII·M·VII·D·XI·FILIVS * * NVS·AVGVSTINVS·VXT·AN·I·D·III * * * AN·I·M·VIIII·D·V·CAERESIVS * * * * * I·LEG·VI·VIC·CONIVGI·CARIET·SIBI·F·C·

P. 217.

CXLIX.

D M CORNVICTOR·S·C MIL·ANN·XXVICIV PANN·FIL SATVRN1 NI·PP·VIX·AN·LV·D·XI CONIVX·PROCVRAVI

P. 220.

CL.

DIS MANIBVS AFVTIANO BASSI ORDINATO Tribuno COHortis⁻ 11 TVNGrorum FLAVIA BAETICA CONIVNX FACiendum CVRAVIT

P. 247.

CLI.	CLII.
DIS MANIBVS	$\mathbf{D} \cdot \mathbf{M}$
AMMONIVS DA	C·IVLII
MIONIS * COH	MARCELLINI
I HISPANORVM	PRAEF
STIPENDIORVM .	COH·I·HAMIOR
XXVII HEREDES	P. 259.
FC	
P. 255.	

CENTURIAL STONES.

CLIII. O C IVLII CAECINIANI P. 112. CLIV. CHOR· \overline{VI} ·HAST·PRI· >ROESIMODERA P. 112.

CLV. CHO·V >·PAETINI P. 112.

CLVI.

COH·II >VALERI·FL AVI P. 112.

CLVII. >MVN .AXSV P. 114.

CLVIII. >VALERI VERI P. 115.

CLIX. COHVI O STATII SOLONIS P. 115.

CLX.

LEG·II·AVG >IVLI·TE RTVLLIA P. 115. CENTURIAL STONES.

CLXI. **LII** AVG **O VOLVSIANA** P. 115.

CLXII. >CASSI PRIS \mathbf{CI} COH·VI P. 115, note.

CLXIII. >COH VII [MA]XI[M]IAN[A]. P. 115, note.

CLXV. **)** CANDIDI FIDES·XX· IIII P. 117.

CLXVII.

>VALERI

CASSIA

N??PXIX

P. 118.

P. 116. CLXVI. **COHO** · I · FRISIN **O MASAVONIS** P•XX1II P. 117. CLXVIII. **3** FLORINI PXXII

P. 118.

CLXX. CLXIX. >CLAVDI $P \cdot XXX \cdot S$ N CXX P. 117. P. 117.

> . CLXXI. COH IIII PR.POS >IVL · VITALIS P. 120.

6

CLXIV.

COH·I·>OCRATI MAXIMI 8L·M·P

>ANTONR ? M

XLI

PIGS OF LEAD.

CLXXII. BRITANNIC**AVG II P. 32.

CLXXIII.

TI CLAVDIVS·CAESAR·AVG·P·M·TRIB·P·VIIII· IMP·XVI·DE·BRITAN

P. 32.

CLXXIV.

TI·CL·TR·LVT·BR·EX·ARG

P. 32.

CLXXV.

NERONIS AVG·EX·KIAN IIII COS BRIT P. 32.

CLXXVI.

 $IMP \cdot VESP \cdot \overline{V} :: T \cdot IMP \cdot III \cdot COS$

P. 32.

CLXXVII.

 $IMP \cdot VESP \cdot \overline{VII} \cdot T \cdot IMP \cdot \overline{V} \cdot COS$

P. 32.

CLXXVIII. IMP·DOMIT·AVG·GER·DE CEANG

P. 32.

PIGS OF LEAD.

XLIII

CLXXIX

IMP·CAES·DOMITIANO·AVG·COS·VII

P. 32.

CLXXX.

CAESAR ***** VADON

P. 32.

CLXXXI. IMP·CAES·HADRIANI·AVG·MET·LVT P. 83.

CLXXXII. IMP·HADRIANI·AVG

P. 33.

CLXXXIII. IMP·DVOR AVG ANTONINI ET VERI ARMENIACORVM

P. 33

CLXXXIV.

L·ARVCONI·VERECVNDI·METAL·LVTVD

P. 33.

CLXXXV.

C·IVL·PROTI·BRIT·LVT·EX·ARG

P. 33.

CLXXXVI. IMP·CAES·HADRIANI·AVG·T·M·LV

P. 33.

CLXXXVII.

[IMP·C]AESAR·DIVI·NERVAE·F·NERVA·TRAIANVS [AVG]VSTVS·GERMANICVS·DACICVS·PONTIFEX·MAX IMVS.TRIBVNIC.POTESTAT.VII IMP IIII.COS.V.P.P [E]QVITIBVS·ET·PEDITIBVS·QVI MILITANT·IN ALIS [Q]VATVOR ET.COHORTIBVS.DECEM.ET.VNA.QVAE.AP PELLANTVR.I.THRACVM.ET.I.PANNONIORVM.TAM PIANA·ET·II·GALLORVM SEBOSIANA·ET·HISPA NORVM VETTONVM·C·R·ET·I·HISPANORVM·ET·I VALCIONYM MILLIARIA · ET · I · ALPINORVM · ET · I · MORINORVM·ET·I·CVGERNORVM·ET·I·BAETASI ORVM·ET·Ī·TVNGRORVM·MILLIARIA·ET·ĪĪ·THRA CVM·ET·III·BRACAR·AVGVSTANORVM·ET·IIII· LINGONVM-ET. IIII. DELMATARYM. ET. SVNT IN BRITANNIA SVB·I·NERATIO MARCELLO. QVI·QVINA·ET VICENA·PLVRAVE STIPENDIA MERVERVNT·QVORVM·NOMINA·SVBSCRIPTA SVNT IPSIS LIBERIS POSTERISQVE-EORVM-CIVITA TEM.DEDIT ET.CONVBIVM.CVM.VXORIBVS.QVAS. TVNC+HABVISSENT+CVM+EST+CIVITAS HS+DATA AVT.SI.QVI.COELIBES.ESSENT.CVM.IIS QVAS POSTEA · DVXISSENT · DVMTAXAT · SINGVLI · SIN GVLAS A.D.XIIII.K. FEBR. M· LABERIO MANIMO II Q. GLITIO ATHLIO, AGRICOLA II COS. ALAE·T·PANNON1ORVM·TAMPIANAE·CVI·PRAEST C VALERIVS CELSVS DECVRIONI **REBVRRO**. SEVERI.F. HISPAN

DESCRIPTVM·ET·RECOGNITVM·EX TABVLA·AENEA· QVAE·FIXA·EST·ROMAE·IN MVRO·POST·TEMPLVM [DIVI AVG]VSTI AD·MINERVAM·

Q·POMPEI	HOMERI
C•PAPI	EVSEBETIS
T •FLAVI	SECVNDI
P CAVLI	VITALIS
C VETTIENI	MODESTI
P·ATINI	HEDONICI
TI·CLAVDI	MENANDRI
	P. 5.

CLXXXVIII.

SE | NI | CIA | NE | VI | VA | S | II | NDE P. 70, note.

CLXXXIX.

IMP CAES DIVITRAIANPARTHFDIV.NER * * TRAIANHADRIANAVG * * ...B. POTIV COSIIIARATIS

H

P. 86.

CXC.

IX

NVMC ****** IMP CAESAR·M AVREL·ANTONINVS PIVS·TI.IX AVG·ARAB

IX

P. 227.

XLV

CXCI.NINO AVG.PIO PP·COS III

* I·I·CVGERNOR .M*III·MP P. 233.

CXCII. MÆMRVS P. 106. CXCIII. ÎIAVGANT P. 107.

CXCIV. LEG·VI· VIC·PF G·P·R·F· P. 116, note. CXCV. COHVI LOVS SVAVIS P. 118, note.

CXCVI. CATTIVS MANSINVS P. 127. CXCVII. PRIMVSTES ERA P. 131.

CXCVIII. T. IVNIANI HOFSVMAD_PV EC VMODELICTA A MEDICIS

P. 177.

XLVI

XLVII



CC. socio RÓMAE Additions to p. 54.

NOTES.

ENGLAND.

CHESHIRE.

§ 1. Amongst the Marmora Oxoniensia is an altar, found at *Chester, bearing an inscription of the date A.D. 154, which has been frequently copied and explained.⁺

There can be but little doubt that the true reading of the inscription is as follows :

> I·O·M·TANARO T·ELVPIVS·GALER PRAESENS·GVNTIA PRI·LEG·XX·V·V COMMODO ET LATERANO COS V·S·L·M

Of the interpretations which have been proposed, the most extraordinary is that given by De Wal, in his *Mythologiae Septen*trionalis Monumenta, Utrecht, 1847. He expands it thus :

> "Jovi Optimo Maximo Tanaro, Titus Elupius, Galeria tribu, et Præsens, Guntia tribu, Primipilares legionis xx ‡Valeriæ Victricis, Commodo et Laterano consulibus, Votum solvunt lubenter merito."

^{*} The Deva of the Itinerary of Antoninus.

[†] It is especially interesting on account of the epithet Tanarus, which is given to Jupiter; and the supposition is not improbable, that Tunarus, Turas, and Turanuncus denote the same deity, the Thor of the northern nations.

 $[\]ddagger$ I prefer this explanation (scil. VALERIA) of the first of the V-V commonly applied to this legion, to V[ALENS] adopted by Horsley, Orelli and Bruce, and V[ALERIANA]

The obvious *objections to this rendering are, that there is no ground for supposing that the altar was erected by two persons, and that there is no authority for a tribe called *Guntia*. I can see no reason for rejecting the opinion adopted by Horsley, *Britannia Romana*, p. 315, and Orelli, n. 2054, that GVNTIA is the name of the birth-place of Titus Elupius Præsens, scil., *Guntia*, a town in Vindelicia. The *legitimus ordo nominum*, from the *pranomen* to the *patria*, is thus preserved, with the exception,

* My objection is not to the supplying of the et, although not found on the stone, for there are cases in which this is necessary, but to the mistake, which is common, of introducing it where it is not required. Thus I question whether it is necessary in another well-known inscription, also found at Chester:

> ** O'SALDOMIN *** M'NNINVI **** SIMORVM AVGG-GENIOLOCI FLAVIVS-LONG ** TRIBMIL-LEG *** * LONGINVS-FIL * VS-DOMO SAMOSATA V S

urged by Musgrave. It is possible that there may have been two 20th legions, one of which was styled Valens Victorie, as Musgrave supposed on the authority of "an inscription at Parma and another quoted by Gruter," or Valens may have been another title of the same 20th, but the authority of Dio Cassius is express as to that which served in Britain having been styled Valeria Victria, and he even questions the existence of a different 20th legion in his time. See Dio Cassius, LV, 23, Spon's Miscellanea, p. 195, and Henzen, nn. 6650, and 6571. Stuart, Caledonia Romana, p. 366, ed. Prof. Thomson, strangely observes-" Some critics have imagined that the proper title of this legion was Valeria or Valeriana; but this is set at rest by the inscription on plate xv., fig. 8." It is not easy to understand the meaning of this assertion, for on reference to the specified plate and figure, it appears that the epithets of the 20th are there given as VAL-VIC, from which, as is plain, no inference can be drawn in favour of either Valens, or Valeria, or Valeriana. Nor is there any inscription found in Britain, so far as I am aware, in which these titles of the legion are given in extenso. In the Journal of the Archaological Institute, xv. p. 159, there is a remark that "the [first] title occurs in the form Valeriana on an inscription in Bath;" but this statement is erroneous. Mr. Warner, Hist. of Bath, Append., p. 121, gives Valeriana as an expansion, but the stone has only V-

Horsley expands it thus:-"" Pro salute dominorum nostorum invictissimorum Augustorum, Genio loci Flavius Longus tribunus militum legionis vicesime Victricis et Longinus filius ejus domo Samosata votum solverunt." To me it seems more probable that the letter or letters denoting the father's making a vow were either to be understood, (of which there are examples), or are lost, having been cut on a portion of the stone now defaced, and that the altar was erected by the son alone, in performance of the vow made by the father, who was prevented from executing it. Henzen, n. 5763, furnishes an example of the performance of a father's vow by his sons. Horsley's reading of ET before LONGINVS appears highly improbable: the lost letters were, doubtless, *mater* of the nomen. For the emendation of an error, similar to that of De Wal's, whereby through intrusion of an et two persons are made out of one, see my notes on inscriptions found in Mannout/shire.

indeed, of the nomen patris, but that is omitted in the inscription. Gough's objection, Canden's Britannia, iv. p. 89, to the position of the tribe (Galeria) between the names (Elupius and Prasens), with his consequent preference of Galerius, is not worth considering; for it is plain that he was not aware that, in the normal arrangement of Latin names, the nomen patris and tribus come between the nomen gentilitium and the cognomen. And yet Mr. Wright, "Celt, Roman, and Saxon, p. 261, influenced perhaps by the objection, gives Galerius.

Horsley suggests a doubt whether we should read PRI for *prinipilus*, or PRE for *prinipilus*; but there seems no ground for questioning the received reading—PRI. With Henzen, however, I think it uncertain whether we should regard it as standing for *prinipilus* or *princeps*. Of the two I prefer the latter, as we find PRI. PRI. for *princeps prior*, or *primus* in Orelli, n. 3451.

§ 2. In Wright's Celt, Roman, and Saxon, p. 362, we find the following account of the tabulæ honestæ missionis found in Britain :---

In earlier times the grants of citizenship were duly registered at Rome, and copies of the grant, inscribed on plates of copper or bronze, appear to have been sent to the place where these new citizens resided. Several such plates have been discovered in Britain, as well as in other parts of the empire. One of these was dug up in the parish of Malpas, in Cheshire, in 1812; fragments of two others were found in a gravel pit on Sydenham Common, in Kent, in 1806; and another was found at Stainington, in Yorkshire, in 1761. They are all decrees of the Emperor Trajan, in favour of certain veterans serving in the troops in Britain, and conferring upon them the civitas, or rights of citizenship, and the consequent connubium, or civil right belonging to legitimate marriage.

The inscription found at Malpas, as the most perfect, may be given as an example of this important class of inscriptions.

†[IMP·C]AESAR DIVI·NERVAE F NERVA TRAIANVS [AV]GVSTVS GERMANICUS DACICVS PONTIFEX MAX IMVS TRIBVNIC POTESTAT VII IMP IIII COS V PP-[E]QVITIBVS ET PEDITIEVS QVI MILITANT IN ALIS

^{*} In the 2nd edition, 1861, he gives it correctly, "seil. of the Galerian tribe."

[†] I have given the text according to the readings in the Monumenta Historica Britannica, n. 7.

[Q]VATVOR.ET.COHORTIBVS.DECEM.ET.VNA.QVAE.AP PELLANTVR T.THRACVM ET T. PANNONIORVM TAM PIANA·ET·II·GALLORVM SEBOSIANA·ET·I·HISPA NORVM VETTONVM C R ET T HISPANORVM ET T VALCIONVM·MILLIARIA·ET I·ALPINORVM·ET·I. MORINORVM ET I CVGERNORVM ET I BAETASI ORVM·ET·I·TVNGRORVM·MILLIARIA·ET·II·THRA CVM·ET·III·BRACAR·AVGVSTANORVM·ET·IIII· LINGONVM ET IIII DELMATARVM ET SVNT IN BRITANNIA SVB-I-NERATIO MARCELLO QVI-QVINA-ET VICENA-PLVRAVE STIPENDIA MERVERVNT-QVORVM-NOMINA-SVBSCRIPTA SVNT IPSIS LIBERIS POSTERISQVE-EORVM-CIVITA TEM-DEDIT ET-CONVBIVM-CVM-VXORIBVS-QVAS-TVNC-HABVISSENT-CVM-EST-CIVITAS-HS-DATA AVT-SI-QVI-COELIBES-ESSENT-CVM-HS OVAS POSTEA DVXISSENT DVMTAXAT SINGVLI SIN GVLAS AD XIIII K FEBR м LABERIO ΜΑΧΙΜΟ ΪΙ Q GLITIO ATILIO AGRICOLA II COS ALAE-T-PANNONIORVM-TAMPIANAE CVI PRAEST C VALERIVS CELSVS DECVRIONI REBVRRO SEVĖRI F HISPAN DESCRIPTVM·ET·RECOGNITVM·EX TABVLA·AENEA QVAE·FIXA·EST·ROMAE·IN MVRO·POST·TEMPLVM [DIVI AVG]VSTI AD MINERVAM-Q-POMPEI HOMERI C·PAPI EVSEBETIS

T·FLAVI	SECVNDI
P·CAVLI	VITALIS
C.VETTIENI	MODESTI
P·ATINI	HEDONICI
TI·CLAVDI	MENANDRI

The date of this record is fixed by its internal evidence to the 20th day of January, A. D. 103. The other similar monuments found in Britain are all of the same year. The example given above may be translated thus:— The emperor Cæsar, deified Nerva's son, Nerva Trajanus Augustus, the German, the Dacian, Pontifex Maximus, invested with the tribunitian power the seventh time, emperor the fourth year [time], consul the fifth time, father of his country, to the cavalry and infantry who serve in the four alae and eleven cohorts, which are called the first of the Thracians and the first of Pannonians, termed the Tampian, and the second of Gauls termed Sebosian, and the first of Spanish Vettones, Roman citizens, and the first of Valciones, a milliary one, and the first of Alpini, and the first of Morini, and

6

the first of Cugerni, and the first of Baetasi, and the first of Tungrians, a milliary one, and the second of Thracians, and the third of Braccae Augustani, and the fourth of Lingones, and the fourth of Dalmatians, and they [dele] are in Britain under Julius Neratius Marcellus, who have served twenty-five or more years, whose names are written below, to themselves, their children and posterity, has given *civitas* and *connubium* (the rights of citizenship and marriage) with their wives, whom they might then have when citizenship was given to them, or if any of them were unmarried, with those whom they might afterwards take, that is to say, each with each. On the 13th Kalends of February. To M. Laberius Maximus twice, and Q. Glitius Atillius Agricola twice consuls, to the first ala of the Pannonians, termed the Tampian, which is commanded by C. Valerius Celsus, to the decurion Reburrus, son of Severus, the Spaniard. Cepied and revised from the tablet of brass which is fixed at Rome on the wall behind the temple of divine Augustus near that of Minerva.

Quintus Pompeius Homerus, Caius Papius Eusebes, Titus Flavius Secundus, Publius Caulus Vitalis, Caius Vettienus Modestus, Publius Atinius Hedonicus, and Titus Claudius Menander."

In this account there are some serious errors, which it seems important to point out, as the work in which they are found is justly regarded as a very useful and able compendium of British Archaeology. ** The statement that "they are all decrees of the emperor Trajan" is erroneous. Of the three tabula honesta missionis, given in Monum. Hist. Brit., pp. ev., evi., two are Trajan's and one Hadrian's. Again, ""the statement that "the date of this record [the inscription found at Malpas] is fixed by its internal evidence to the *20th day of January, A.D. 103" is erroncous. **TRIB**•**POT**• $\overline{\text{VII}}$ •**IMP**• $\overline{\text{IIII}}$ •COS• $\overline{\text{V}}$ correspond to A. D. 104. **The statement is also erroneous that "the other similar monuments found in Britain are all of the same year." The dates of the others are correctly given in Monum. Hist. Brit. as A.D. 105-6 and 124. Mr. Wright's text is, I believe, taken from that in Lysons's Reliq., the same which is adopted in Monum. Hist. Brit., but it requires cmendation. **Instead of VALCIONVM in the 9th line we should evidently read, with Henzen, VANGIONVM;

^{**}The errors marked thus ** are here noticed by me for the first time, while those marked \dagger were encoded in my article published in the *Canadian Journal* for May, 1859. Mr. Wright, in his 2nd edition, 1861, corrects the latter, but leaves the former as they originally stood.

^{*} Mr. Wright reads XIII K FEBR which corresponds to Jan. 20, but in Monum. Hist, Brit, we find XIIII K FEBR i, e. Jan. 19.

he also gives instead of I.NERATIO, L.NERATIO. This legate was the brother of the distinguished lawyer, Lucius Neratius Priscus, and had been *consul the year before, i. e. A. D. 103. See Borghesi, Ann. Inst. Arch., 1852, p. 5. + †Again, the meaning of the words, dumtaxat singuli singulas, is not expressed by "each with each." The sense is "provided they have but one each." Martini, Diss. super Cland., explains this as prohibiting their having more than one wife at the same time; but Spangenberg, Tab. Neg., p. 520, regards it as a limitation of the privilege of marriage; and, in confirmation of this view, refers to two tabula, in which prime is expressed. The constructions, also, are in some cases incorrect. ** Instead of "on the 13th kalends of February" as the translation of A·D·XIII·K·FEBR, it should be "on the thirteenth day before the kalends of February." Again, the words M. Laberio Maximo II. Q. Glitio Agricola II. Cos, should not have been translated as if they were in the dative case. The expression is the ordinary form in the ablative. # Nor do I regard alw prime Tampiana as being in the dative : they are in the genitive after decurioni. Finally, the name of the last witness is not ** " Titus Claudius Menander," but Tiberius Claudius Menander.

 \pm Reburns, the son of Severus, a Spaniard, a decurio of the first *ala* of Pannonians termed the Tampian, is specially named, as one of those to whom the privileges of *civitus* and *commbining* were given, either because this revised copy belonged to him, and was made for his use, or because he was the bearer of the *diploma* to the army in Britain – According to the first of these explanations, whilst the original at Rome gave the names of all those to whom the privileges had been ceded, in each copy made for an individual only his name was given, with occasionally the addition of the names of his wife and children. The seven names, with which the inscription ends, are those of the witnesses who attested the truth of the copy. On this subject, see Marini, *Atti de Frat. Arv.*, ii. p. 433; Platzmann, *Juris Romani Testimoniis*, §c.; Morcelli, *de Stil.*, ii. p. 309; Borghesi, *Actt. Acad.*

^{*} His prænomen is usually given as P.

[†] This name is on a stone found in Yorkshire. See Camden's Brit. ed., Gough, iii. p. 272.

pont. Archæol. x. p. 131; Cardinali, Diplomi Imperiali; Arneth, Zwölf Römische Militär-diplome; and Henzen, Rhein Jahrbb, xiii. p. 98.

§ 3. Camden, *Gough's edit.*, iii. p. 45, notices the discovery of 20 pigs of lead on the coast of Cheshire. The inscription on some was—

IMP.VESP.VII.T.IMP.V.COS,

on others IMP·DOMIT·AVG·GER·DE CEANG

In 1838 a pig of lead was found about a mile from Chester, on the road to London, and very near the Roman road from Chester to Manchester. It bore the inscription

 $IMP \cdot VESP \cdot \overline{V} :: T \cdot IMP \cdot \overline{III} \cdot COS.$

In 1859 another pig of lead was found near Common Street, Chester. It bore the imperfect inscription

CAESAR**** VADON.

On these see my notes on inscriptions found in Derbyshire.

§ 4. In The Journal of the Archaeological Association v. p. 223, Mr. C. Roach Smith figures a stone bearing the following inscription :

COH·I·> OCRATI MAXIMI QL·M·P

On this see my notes on inscriptions found in Monmouthshire.

§ 5. In the year 1854 [?] an altar was found in Chester bearing the following imperfect Greek inscription :

HPΣIN
* * ΕΡΜΕΝΕΣΙΝ
έrmoγεnhΣ
ΙΑΤ̈́ROΣ ΒΩΜΟΝ
ΤΟΝΔΑΝΕΘΗΚΑ

On this see my notes on inscriptions found in Northumberland.

§ 6. In The Gentleman's Magazine for March, 1862, there is a report of the proceedings of the Chester "Architectural, Archæological, and Historic Society," in which an account is given of an altar found in 1861, in Bridge St. Row.

"At some early period a piece had been chipped away from the proper left front of this altar, whereby the inscription had become somewhat difficult to decipher; but what remained was easily discernible, and ran as follows:---

DEAEM NERVA FVRIV FORTV NATVS MAG V

This, on the supposition that MAG represented the word Magister, and that the initial S completed the inscription when perfect, Mr. Ffoulkes translated thus:--"To the goddess Minerva, Furius Fortunatus the magister performs his vow." The magister was a personage of the highest rank, and there were but few of them met with in the whole history of the empire: the letters in question might therefore bear some other construction, as it might fairly be doubted whether Furius Fortunatus of Chester would be likely to be a man of such an excellent position."

The argument adduced here against mag. standing for magister is, in my judgment, inconclusive, as the statement that "the magister was a personage of the highest rank, and there were but few of them met with in the whole history of the Besides the magistri of different kinds empire" is erroueous. who held high positions under the emperors, there are many examples of the application of this term to presiding officers in towns and in colleges. See Henzen's Index, p. 163 and p. 177. The reading, however, of Mr. Hughes, who regarded "the supposed first three letters of the title magister as in reality initial letters of independent words," is to be preferred, especially as he was led to this reading "by distinctly seeing stops or contracting marks between each of those letters as well as the remains of a P farther on in the same line." "It is understood," the report proceeds, "that Mr. Ffoulkes has, since the meeting, examined the inscription more minutely, and has arrived at a similar opinion."

There can be no reasonable doubt as to the correctness of Mr. Hughes's reading. The same letters, MAG, are found in a similar position in Horsley's *Yorkshire*, n. xvii :

> DVICI BRIG ET NVMM AVGG T AVR AVRELIAN VS DD PRO SE ET SVIS SMAGS

Dr. Musgrave read the last five letters of the last line—sacram memori animo gratis solvens: Horsley preferred—susceptum merito animo grato solvit: and Orelli, n. 1989, gives for the four last—memor animo grato (or agens gratias) solvit. Of these I prefer memor animo grato solvit. The phrase animo grato resembles $\mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{L} \cdot$, animo libente, so often found in the African inscriptions. In the same way, I think, the same letters, MAG, in Monum. Hist. Brit., p. cix. n. 24 b, should be expanded, not MAGNAM, as suggested by Mr. Mathews, Gentleman's Magazine, 1842, p. 598. If Mr. Hughes be correct as to P following the MAG, the last two lines may be read :—

> M[EMOR] A[N1M0] G[RATO] P[OSVIT] *V[OTO] [S[OLVTO] or [S]VSCEPTO.

§ 7. From a well known passage in the Agricola of Tacitus, c. 31, we learn that amongst the Roman auxiliaries serving in Britain in A D. 84 were two cohorts of Tungrians. The numbers of these cohorts are not stated, but the inscriptions-which have been found warrant the belief that they were the 1st and 2nd. The continuance of the 1st in the island is attested by many memorials, and was long ago known to archeologists, but no traces of the 2nd were discovered until a comparatively late period. It is not mentioned in the Notitia nor in the Tabulæ honestæ missionis; no recognised records of it had been found in the times of Camden or Horsley; and even within the last few years, Böcking, in his elaborate edition of the Notitia, 1839-1853, makes no mention of any traces of it, whilst Roulez, in an article, Mem. l'Acad. Royale de Belgique, 1852, xxvi., p. 12, on "the contingent furnished to the Roman army by the peoples of Belgium," remarks:

"Nous ne savons pas ce que devint la seconde des cohortes (ce qui ne veut pas dire la cohorte II, car elle a pu avoir un antre numéro) qui avaient combattu sous les drapeaux d'Agricola: l'absence de tout vestige de son séjour dans la Bretagne doit faire croire qu'elle quitta ce pays long temps avant l'autre."

The inscriptions, which have been found at Castle Steads in this county, and at *Birrens in Scotland, prove that the 2nd cohort was quartered at both these places, and we can establish its presence at the first of them so late as A. D. 241. Mr. Thomas Hodgson, *Archeologia Æliana*, ii. p. 80, has discussed the inscriptions on the two altars erected by this corps, which have been found in this county since the publication of the *Britannia Romana*. The following are the inscriptions:

> $ET \cdot NVM * * * *$ $N \cdot COH \cdot \overline{11} \cdot TVN$

[•] See my notes on inscriptions found in Dumfriesshire.

GROR·GOR· 💬 ·EQ * L·CVI·PRAE EST * * CLAV D * * * * PRA EF·INSTANTE AEL·MARTINO PRINC·X·KAL * * * IMP·DNG * * AUG·III PO MPEIANO COS

 $\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{O} & \mathbf{M} \\ \mathbf{COH} \cdot \mathbf{II} \cdot \mathbf{TV} \mathbf{NGR} \\ \overline{\mathbf{\infty}} & \mathbf{EQ} \cdot \mathbf{C} \cdot \mathbf{L} \cdot \mathbf{CVI} \\ \mathbf{PRAEEST} \cdot \mathbf{A} \mathbf{LB} \\ \mathbf{SEVERVS} \cdot \mathbf{PR} \\ \mathbf{AEF} \cdot \mathbf{TV} \mathbf{NG} \cdot \mathbf{IN} \\ \mathbf{STA} \cdot \mathbf{VIC} \cdot \mathbf{SEVRO} \\ \mathbf{PRINCIPI} \end{array}$

Mr. Hodgson expands them thus :

[Jovi optimo maximo] et Numinibus Augusti nostri cohors secunda Tungrorum Gordiana milliaria equitata cirium Latinorum, cui praeest Sicilius Claudianus præfectus, instante Aelio Martino principe, decimo kalendarum J———, imperatore Domino nostro Gordiano Augusto tertium Pompeiano consulibus.

* Jovi optimo maximo cohors secunda Tungrorum milliaria equitata civium Latinorum, cui praeest Albus Severus praefectus Tungrorum, instante Victore Sevro (or. Severo) principi.

The chief doubts which I have as to these expansions relate to the names of the prefect and *princeps* in the 2nd. I would substitute *Albius* for *Albus*, and *Victorius* for *Victor*. The difficulty about III in the last line but one of the 1st, marking the *third* consulate of Gordian, when it was really his *second*, I know not how to get over except on the supposition, suggested by Hodgson, "of some unrecorded or forgotten petty consulate." Henzen suggests, as a remedy, the reading II.ET. In this he was anti-

^{*} Dr. Bruce, Roman Wall, 2nd ed., p. 264, adopts Mr. Hodgson's expansion.

cipated by Hodgson, who abandoned it, when he was informed by the lady, in whose possession the altar was, that "the I was too distinctly cut to be mistaken."

Let us now consider the "two imperfect inscriptions given by Camden," from which Horsley was led to believe that *Castle Steads was for a short time garrisoned by the *cohors prima Tungrorum*.

The first, as figured, pl. xxi., fig. 8, iii. p. 422, ed. Gough, may be thus represented :

I O M OHITVNG ILEC CLCV AEES AVRE OPTA VSP FVII STAN MES OPSP PI INC

The stone was broken on the left side (proper), and a crack extended from the top to the bottom, passing a little to the right of O in the first line, and of T in the second, between CC in the third, S and A in the fourth, through A in the fifth, between I and S in the sixth, S and O in the seventh, and I and I in the eighth. It may be restored thus :

> I • O • M COH•II•TVNG•M IL•EQ•CL•CVI•PR AEEST•AVREL OPTATVS•PRAEF TVN•INSTANTE MESSOR•SP PRINCIPI

i. e. Jovi optimo maximo, cohors secunda Tungrorum, miliaria, equitata, civium Latinorum, cui præest Aurelius Optatus præfectus Tungrorum, instante Messorio Sp..... principi.

^{*} Otherwise called *Combeck fort*. It is regarded by Horsley and Bruce as the *Petriana* of the *Notitia*. MacLauchlan, *Memoir written during a survey of the Roman Wall*, p. 62, observes that "the garden at Walton House is placed within the station, which include the flower garden, and extends about twenty yards beyond the north wall."

In the second line I read, with Hodgson, II instead of I, as the second I seems to have been lost by the fracture, and we have the II quite distinct on the other two altars also found here. In the third, I read *mil. eq.* i. e. **milliaria equitata*, as suggested by Hodgson. Mr. Carlisle, *Archaeologia*, xi., correctly explained them, as they occur in the first inscription, by a reference to Hyginus *de castrametatione*, from whose statement it appears that a *cohors equitata milliaria* consisted of 760 foot soldiers and of 240 horsemen.⁺ In the explanation of $\mathbb{C} \cdot \mathbf{L} \cdot -i$. *c. civium Latinorum*, I

^{*} Otherwise miliaria, which is at present preferred.

[†] It is strange that the author of an article, manifesting so much careful research as these observations by Mr. Hodgson evidently do, should be so little acquainted with the character of the auxiliary forces employed by the Romans as to remark relative to this cohort :

[&]quot;The description here given of the cohors miliaria, may not at first sight, perhaps, appear applicable to the cohort now under consideration, from the circumstance of its being the second, and not the first, cohort of the Tungri; but it should be recollected that it is an auxiliary, and not a legionary, cohort; and, as is well observed by Mr. Gale. "though the second of the Tungri, it might yet be the first, or miliary, cohort of the auxiliary legion to which it belonged." No such body as an "auxidary legion," composed of such "auxiliary cohorts," ever existed, and the term miliary, as applied to an auxiliary cohort, was in no way connected with its number, whether 1st or not. In this particular case, scil. of the Tungrians, both 1st and 2nd cohorts were miliary. But as this whole subject has received little attention from English scholars, and is not treated of in any of our works on Roman Antiquities, it may, perhaps, be useful for me to discuss it more particularly. There were three classes of auxiliary forces-cavalry, infantry, and mixed cavalry and infantry. To the first of these classes belong the alw, to the second the cohortes peditum, or peditate, and to the third the cohortes equestres. or equitatic. Both the ala and cohortes were numbered, I, II, III, &c., probably according to the order in which they were formed, and were designated by the name of the people amongst whom they were raised. Thus ala 1 Tungrorum, cohors 121 Nerviorum, &c. They also bore titles similar to those conferred on the legions, such as ala Ang. Gordiana, ala Flavia pia fidelis mil., cohors I Elia Dacorum Gordiana, &c. The also had also titles, probably derived from the names of the officers who first organized or commanded them, such as ald Frontoniana, ala Indiana. Of each of these bodies there were two kinds, denominated according to their number of men quingenaria or miliariae, i. e. 500 or 1000 strong. In the alt quingenaria there were 16 turnae or troops, in the ala miliaria 24. Each of the troops was commanded by a decurio, and the whole ala by a præfectus equitum. In the cohortes peditum or peditatæ, there were six or ten centurice or companies, according as they were respectively guingenarice or miliariae. Each century was commanded by a centurio, and the cohort by an officer styled proefectus or tribunus. In the cohortes equestres or equitata, there were six centurize of infantry and six turnie of cavalry, or ten of infantry and ten of cavalry, according as the cohort was quingenaria or miliaria. The commanding officer was called præfectus. Such was the 2nd cohort of the Tungrians-miliaria equitata. The advantages of this mixed body of infantry and cavalry were first known to the Romans at the siege of Capua. See Livy xxvi, 4. Casar, Bell. Gall. i, 48, vii, 65, viii, 13, adopted this usage from the Germans, and under Vespasian cohorts of this description were in the Roman service. See Josephus, Bell. Jud. iii, 4. They then consisted of 600 infantry and 120 cavalry. From Trajan's time there were the two classes already noticed-quingenaria and miliaria. The first consisted of-

have followed Mr. Hodgson, not that I am quite satisfied with it, as I know no authority for it, but because it is probable and I have myself* nothing more likely to propose. The readings of the remaining lines are justified by reference to the second of the two altars explained by Mr. Hodgson; indeed the inscriptions are precisely similar, with the exceptions of the names of the individuals, who are mentioned, the use of the symbol $\overline{00}$ for MIL, and TVNG, for TVN. which I propose in the 6th line, as there does not seem to be room for the G.

Relative to instante, Mr. Hodgson judiciously remarks :---

"Instante, say both Mr. Ward and Mr. Gale, is the same as curante, but this I take to be an opinion not exactly warranted by inscriptions. From these it appears to me that by cura or curans, is expressed one species of duty, and by instans, another and inferior duty. The former terms seem to have been applied to those who gave orders, or provided the necessary funds for the erection of any work; and the latter to those, on whom devolved the duty of carrying the others' directions into execution, and of superintending the progress of the work."

The gradations in rank of the persons engaged in the execution of a work are marked by the words, *jubente* or *imperante* (or *jussu* or *imperio*),—*curante*, (or *cura*, *sub cura*, *per curam*, or *per*) —and *instante* or *insistente*, (or *instantia*.) The first of these is applied to the emperor or the imperial legate, or the person supplying the funds, the second never to the emperor but to the legate or other officer or individual charged with the direction of the work, and the third never to the emperor or legate but to the

FORTVNAE·COH·I·NERV M·GERMANORVM·EQ

we have an example of the *miliaria* and *equilata* separated by the name of the people. I suspect, however, that the M should have been read AN^* or ANA^{*} e. cohors primes Nervana Germanorum equitata. See § 10.

*Henzen, nn. 6780, 6781, suggests as an emendation C'R', but the reading C'L' cannot be questioned.

³⁸⁰ infantry and 120 cavalry; the second of 760 infantry and 240 cavalry. I have mentioned that such cohorts were styled equestres or equitate, but the latter word is the term used in inscriptions, and was, I suspect, a vulgarism. Pliny, Ep. x, 107, 108, uses equestres. The following are the varieties, which I have noticed, in the epigraphic designation of such cohorts:-MILLIAR-EQVIT', MIL-EQ., ∞EQ --but I do not recollect having ever met with the two words together in extense. The style of the 1st cohort of the Varduli, which served in Britain, is peculiar, as these designations are inverted in order; and if the inscription given in Gough's Camden, iv. p. 62, be correct-

officer or individual under whose immediate superintendence the work was executed. Mr. Hodgson also judiciously rejects the opinion that *Princeps* is a proper name. He correctly regards it as a designation of military rank, and cites in confirmation of his view, a passage from *Manutius*, in which it is stated that there were centurions called *primus princeps*, secundus, et similiter. He would have expressed the opinion, which he seems to have held, more clearly, if he had added that *princeps* alone stands for *primus princeps*. The first centurion of the *principes* was called *princeps*, and in military rank stood next to the first centurion of the *triari*, who was called *primipilus*.

The other imperfect inscription which was found here, as noticed by Camden, is-

IV..... M..... CVPA L.... LEG: AVG: PP: COH: I: TVNG POSVIT

Instead of CVPA read CVRA, taking L as the initial of the prænomen of the legate. The other lines are, of course, LEG[ATI] AUG[VSTI] P[RO]P[RAETORE] COH[ORS] PRIMA TUNG[RORVM] POSVIT. It must be confessed that this inscription seems to countenance the statement that the 1st cohort of the Tungrians at one time garrisoned the station at Castle Steads; and yet, as no certain memorial of the 1st has been found here, it is not improbable, as Hodgson suggests, that in the injury which the stone has sustained by fracture, the second numeral may have been obliterated.

§ 8. On a fragment of an altar, found within the station of *Birdoswald, is the following inscription :

IOM COH · I · A ELI DAC · ANIO

^{*} There can be no reasonable doubt that this is the Amboglanna of the Notitia.

Horsley, Brit. Rom. p. 253, observes: "Anio must be the name, or part of the name, of some person who belonged to this cohort. The name Anionius is in Gruter, but I will not say that this has been the name here." The true reading is ANTO. the beginning of ANTONINIANA. The cohors prima Ælia Dacorum was also styled Gordiana, Postumiana, and Tetriciana or Tetricianorum. P. S.—Henzen, n. 6689., has anticipated me.

§ 9. One of the most highly ornamented altars discovered in England was found "in the camp at "Maryport." It is figured in Dr. Bruce's *Roman Wall*, 2nd ed, p. 377. The inscription, which has been known since the time of Camden, is easily deciphered and interpreted, with the exception of the last two lines. In Dr. Bruce's copy it stands thus:

> GENIO LOCI FORTVNAE +REDVCI ROMAE AETERNAE ET FATO BONO G CORNELIVS PEREGRINUS TRIB COHOR EX PROVINCIA. MAVR CAESA DOMOSE ,

It is accompanied by the following translation and remarks :

"To the Genius of the place, To treturning Fortune, To eternal Rome, And to propitious fate Gaius Cornelius Peregrinus

18

^{*}This station. otherwise known as *Elenborough* or *Elenfoot* is regarded by Horsley as either *Virosidum* or *Olenacum*. Camd-n believed it to be the la ter.

[†]In Horsley's plate the line is complete without VCI.

[‡] This does not express the meaning of *redux* as applied to *Fortuna*. It means "causing the return," " bringing back."

Tribune of a cohort, From the province of Mauritania Cæsariensis

The lower lines of the inscription of this altar are much injured; they probably refer to the restoration of some buildings."

Orelli, n. 1776, following Gruter, MXVII. 7, gives the last two lines thus :

DOMO SETEDES DECVR·

Gruter, cvii, 5, has a different reading of the last line but one, scil., DOMOS·AEDES; whilst Horsley, Cumberland, lxviii., gives DOMOS ⁻EÆD.

Camden, ed. Gough, iii, 423, remarks :—" Every thing is perfectly plain on this inscription, except that in the last line but one ET and ÆDES are expressed in abbreviations. The end is imperfect. Perhaps we are to restore it thus, DECVRIONVM ORDINEM RESTITVIT, &c. The Decuriones were in the *municipia* the same as the senatores at Rome and in the colonies." Horsley justly remarks that he is at a loss to understand Camden's meaning, but suggests no explanation of the difficulty. Gough, p. 438, adds : "Peregrinus was a tribune of a cohort from Mauritania Cæsariensis, and repaired the houses and apartments of the decuriones." "Gale, M. S. n., supplies it Decuriar rest."

These observations are evidently most unsatisfactory. What has the restoration of the order of *decuriones* or the repairing of their houses to do with the erection of such an altar as this ? Wright, *Celt. Roman, and Saxon*, p. 275 (p. 279, 2nd ed.), remarks : "The last line of the inscription, probably the usual formula, V S L L M, has been entirely erased, and we have only two letters of the name of the town from which Peregrinus came; perhaps it was on the river Serbes." To this is subjoined the note : "The last remaining letters of the inscription have usually

been explained *domos e*[*versos*] [sic], and supposed to refer to some buildings which the tribune Peregrinus had restored, but the interpretation given above is the only one authorised by a comparison of other similar inscriptions."

There can, I think, be but little doubt that Mr. Wright's is the true explanation; but the conjecture noticed by Orelli, n. 1776, scil. *Stitifi*, is much more probable than "the river *Serbes*." According to this view SE Γ E may be regarded as a misreading of SITIF., *i. e.*, *Stitifs*, the well known colony on the borders of Numidia. But the chief difficulty, the interpretation of DES DECVR, remains for consideration. On the supposition that *these letters have been correctly read, (which I regard as very doubtful), the only feasible explanation, which I can suggest, is DE S[VO] D[EDIT] ET CVR [AVIT]. The letter read as E may be ligulate ET, an abbreviation which is not uncommon.

The use of domo in the sense "birth-place," or as Mr. Wright expresses it, "native of," is very common : thus Virgil, $\mathcal{E}n$.viii, 114, unde domo? Dr. Bruce's translation "of a house," Roman Wall, 2nd edit., pp. 375, 410, fails to convey the meaning in English, as house may be regarded as signifying family. Sometimes instead of DOMO we have only D•, as in the inscription last cited ; whence I would expand D NICOMEDIA, in Horsley's Cumberland, n. lii., domo Nicomedia, not de Nicomedia as he has read it ; also in n. lvii. of the same county D MVRSA, domo Mursa, not de Mursa; and yet, it must be remembered, in favour of his explanation, that in n. lv. we have +DE TVSDRO in extenso.

Camden's conjecture, from the words on the back of the altar— VOLANTI VIVAS—that the place was called *Volantium*, is unquestionably erroneous. Horsley correctly explains them as a

^{*}On the first view the reading DEC DECVR · i. e decreto decurionum at once presents itself, but this seems scarcely appropriate to the circumstances.

[†] The use of the de here may, perhaps, be accounted for by referring it to natus, which is found in this inscription, but not in the others. Domo, or donus, are used with the ablative or genitive of the place, e. gr. domo Brixia, domo Florentia, domo Philippis, domo Bononiæ; sometimes with the ethnic adjective, e. gr. domo Bituriæ.

good wish for some person named *Volantius*—scil.—"O Volantius may you live"—" long life to you Volantius." Altars and sepulchral monuments were often profaned by such *graffiti*.

§ 10. In the Archaelogia _Eliana, ii., p. 420, we have the following inscription, copied from a stone "found about two miles from the station on the Roman wall at "Burgh-upon-Sands":--

I O M COHNRVAN GERMANORVM MIL EQ CVI PRAEEST PIVS CLCLND AIINIANV I R H V·

Mr. C. Hodgson, who communicated a paper on the subject, mentions the opinion of his brother, "that it had been an altar erected to Jupiter, the best and greatest of the Gods, by a miliaria equitata cohort of German soldiers, called Vangiones, which was commanded by a Prefect, whose first name was Pius, and the second, perhaps, Secundus. The last line but one seems to have contained his agnomen, and the last, in sigla or notes, the reason for dedicating the altar. The sigla $N \cdot \mathbb{R} \cdot$ in the second line, may be synonymous to $C \cdot \mathbb{R} \cdot$ in several inscriptions in Gruter and Horsley, and $C \cdot \mathbb{L} \cdot$ in those above at p. 91, and in English may mean—" by nation Romans."

It is plain that the proposed reading must be at once rejected; nor can there be any doubt, that the cohort mentioned here is the same as that named in the following inscriptions, the first found at †Netherby in this county, the others at Birrens in Scotland :

^{*} Either the Congavata or Axelodunum or Gabrosentis of the Notllia, but which is uncertain.

⁺ Supposed to be the castra exploratorum of the Itinerary of Antoninus.

(1) DEO SANCTO COCIDIO PATERNVS MATERNVS TRIBVNVS C.H I NERVANE EX EVOCATO PALATINO V·S·L·M· *(2) FORTVNAE COH·I NERVANA GERMANOR $\overline{\infty}$. EQ

†(3)

I O M COH·I·NERVANA GERMANOR· ∞·EQ. CVI PRAEEST L FANI VS FELIX TRIB.

[‡]Henzen, n. 5888, gives the first of these inscriptions, and proposes for NERVANE, which he can scarcely accept as standing for NERVIANE, the reading NERV·[IORVM] AVG. He states, however, §an objection to this conjecture, which I regard as decisive against it, that when AVG· (i. e. AVGVSTA) is thus applied, the usage is that it precedes the name of the nation.

22

^{*} This seems to be the inscription, which is incorrectly given by Pennant, Append. p. 403. Gough. Cumden's Britannia. iv., p. 62. Hodgson. iii., pt. ii., p. 253, Newton, Monum Hist. Brit. 71 a, and Prof. D. Wilson, Prehistoric Annals, p. 399.

[†] First published by Prof. D. Wilson, Preh. Ann., p. 400.

 $[\]ddagger$ Henzen notices the unique designation of a military office which is found in this inscription—scil. EX EVOCATO PALATINO. I have never met with another example of it. The signification of ex is plainly that Patternus [?] Maternus had been promoted to the rank of tribunus of this cohort, from the posit on of evocatus Palatinus, by which expression we may understand a soldier who after the expiration of his time of service, had been called on to discharge some extraordinary duty as a Palatine soldier, *i.e.*, as one of the bouchold guards. See Sustonius, Galba. c 10. Or it may be that he had been a Palatine soldier, and from that position was called out for foreign service, in which he received his promotion. It is worthy of remark that the Nervii supplied one of the Palatine legions, mentioned in the Notifia. See p 19, ed. Böcking.

[¿] Independently of this the reading cannot be questioned.

Mr. Roach Smith, *Collect. Antiq.*, iii., p. 202, figures the altar, which bears inscription (2), and in his observations on it, p. 204, remarks :

"Hodgson, though he corrects the mistake of Lysons [who traced the epithet NERVANA to the emperor NERVA] by referring to the rescripts of Trajan and Hadrian, did not perceive the full force of the association of the words Nervana and Germanorum and Nerviorum Germanorum. The solution is afforded by Tacitus, who informs us that the Nervii and Treviri were proud of their descent from the Germans: circa affectionem Germanicæ originis ultro ambiliosi sunt."

This is a very ingenious, but not certain application of the passage in the Germania. According to Mr. Smith's view, we must regard NERVANA, either itself or as standing for NERVIANA, as an ethnic adjective from NERVII. Now this is liable to the objection that there are examples of the adjective NER-VIVS, NERVIA, (see Orelli, nn., 2975, 5968), but none of either NERVANVS or NERVIANVS. It is strange, also, if this explanation be correct, that neither the *3rd nor the *6th cohort of the Nervii, of both of which memorials have been found in Britain, adopted the style. Mr. Smith, indeed, suggests Germanorum as an explanation of GR, applied to the 3rd, in Horsley's Northumberland, cxiii., but the letters are much. more probably a misreading of $\mathbf{C} \cdot \mathbf{R}$, civium Romanorum. The opinion of Mr. Lysons was that the term was derived from the name of the emperor Nerva, i. e., as I understand, his view was that the first cohort of the Germans was styled Nervana Germanorum, as the first cohort of the Dacians was styled *Elia* Dacorum, or of the Spaniards, Flavia Hispanorum. It is not easy to understand how "a reference to the rescripts of Trajan and Hadrian" could prove that this opinion was erroneous. I have no opportunity of referring to Hodgson's statements on the subject, but suppose that his objection to Lysons's opinion is that there is no notice of a cohort of Germans in any of the tabulæ found in Britain. If this was his objection, it is not conclusive, for on this principle we should have to reject some c. gr. cohors prima Hamio $r\nu m$, of which there is unquestionable evidence. And yet it must

[•]The tabulæ honestæ missionis prove that the 1st and 2nd also served in the island, but no traces of the 2nd have been found, nor indeed of the 1st, unless we accept COII I NERVANA as representing it.

be admitted that his view is not without its difficulties. When an auxiliary body received a title formed from the name of an emperor, it was the usage, (at least in later times), that that taken from his nomen gentilitium was placed before the name of the people—e. gr., cohors I Ælia Ducorum, ala I Flavia Gætulorum. whilst that taken from his cognomen was placed after the name of the people-e.gr., cohors II Tungrorum Gordiana, ala I Tungrorum Antoniniana, &c. It is possible, however, that this may be an exception, as ala I Vespasiana Durdanorum, Henzen, 6857. Nor are we without difficulty as to the formation of the adjective, if we trace it to NERVA. In Henzen's n. 5335 we have NER-VANA applied to Sitifis, a colony called after the emperor, but in Renier's edition of the inscriptions found at that place, including that given by Henzen, he always reads the adjective with the i. And yet it seems not improbable to me that both forms, scil. Nervanus and Nervianus derived from Nerva, were in use; certainly the adjective Nervanus is more reasonably traced to Nerva than to Nervii. It is difficult to decide which opinion should be preferred, as there are objections to both : on the whole I incline to Mr. Smith's, but I am not satisfied that it is correct.

As to the inscription, on which Mr. Hodgson comments in the Archaologia Æliana, I would read it thus :

I[OVI] O[PTIMO] M[AXIMO] COH[ORS NERVAN[A] GERMANORVM MIL[IARIA] EQ[VITATA] CVI·PRAEEST [AP]PIVS CL[AVDIVS] CLAVD[IA] [TRIBV] ATINIANV[S] PR[A]EF[ECTVS] V[OTVM] [SOLVIT]

i. e., Jovi optimo maximo, cohors Nervana Germanorum, miliaria, equitata, cui, præest Appius Claudius, Claudia *tribu*, Atinianus, præfectus, votum solvit.

§ 11. A remarkable example of the danger of attempting to restore an inscription without sufficient data is to be found in Mr. Roach Smith's remarks on a lettered stone, found, I believe, at the station at Maryport.

It is figured in the *Collectanea Antiqua*, ii. pl. 48, fig. 7, and the following (p. 202) are Mr. Smith's observations on it :---

.... ILSER . QVINANAT . GALATIA · DEC BVIT GALA.... XIT ANN MORITV DESIDER RIS · INT

"This inscription is incorrectly given by Gordon, and Hodgson does not attempt to restore it. Two lines seem wanting at the beginning and one at the end. What is left may probably be read thus:-fILius SERVii QVI NATUS GALATIA DECUBVIT GALATIA viXIT ANNOS · MORITVrus DESIDERavit patRIS IN Tumulo sepeliri?"

Mr. Wright, Celt, Roman, and Saxon, p. 320 (p. 325, 2nd ed.), gives the translation according to this reading :--

$" \dots IL SER$	son of Servius,
QVI NANAT	who born
GALATIA DEC	in Galatia
BVIT GALA	died in Galatia ;
XIT ANN	He lived years;
MORITV	On his death-bed
DESIDER	he desired
RIS INT	in his father's tomb to be buried."

To this is subjoined the following note :---

"The translation of this inscription is made after the ingenious restoration of Mr. Roach Smith, who (*Collectanea*, ii. p. 202) explains it, I believe, correctly, as follows:—f ILius SERvii QVI NATUS GALATIA DECUBVIT GALATIA viXIT ANNOS...MORITVrus DESIDERavit patRIS IN Tumulo sepeliri. In the second line, NANAT appears to be an error of the stonecutter for NAT."

In p. 319, Mr. Wright refers to this inscription in the following terms:---

"A broken inscription in one of the stations along the wall of Hadrian D

commemorates a native of Galatia, whose father having, as it appears, died in Britain, the son, who died in his native country, wished on his death-bed to be carried into Britain to be laid in his father's grave."

This simple statement of the story, as it is told in the restored inscription, manifests its improbability. It is not common, even now, with our increased facilities of transportation, for the bodies of the dead to be removed such a distance as Galatia was from Britain; and when these cases do occur, they are usually of members of families of distinction or in affluent circumstances, and with the object of having the remains deposited near those of relatives of the deceased in their native lands. Here the case seems to be of a son, whose remains, in accordance with his desire on his death-bed, were removed from his birth-place Galatia, being the place also of his death, to the grave of his father in Britain, whose presence there and whose death there are equally unexplained; and indeed inexplicable, unless on the supposition that he had gone there with the corps in which he was serving, probably as a private soldier. But besides this, at the time of the inscription (to whatever date during the Roman occupation of the island it should be referred) this power of removal seems not to have been at the pleasure of individuals. We know that the Romans did not allow a body, even temporarily interred, to be removed to any other place without the permission of the pontifices or other proper authorities. Of this we have an example in Gruter, p. DCVII. n. 1, where we find a copy of the memorial addressed by Velius Fidius for permission to remove the bodies of his wife and son from an obruendarium, or sarcophagus of clay, to a monument of marble, with the object-ut quando ego essedesiero, pariter cum iis ponar. See p. 14 of Roman Sepulchral Inscriptions, a scholarly and very interesting little work, by the Rev. J. Kenrick, of York, England; and Orelli, nn. 794, I do not mean to say that there is no authority for the 2439. removal of human remains, without a statement of permission, for there are examples, but I think that the absence of the notice in this case of both removal and permission throws additional doubt on a reading previously highly improbable. It must also be admitted, that the improbability of the removal of the bones, which in those times would, perhaps, be the only remains, is less than that of the transportation of the body.

But if we examine the restoration in detail, we shall, I think, find the degree of improbability considerably increased.

Mr. Smith reads the fragment of the first line thus : $[F]IL \cdot SER[VII]$. Now the obvious objection to this reading is that the order is contrary to usage : the name of the father should precede, and FIL or F follow. There can, I think, be but little doubt, that the name of the father was in the mutilated portion of the line before FIL and that SER stands for SER [GIA] tribu, which is thus in its proper place. In the second line—QVINANAT— NANA is treated as * a blunder of the stone-cutter, who inadvertently doubled the NA, *i.e.*, the reading

MATRIBVS M>NAN TONIVS ORBITOAL VSLM

In the 4th line the R is placed within the O, the I is a prolongation of the upright of the B, and the perpendicular of the T bisects the upper semicircle of the O.

By Mr. Smith's process the inscription assumes the following form :

MATRIBVS		
ORBITOAL		
M>NAN		
TONIVS		
VSLM		

Now even if we make the concession (for which we have no warrant) that ORBITOAL stands for ORBIS TOAL and that for ORBIS TOTALIS. what authority have we for the word TOTALIS? Again, what is the interpretation of M>N preceding ANTONIVS? Mr. Hunter, p. 53, takes no notice of the centurial mark, which appears very plainly in the

^{*} That the ancient stone-cutters, like their brethren in our day, sometimes disfigured their work by gross errors, there can be no doubt. Sidonius Apollinaris, iii., 12. refers to this in his request-vide ut vitium non faciat in marmore lapicida; and there are unquestionable examples still extant. Nor can it be doubted that the provincial workmen were inferior in knowledge and skill to the Roman and Italian. Yet I cannot but think that more errors are attributed to them than those for which they are justly responsible, and that modern critics sometimes impute to the blundering of the mason what might more properly be charged to the ignorance of his employer, or to the peculiarities of the language at the time in which the inscription was cut. or not unfrequently to the mistakes of the critics themselves. The most remarkable example, which I have noticed. of futile assumption of "the ignorance or neglect of the mason," is in Mr. Roach Smith's Collectanea Antiquas iv., 55, where he proposes to get over the difficulties of a perplexing inscription on an altar found at Doncaster by transposing a whole line. making that which is fourth stand second. Even if the effect of this novel mode of "rectification" were wholly satisfactory, so viole, t a change could not fail to be received with suspicion or even aversion, but what shall we think of it. when even after this, we have to read the transposed line-ORBITOAL-ORBIS TOTALIS, in the sense-" of the whole world." and receive no additional light on the obscurity of the line, which has been thus displaced from second to third. The whole inscription may be represented thus :

QVI · NAT[VS] is given instead of QVINANAT|VS]. Sooner than resort to this uncritical expedient, I prefer regarding QVINA as the cognomen,* even though I can produce no example of it. The letters are certainly in the position where the cognomen should be expected, scil. after the tribe. The translation of DECVBVIT-"died"-is liable to the objection, that this is not the ordinary meaning of the word. Decumbere commonly means "to fall sick," although there are examples of its gladiatorial application, "to fall in death." It is not impossible, however, that it may be used here in the sense-"the took to his bed and never left it alive." The last two lines of the inscription, † as given by Mr. Smith, scil. DESIDER* * * * RIS · INT * * * * are restored thus : DESIDER[AVIT · PAT]RIS · IN · T[VMVLO]; and to this is added, to complete the conjectural sense, but without a trace of authority on the stone, the word SEPELIRI.

The objection here is to the Latinity of the phrase desideravit sepeliri. So far as I am aware, there is no authority for its use; and the appearance of it in an inscription would, in my judgment, at once suggest doubts of the correctness of the reading or of the genuineness of the inscription.

It is not my intention to suggest any conjectural reading of the inscription which we have been examining; it seems to be too far gone to be within the reach of hopeful critical treatment. I may be permitted, however, to observe, that the reading GALA [TI],[‡] the $K\dot{a}\lambda a\tau o\nu$ of Ptolemy, is more probable than GALA [TIA]; and that the fragmentary words MORITV**** DESI-DER**** may be more plausibly explained as intimating that the

* It has occurred to me, that rerbaps the true reading is OVINA, a name, of which the first four letters are found in Mommsen, *Inscript. Neapol.* n. 6811.

† In Gordon's Itinerary, pl. 45, we find NON VA in a in a line under RIS INT.

[‡]The mention of the place of death is so uncommon, that there was probably some special reason for noticing it here. Perhaps the resemblance of *Galatum* to *Galatia* was the cause. It has been identified with *Galacum* of the Itinerary.

wood-cut, p. 54, but gives $M \cdot N \cdot as$ names of ANTONIVS. whilst Mr. Smith passes over the whole in silence. The only results of this assumption of "a blunder of the mason" and the consequent transposition of the lines are the introduction of a word, known only in spurious Latinity, and the shifting of an unexplained difficulty from the second line to the third. The inscription, as it stands, certainly seems inexplicable, but a candid admission of this is, in my judgment, much preferable to any attempt at explanation at variance with the principles of sound criticism.

deceased pined and died from fretting for his distant or deceased father, mother, or brother, scil. *desiderio patris, matris,* or *fratris.* Thus we have in Henzen, n. 7378 :---

$\mathbf{D} \cdot \mathbf{M} \cdot \mathbf{S}$

TELESINIAE·CRISPI NILLAE·CONIVGI·SANCTIS SIMAE·QVAE·OB·DESIDERIVM P·LALI·GENTIANI·VICTORIS FILI·SVI·PIISSIMI·VIVERE ABOMINAVIT·ET·POST·DIES·XV FATI·EIVS·ANIMO·DESPONDIT &c. &c. &c.

and in Cicero, Epist. ad. Attic. i. 3. Aviam tuam scito desiderio tui mortuam esse.

§ 12. In the Archæologia "Eliana, vol. iv., a broken slab, which was found in Birdoswald during the excavations which were made under the direction of Mr. Potter in 1852, is figured; and that gentleman gives the following expansion of the inscription which it bore:

"SVBMODIOIV	Sub[li]mo Dio Ju-
LIOLEGAVGPR	-lio leg[ato Aug[ustali] Pro-
PRCOHIAELDC	Prætori Coh[ors] i Æl[ia D[a]c[orum]
CVIPRAEESTM	cui præest M[arcus]
CLMENANDER	Cl[audius] Menander
TRIB	Trib[unus]."

Mr. Potter is of opinion that "if this reading be correct, there is reason to suppose that the Julius here mentioned was Julius Severus, who, in the time of Hadrian, was proprætor of Great Britain;" and, after examination, rejects a different reading which had been suggested, viz. : sub Modio Julio.

I am unable to comprehend the grounds on which Mr. Potter adopted Sublimo Dio, a reading which is wholly unprecedented and scarcely intelligible. I concur with Mr. Smith, Collectanea Antiqua, iii., p. 20, in preferring sub Modio Julio, which (as Mr. Potter remarks) gives "the name of a proprætor of Britain not

hitherto known." I am not satisfied, however, as to the correctness of Julio. The fracture of the slab seems to have so materially injured the letters, in the second line, given as LI, that it may reasonably be doubted (at least by one who has not seen the stone) whether that be the right reading; eepecially as Modius is a rare nomen, Julius a rare cognomen, and the combination of the two, so far as I know, unprecedented. Under such circumstances, I am inclined to venture on the conjectures, that the injured letters are ST, and that the Modius Justus named here is the same, who, at a different time, was LEG \cdot AVG \cdot PR \cdot PR of Numidia. He is mentioned in the following inscription given by Renier, Inscriptions de l'Algérie, n. 44.

STAT · AGRIP	Stat[iæ] Agrip-
PINAE CON	pinæ, con-
IVGIS MO	jugis Mo-
DI IVSTI LEG	di[i] Justi, leg[ati]
AVG·PR·PR	Aug[usti], Pr[o] Pr[ætore],
CONSVLIS	Consulis,
SPECVLATO	Speculato-
RES ET	res et
BENEFICIARI	Beneficiari[i].

In Mommsen's Inscript. Neapolit. n. 5274, we also find the names Modius Justus.

§ 13. In the *Journal of the Archaeological Institute*, 1860, p. 159, there is a report of a notice by Dr. Bruce of an inscribed stone recently found at Carlisle.

DEI HERC · · · · · VICTI COI · · · · TIBVS·PRO S · · · · COMMILITON · · · · BARBARORV · · · · OB VIRTV · · · P· SEXTANTIV · · · TAT·TRAIA · · · · ·

The letters are occasionally combined, or tied, but are here printed separately. The inscription (Dr. Bruce remarked) is difficult to interpret, as a

portion of each line is lost; it is also peculiar in several respects. The following reading may be conjecturally proposed :—" Dei Herculis invicti comitis numini et Dis Penatibus pro salute commilitonum barbarorum, ob virtutem, Publius Sextantius" $\cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot$ Of the concluding letters no satisfactory explanation has been proposed; it cannot be supposed that the Emperor Trajan is here referred to, none of his usual titles being given. The name Trajanus was by no means common; the epithet Trajana was sometimes applied to the second Legion, but there appears no ground for the conjecture that this inscription may have been connected with that legion."

TAT seem to me to be the last three letters of CIVITAT., *i. e., civitate* and TRAIA the beginning of TRAIANENSIS, or, rather, TRAIANOPOLI. Thus we have in Orelli, n. 2003, CIVES TRAIANENSES, and in *Museum Veronense*, p. 221, n. 7, CIV[ITATE] POLLENT[IAE].

§ 14. Many centurial inscriptions have been found in this county. On these see my notes on inscriptions found in *Monmouthshire*.

§ 15. Horsley, n. xxxiv., gives the following found at Castle Steads :---

OMNIVM GENTIUM TEMPLVM OLIMVETVS TATECONIAB SVMG·IVL· PITANVS P·P·RESTITVIT

On this see my notes on inscriptions found in Yorkshire.

§ 16. Few Latin inscriptions have been found in Derbyshire, and of these the majority are on blocks of lead. As the types presented by the blocks of this county are of great importance in the examination of such remains, I propose discussing in this article the general subject of the relics in lead of Roman metallurgy in Britain.

Mr. Albert Way, Journal of Archaelogical Institute, 1859, n. 61, has carefully collected the scattered notices of all the objects of this class, which have at various times been found in Britain, and has thus produced a valuable précis of almost all that is known on the subject.

The blocks, or "pigs," according to the information given in that article, present the following varieties in inscription :

- (1) BRITANNIC**AVG. (a)
- (2) TI·CLAVDIVS·CAESAR·AVG·P·M·TRIB·P·VIIII· IMP·XVI·DE·BRITAN. (δ)
- (3) $TI \cdot CL \cdot TR \cdot LVT \cdot BR \cdot EX \cdot ARG.$ (c)
- (4) NERONIS AVG EX KIAN $\overline{\text{IIII}}$ COS BRIT. (d)
- (5) $IMP \cdot VESP \cdot \overline{V}_{::} : T \cdot IMP \cdot III \cdot COS.$ (e)
- (6) IMP \cdot VESP $\cdot \overline{VII} \cdot T \cdot IMP \cdot \overline{V} \cdot COS. (f)$
- (7) IMP·DOMIT·AVG·GER·DE CEANG (g)
- (8) IMP·CAES·DOMITIANO·AVG·COS·VII. (h)
- (9) CAESAR ***** v ADON. (i)

⁽a) Found on Blackdown Range, Mendip Hills, Somerset.

⁽b) Found near Wokeyhole. Somerset.

⁽c Found at Matleck, Derbyshire; also in Pulborough, Sussex.

⁽d) Found near Stockbridge Hants.

⁽e) Found about a mile from Chester, on the road to London.

⁽f) Found at Hints, Staffordshire; also on the coast of Cheshire.

⁽g) Found on the coast of Cheshire.

⁽A) Found about eight miles from Ripley, in Yorkshire.

⁽i) Found near Common Hall Street, Chester.

- (10) IMP·CAES·HADRIANI·AVG·MET·LVT. (k)
- (11) IMP·HADRIANI·AVG. (l)
- (12) IMP DVOR AVG ANTONINI
 - ET VERI ARMENIACORVM. (m)
- (13) L·ARVCONI·VERECVNDI·METAL·LVTVD. (n)
- (14) C·IVL·PROTI·BRIT·LVT·EX·ARG. (0)

To these is to be added another of Hadrian's, communicated to me by Prof. D. Wilson :

(15) IMP \cdot CAES \cdot HADRIANI \cdot AVG \cdot T \cdot M \cdot LV, (p)

It is plain, on inspection, that the simplest of these are nn. (2), (5), (6), (8), (11), and (12). We shall therefore take these up first, and then proceed to the more obscure.

(2) Ti[berius] Claudius Cæsar Aug[ustus] P[ontifex] M[aximus] Trib[unitia] Po[testate] viiii. Imp[erator] xvi. de Britan[nis].

The date is A.D., 49.

Following Mr. Way, I have regarded the object of lead, bearing this inscription, as a pig. Leland, Collect. Assert. Artur., v., p. 45, describes it as troplacum ex oblonga plumbi tabula. Similarly Camden, i., p. 82, Gough's edit., but Gough, p. 104, applies the term "pig" to it. In the Monum. Hist. Brit. it is called lamina. The learned author of the Historical Ethnology of Britain, Cran. Brit., Dec. iii., chap. V., p. 101, speaks of it as "often described as a pig, but really an oblong plate, 'oblonga plumbi tabula,' and part, probably, of a trophy." It is plain from the context of the passage in which Leland mentions it that it was not a lamina or sheet, for just before noticing it he more than once mentions laminæ plumbeæ, but in describing it substitutes, for lamina, tabula, the difference being, as I understand, that the latter was thicker.

⁽k) Found near Matlock, Derbyshire.

⁽¹⁾ Found about ten miles from Shrewsbury, Shropshire; also about seven miles north of Bishop's Castle, Salop; also about four and a half miles from Montgomery, Shropshire; also near Sydney Buildings, Bath.

⁽m) Found at Bruton, Somerset.

⁽n) Found upon Matlock Moor, Derbyshire.

⁽o) Found about six miles from Mansfield, Nottinghamshire.

⁽p) Found on the bank of the river Carton, in Scotland. See the Stirling Observer of Sept. 19th, 1850.

Е

Mr. Way, p. 22, speaks of these objects generally as "the massa plumbi, ' $E\lambda a\sigma\mu o$) $\mu o\lambda l\beta \delta i\nu o i$ of Dion, in the mediæval times termed *tabula*." The passage in Dion, referred to by Mr. W., is in lvii., 18, and there can, I think, be but little doubt that the $\delta \lambda a\sigma\mu o \lambda$ mentioned there, were what the ancient Romans called *tabula*.

The idea of its being a trophy was, I conceive, suggested by the name being in the nominative, and by the use of the proposition de, which seems to denote that the object was not an article of commerce or of tribute, but of spoil; thus Virgil, Æn. iii., 288, Æneas hæc de Danais victoribus arma. This supposition derives support from the use of the same formula-de Britannis -on the coins of Claudius of the years 46 and 49, A.D., which also bear on the reverse a triumphal arch surmounted by an equestrian statue between two trophies. The first issue of these coins was most probably to commemorate the completion of the triumphal arch decreed for his triumph over the Britons in A.D., 44, and the second, which bears the same legend as this object of lead, was in honour of his enlargement of the pomœrium in A.D., 49. It seems no improbable supposition, that objects of lead were prepared in Britain to grace the triumphal procession on the first occasion and some pageant on the second. It is possible, too, that the word tropæum may correctly designate one of these objects, as a trophy won from conquered enemies, or as intended to form* part of a trophy. Even with these admissions, however, it may have been "a pig," for the block, as well as the plate, seems appropriate for the purpose. On the whole, I am inclined to think that it was of the same class of leaden objects as that bearing the inscription IMP.DOMIT.AVG.GER.DE CEANG. If this be "a pig," as seems to be universally admitted, then it is probable that the other of Claudius DE BRITAN. was the same. Leland appears to have applied the term *tabula* to one of those objects which others after his time called massa.

* There is a passage in Statius, Silv. iv., 3, which at first sight seems to support this supposition, scil. :

" Hujus janua, prosperumque limen Arcus, belligeri Ducis trophæis Et totis Ligurum nitens metallis."

Statius, however, both here and elsewhere, uses metalla in the sense of "slabs of marble."

(5) Imp[eratore] Vesp[asiano] v. T[ito] Imp[eratore] iii. Co[n] s[ulibus].

The date is A.D. 74.*

(6) Imp[eratore] Vesp[asiano] vii. T[ito] Imp[eratore] v. Co[n] s[ulibus].

The date is A.D. 76.⁺

(8) Imp[eratore] Cæs[are] Domitiano Aug[usto] Co[n] s[ule] vii.

The date is A.D. 81, and refers to the last three months and a half of the year, for Titus died on the 13th of September.

On the side of one of the blocks, bearing this inscription, the letters BRIG \cdot are found, which have been interpreted very probably as referring to the *Brigantes*, in whose territories the lead was produced.

(11) Imp[eratoris] Hadriani Aug[usti].

The date is A.D. 117-138.

(12) Imp[eratorum] duor[um] Aug[ustorum] Antonini et Veri Armeniacorum.

The date is A.D. 164-169.‡

We shall now take up n. (7), as there is but one word in it the interpretation of which is obscure. It may be read thus : Imp[erator] Domit[ianus] Aug[ustus] Ger[manicus] de Ceang[is].

^{*} Mr. Way, in the heading of his notice of this pig, assigns it to the right date, but inadvertently gives "VESPASIAN, third Consulate," instead of "VESPASIAN, fifth Consulate, and TITUS, third Consulate."

[†] In the heading of Mr. Way's notice of this pig also, there is a similar slip. Instead of "VESPASIAN," fifth Consulate," as given, he intended "VESPASIAN, seventh Consulate, and Titus, fifth Consulate."

[‡]Mr. Way, gives as the date 163—169. This is correct, so far as it relates to Verus; but Antoninus did not take the title *Armeniacus* until 164, and here the epithet is applied to both.

The date is A.D. 84-96.*

The Ccangi mentioned here, and also in the inscriptions on the sides of the blocks bearing nn. (5) and (6), seem to be the same as the Cangi of Tacitus, Ann. xii., 32 : ductus in Cangos exercitus. Different opinions have been formed relative to their position. Camden, Gough's Edition, i., 82, Gibson, Gough, and the author of the Index of the Monum. Hist. Brit. place them in Somerset-Camden subsequently, iii., 45, altered his opinion, and shire. was inclined to place them in Cheshire. Thus also Latham (Smith's Dic. Gr. and Rom. Geogr.) regards "North Wales as a likelier locality" than Somerset. In this opinion I concur. The position suits better the description of Tacitus-jam ventum haud procul mari quod Hiberniam insulam aspectat. It accords also with the situation of Cancanorum (or Ganganorum) Promontorium of Ptolemy ; and Flintshire, in which, and the adjoining counties of Cheshire and Denbighshire, I would place them, was probably even then noted for its lead-mines, at present the most productive in the island.

Horsley and the author of the Index Monum. Hist. Brit., identify the Cancanorum promontorium as Brachypult point, in Carnarvonshire, which suggests that the Cangi may have occupied that county also.

As it is most probable that Domitian did not receive the title *Germanicus* until 84 A.D., we may take this date for this inscription; and it seems a reasonable conjecture that this was one of a set of blocks prepared for transmission to Rome, with a view to being exhibited at his triumph, which took place in that year. It will be remembered that, on Domitian's accession, Agricola was pursuing his successful career in Britain, and that 84 A.D. was the year of his seventh campaign.

From what has been said it appears that there were three constructions, used in such inscriptions, viz. : the nominative, the

36

^{*}Mr. Way gives as the date 81-96; but Domitian did not obtain the title *Germanicus* until after his reputed victory over the *Catti*, in the close of 83 or the beginning of 84 Eckhel, *Doc. num. vet.* vi. p. 396, has sufficiently refuted the notion that Domitian assumed this title on his accession.

genitive, and the ablative. In n. (2) TI·CLAVDIVS·CAESAR. AVG·P·M·TRIB·P·VIIII·IMP·XVI·DE·BRITAN, we have the nominative, indicating, as I think, that the object was taken as spoil: in n. (8) IMP·CAES·DOMITIAN()·AVG· $\cos \cdot \overline{\nabla 11}$, we have the ablative indicating the time, scil. from September 13 to December 31, A.D. 81; and in n. (11) IMP. HADRIANI AVG. and n. (12) IMP.DVOR.AVG.AN-TONINI || ET·VERI·ARMENIACORVM we have the genitive, indicating that the blocks were the property of those emperors, either as the produce of mines worked for their benefit, or, rather, as part of the imperial tribute. I have read n. (7) IMP.DOMIT.AVG.GER.DE.CEANG. in the nominative, conformably to the unquestionable construction of n. (2), whilst I have preferred regarding nn. (5 and 6) 1MP.VESP. V: :T·IMP·III·COS and IMP·VESP·VII·T·IMP·V.COS in the ablative, indicating the time, although the DE-CEANG on their sides excited a doubt between that case and the nominative. I shall now proceed to the consideration of the doubtful portions of the remaining inscriptions, treserving for special

^{*} Mr. Yates, in a valuable "Memoir on the mining operations of the Romans," Proceedings of Somersetshire Arch. and Nat. Hist. Society, Taunton, 1850, observes relative to this inscription: "I conceive that it should be read in the ablative case, Imperatore Casare Domitiano Augusto consule septimum. On this supposition the mine may have been worked by private hands." The first of these remarks is unquestionably correct; Domitiano, followed by Cos, VII., is certainly not in the dative. The latter is probable, as it is questionable whether under the emperors any mines were worked except for their benefit, or that of the individuals who rented them.

[†] Thus Mr. Yates, On the mining operations, dec., p. 2, observes:---"The retention of mines by government may account for the inscription found on pigs of lead, such as IMP-IIADRIANI'AVG, in the genitive case, showing that they belonged to the Emperor. In other instances the name of an individual, occurring in the genitive, shows that he rented his mine from the government, e. g., L'ARVCONI'VERECVNDI. This implies that the lead was the property of Lucius Aruconius Verecundus." In article 17 I notice an inscription, having the name in the nominative, on a block, the product, as I believe, of a rented mine.

 $[\]ddagger$ From Mr. Yates's Memoir, pp. 21, 22, 23, I learn that two pigs of the Emperor Severus, probably imported from Britain, have been found in France, one at Lillebonne, the ancient Julia Bona, and the other at Sassenay near Chalons-sur-Saone, not far from a Romau Road, which led to the coast opposite Britain. On one of these are the inscriptions LVICVC and DL'P. M. Canat, President of the Historical and Archaeological Society of Chalons, in a memoir on the subject, dees not attempt to interpret the first of these, but infers from the accent in the second, whereby L and P are separated, that the letters denote numbers, and thus interprets DL'P as meaning 550 pounds in weight, P standing, as is common. for *Pondo*. But as this does not at all correspond with the actual weight of the pig, he "conjectures that it [*Pondo* f] here denoted the semis or half-libra." In this way the marked, and the actual weights agree within 2 kilogrammes and 8 hectogrammes, "the loss of which

notice n. (1) BRITANIC^{**}AVG II, and n. (9) CAESAR *****VADON, which are imperfect, also n. (4) NERONIS AVG·EX KIAN· $\overline{1111}$ COS BRIT, which is unique. These doubtful portions are (a)^{*} LVT—in

(3) TI·CL·TR·LVT·BR·EX·ARG.
(10) IMP·CAES·HADRIANI·AVG·MET·LVT.
(14) C·IVL·PROTI·BRIT·LVT·EX·ARG·;
(a) MET·LVT·—in n. 10; (a) METAL·LVTVD·—in n.
(13) L·ARVCONI·VERECVNDI·METAL·LVTVD·;
(b) EX·ARG·—in nn. (1) and (14); (c) TR· and BR·—in
n. (3); and (d) T·M·LV· in n. (15).

(a) LVT•, MET•LVT•, METAL•LVTVD•—As these readings seen to be unquestionably correct, I shall offer no criticism on the interpretations, which have been given, of erroneous readings, such as POT• for LVT• in n. (3), MEM•L•VI for MET• LVT in n. (10), and LVND for LVTVD in n. (13), but shall limit my remarks to the explanations, which have been proposed, of the readings as given above. Mr. Crane, Archeologia, xiii. 405, regards LVT• in n. (3) as standing for LVTVM, and reads the whole inscription thus: "Ti[berii] Cl[audii] tr[ibutum] lut[um] Br[itannico] ex arg[ento]—the tribute of Tiberius Claudius paid out of British money."

Lyson's History of Derbyshire, p. ccvi., traces LVT • and LVTVD • to LVTVDARVM, the Roman Station mentioned by *Ravennas* as next to *Derventio*, and believed to be represented by the modern *Chesterfield*.

Mr. Bateman, Vestiges of the Antiquities of Derbyshire, p. 135, observes :--

may very well be ascribed to accident, waste, or abrasion." There is no authority, so far as I am aware, for the inference from the accent, nor for the use of P or *Pondo* as denoting the *semis* or *half-libra*. The accuracy of the readings seems to me very doubtful. Can it be that the letters, given as LVICVC, are really LVT CANG?

^{*} Dr. Thurnam, *Historical Ethnology of Brituin*, p. 100. *Cran. Brit.*, Dec. 3, mentions "the inscription LVTVM EX ARGENT on various British pigs of lead of the date of Claudius and his successors." There is no authority, so far as I am aware, for this statement; pigs have been found bearing LVT·LVT·EX·ARG; and EX·ARGENT; but there is no example either of LVTVM EX ARGENT; or of LVTVM alone.

"These inscriptions, [nn. (3), (10), and (13)] have given rise to various conjectures, and accordingly to a great display of erudition; but if we allow the LVT. and the LVTVD. to be the contractions of LVTDARVM, the name of a Roman station next in order, according to Ravennas, to Derventio, or Little Chester, and which is supposed to be Chesterfield, much of the difficulty will vanish. The first [n. (10)] will then be found to bear the name of the Emperor Hadrian, in connexion with the name of the metallic district, of which it is probable that Chesterfield was then, as Wicksworth has subsequently been considered, the regulating town ; hence this inscription would mean no more than that the block of lead upon which it was stamped belonged to the Emperor Cæsar Hadrian Augustus, from the metallic district of Lutudarum. The second [n. (13)] would, under a similar interpretation, be stamped with the name of its owner, a proprietor of some mines, perhaps, or a merchant, Lucius Aruconius Verecundus, with the addition, as before, of the name of the mining district. The third inscription [n. (3)] appears to mean that the lead upon which it is impressed formed part of the tribute due to Tiberius Claudius from the mines (silver or lead) of the British Lutudæ or Lutudarum. These interpretations [which were first suggested by Mr. Lysons and Mr. Crane] are by far the most conformable to custom and common sense."

The suggestion of Mr. Lysons has also been adopted by Sir Henry Ellis, Townley Gallery, ii., p. 290; Mr. Way, Jour. Arch. Inst., 1859, p. 25; and apparently by Mr. Yates, Mining operations, p. 10. Mr. C. R. Smith, Journal Arch. Assoc., v. p. 228, is of opinion that LUT is a contraction of LVTVM or LVITVM, signifying washed or purified; and he refers in illustration to the use of elutia in Plin. Hist. Nat. xxxiv., 16, where it is applied to the washing by water of tin from the vein in the gold mines of spain and Portugal. Mr. Wright, Celt, Roman, and Saxon, p. 238, adopts this opinion as undoubtedly correct.

In favour of the interpretation received by Mr. Smith and Mr. Wright, may be cited the statement of Professor Phillips, whose authority on such points is justly esteemed of high value, that "he is strongly of opinion that much of the lead ore was collected from the surface by aid of water, artificially directed. The process, in fact, is described by Pliny, in terms so exactly applicable to the modern 'hushes' of Swaledale, that no doubt can remain of this custom, which is now esteemed rude and semi-barbarous, being of Roman or earlier date in Britain."—Ancient Metallurgy in Britain, Journal Arch. Inst. 1859, p. 17.

As to MET · there is no difference of opinion, all agreeing in tracing it to metallum.

(b) $EX \cdot ARG \cdot$ —These letters are found, as we have already

seen, in nn. (3) and (14), and an expansion of them appears on the side of the block, n. (4), in the form $EX \cdot ARGENT$. Mr. Pegge, *Archaeologia*, ix., p. 45, read them *ex argent[o]*, and regarded them as denoting that the *silver* had been extracted from the lead. He cites in illustration the remarks of Mr. Pennant, *Tour in Wales*, i., p. 58, but notices the difficulty that *ex argento* rather implies the extraction of lead from silver than of silver from lead. Dr. Gifford proposed *ex argent[ariva]* and Sir Henry Ellis, *Townley Gallery*, ii., p. 291, suggests *ex argent*-*[ariis]*, the sense intended by each being, I presume, the same, although the number is different, seil. from the silver mine or mines. Sir Henry Ellis remarks—"The known richness of the English lead, with which silver has been sometimes found mixed in large quantities, may serve to explain the word *ex argentariis.*"

Mr. Roach Smith, Journal of Arch. Assoc. v., p. 228, remarks --- "Ex argent. refers to the separation of the silver from the ore."

Mr. Wright, Celt, Roman, and Saxon, p. 238, observes :

"EX ARG. or EX ARGENT. is explained by a passage of Pliny, who informs us that lead ores are found under two different forms, either in veins by itself or mixed with silver. The latter had to go through a more complicated process of extraction, which is referred to by the words of the inscription—Lutum ex argento—and which it seems the Romano-British Metallurgist considered it necessary to specify."

In Professor Phillips's paper, "Ancient Metallurgy in Britain," pp. 17, 19, we find the following statement on this point :

"The Romans employed lead in pipes (fistulax) and sheets, which were soldered with alloy, as already mentioned. The lead was previously refined and its silver removed; the silver, indeed, being often the object of the enterprise."

"The mines of Middleton and Youlgreave (Aldgroove) in Derbyshire, from which the Lutudæ sent not only lead but 'exargentate' (that is to say rectified) lead from which the silver had been removed, use to this day the pig of the same weight of $1\frac{1}{2}$ cwt. of similar shape and similar mark to that of eighteen hundred years' antiquity."

Mr. Yates, Mining Operations, p. 19, remarks :

"The letters are supposed to stand for *ex argento*, and to intimate that the lead was extracted from silver. This seems to be the true explanation, although, I think, we might read EX ARGENT]IFODINIS]. Even in the present day, we find that where the galena contains a large proportion of silver, as is frequently the case in the British Isles, the mines are not called lead mines, but silver mines. Also the litharge, which is an impure oxide of lead, formed on the surface of the melted mass during the process of refining, is called *argenti spuma* 'froth of silver,' not froth of lead. It would seem consistent with these ideas to regard the lead as extracted from silver, rather than the silver as extracted from lead, although the ore really contains a far greater proportion of lead than silver."

(c) TR·BR.—These abbreviations are found in n. 3. Mr. Pegge, reading POT· for LVT·, regarded TR· as standing for Tr[ibunitia] *i. e., tribunitia pot*[estate]; Mr. Crane proposed tr[ibutum]; Dr. Gifford, tr[iumviri]; Mr. Yates apparently adopts Mr. Crane's suggestion. As to BR·, Mr. Pegge regarded it as standing for Bi[itannicus], agreeing with *Cl*-[audius]; Mr. Crane, Br[itannico], agreeing with *argento*; Dr. Gifford, Br[itannorum] governed by **argentaria*; and Sir Henry Ellis, Br[igantum], governed by *argentaria*; in which opinion Mr. Yates seems to concur.

(d) $\mathbf{T} \cdot \mathbf{M} \cdot \mathbf{LV}$.—No explanation has yet, so far as I am aware, been offered of these *sigla*: I shall consider them in a subsequent part of this article.

As the principal opinions on the doubtful portions of the inscriptions have been stated, let us proceed to enquire to which the preference should be given, and whether any other more probable interpretation can be proposed. As to $LVT \cdot$, MET \cdot $LVT \cdot$, and METAL·LVTVD \cdot , there can, I think, be but little doubt that the explanation of Mr. Lysons is to be preferred to those offered by Mr. Crane and Mr. Smith. There is a *prima* facie probability that MET \cdot and LVT \cdot are shorter forms of METAL \cdot and LVTVD \cdot ; moreover, the blocks on which these abbreviations occur, 'scil., those bearing nu. (3), (10), (13) and

^{*} I am not sure that this was the construction intended by either; perhaps it was *Lutu-dari Britannorum* and *Lutudari Brigantum*, *i. e*, at Lutudarum of the Britons or of the Brigantes.

(14), have all been found either in Derbyshire, where was the station "Lutudarum," or in its neighbourhood. Mansfield, about 6 miles from which n. (14) was found, is only some 12 miles distant from Chesterfield, which is believed to be on or near the site of the ancient "Lutudarum." The only exception is in the case of the four blocks bearing n. (3), which were found in Sussex, but it may reasonably be inferred relative to these, as to other pigs under similar circumstances, that they were on their way to the coast for shipment to the continent, and were probably the product of mines in Derbyshire, as one bearing the same inscription was found at Matlock in that county. And yet I am inclined to think that LVT · and LVTVD · on the blocks were not mere designations of locality. I strongly suspect that they both represent the Celtic term for lead or lead-ore, of which LVTVDA-RVM was a form, signifying the place where the veins were found and worked, i. e., the lead mines. This suspicion is strengthened by the fact that we can trace this designation of the metal in lood in Dutch, loth in German, lod in Danish, lod in Icelandic, lod in Swedish, lot in Russian, *luaidh in Gaelic, and læd or lead in Anglo-Saxon, whence our term is derived. It also derives some support from the remarkable omission in the inscriptions of the ordinary Latin designation of the metal-plumbum.

According to this view the Latinized form of the Celtic word may have been *lutum* or *lutuda*. When LVT · alone is used I regard it as the substantive, but in such forms as MET·LVT., METAL·LVTVD · I think that it is the adjective.

But a question arises as to Lutuilarum—in what case is it? Is it the nominative singular of the second declension ? the genitive plural of the first declension ? or the genitive plural of the third declension ? Dr. Gifford and Sir Henry Ellis, when they read LVT \cdot in n. (3) as Lut[udari], seem to have adopted the first opinion. Similarly Sir Henry Ellis, p. 290, reads LVTVD. Lutudar[ense], *i. e.*, I presume, deriving this adjective from Lutudarum as the nominative. Prof. Phillips, in the passage which I have cited, p. 40, has adopted the second opinion, but seems to

^{*} Can the combination of this and the Gaelic *udhe*, the end of a journey, be the origin of Lutuda—Luaidhudhe, the lead station ?

have mistaken Lutudæ for the name of a people or tribe. Mr. Yates is inconsistent on this point, for in the same page, p. 11, he says, "at Lutudarum" and "to Lutudar," leaving it uncertain whether he adopted the first or third opinion. Similarly Mr. Bateman, p. 31, speaks in one sentence of "the metallic district of Lutudarum," and in another, the next but one, uses the terms— "the mines of the British Lutudæ or Lutudarum." Of these I prefer Lutudæ, the nominative plural of the first declension, and hence form Lutudensis as its adjective.

Let us now consider the meaning of metallum Lutudense, or metalla Lutudensia. The words admit the translations :----"Lutudian metal" and "Lutudian mines"; and "Lutudian" may define either the locality-scil., at Lutudæ-where the lead was manufactured, or where the mines were situated, or, it may be, "Lutudian" was applied to any lead, wherever produced, that had the characteristics of that obtained (or approved) at Lutude. There is not one of these interpretations which seems to me satisfactory. I am inclined to regard the words as signifying nothing more than "lead *mine" or "mines." As to the grammatical **†** construction, it is not easy to decide which should be preferred of the three that are found on the coins which mention mines. On these we have the genitive singular, as METALLI. VLPIANI and PANNONICI; the nominative plural, as .ELI-ANA · PINCENSIA ; and the ablative plural, as METAL · AVRELIANIS. Of these I incline to the ablative plural governed by ex understood, just as we have frequently on potters' work, FIG or OF, i. c., figlina or officina without the preposition. Accordingly I would translate MET·LVTVD· "from the lead mines," and LVT. or LVTVD. alone simply "lead."

Let us now take up the forms $EX \cdot ARG \cdot$ and $EX \cdot ARGENT$. There can, I think, be no doubt, that the *prima facie* interpretation of *en argento* inscribed on an object would be that that object was *made of silver*, as we have *ex arg.* in Orelli, n. 1691; now

^{*} It is worthy of remark that neither MET or METAL is found on the same pig with EX-ARG or EX-ARGENT.

[†] In the ordinary stamps on some English manufactures, stating the names of the manufacturers or the designation of their works, there is a similar ambiguity.

this is certainly inapplicable to these pigs, for they are, I presume, unquestionably made of lead. Adopting the same signification of *ex*, we may suggest another expansion—*ex argent*[ario plumbo]; but the obvious objection to this reading, otherwise plausible, is that the *argentarium plumbum* of Pliny was not lead but tin.

The interpretation, which would probably next present itself, is derived, extracted from silver; and this is adopted as the true signification by Mr. Yates, who, however, seems to prefer argent [ifodinis]. It may be stated in favour of this view, and also of the opinions that we should read argent [ifodinis], argent [aria], or argent [ariis], that as silver was probably the principal object that the Romans sought for in these operations, they may have called their works, "silver mines," instead of "lead mines." Mr. Yates also suggests : "Even in the present day we find that where the galena contains a large proportion of silver, as is frequently the case in the British Isles, the mines are not called lead mines, but silver mines."

The interpretation of EX·ARG· and EX·ARGENT, as denoting that the silver had been extracted from the lead, seems more conformable to present usage. A passage in Strabo, p. 198, ed. Falconer, Oxon. 1807, in which he notices a kind of lead found in Spain, which contained so little silver that it was not remunerative to extract it, is sufficient to prove that the ancients were acquainted with some process for effecting this separation; and the same inference may be drawn from the obscure statement in Pliny, Hist. Nat. xxxiv., 47, referred to by Mr. Wright: "Plumbi nigri origo duplex est: aut enim sua provenit vena nec qui lquam aliud parit; aut cum argento nascitur mixtisque venis conflatur. Ejus qui primus fluit in fornacibus liquor stannum appellatur; qui secundus, argentum : quod remansit in fornaccibus galena, quæ est tertia portio additæ venæ. Hæc rursus conflata dat nigrum plumbum deductis partibus duabus.

If these words be taken in their apparent sense, it is evident that Pliny has made statements on the subject which are wholly at variance with modern mineralogy and metallurgy. No ore is known to exist in any part of the world, which at one smelting process would yield successively *stannum*, *argentum*, and *galena*.

The only satisfactory explanation of the passage seems to be that suggested by Kopp, *Geshichte der Chemie*, iv., 127, that three different smeltings are referred to, *scil.*, melting out the argentiferous lead, removal of lead by oxidation, and reduction of the so formed litharge or oxide of lead.

But if this reading and interpetation of $EX \cdot ARGENT \cdot$ be adopted, what is the grammatical construction ? It is impossible that the words *ex argento*, if regarded as complete, can express "the silver being extracted," or that the lead was, as Prof. Phillips calls it, "exargentate." The only grammatical explanation which seems at all probable is to regard EX as an abbreviation of the participle of some compound verb, such as *excoquo*, and the construction as that of the ablative absolute, *scil.*, **ex*[cocto] *argent*[o].

After the best consideration that I have been able to give to this perplexing phrase, I am disposed to prefer ex argent [aria] (scil., vena or fodina), or the equivalent argent [ifodina], but in the sense that the marks EX • ARG• or ARGENT• indicated that those blocks, on which they were inscribed, were the product of a mine of argentiferous lead-that they were made from a vein which had been found to yield silver, and consequently that those marks were a sort of guarantee that the blocks which bore them contained the precious metal in combination with the lead of which they were composed. The grounds of this interpretation are that as the Romans were acquainted with a process for extracting silver from lead, the blocks of lead would command a higher price, if they were known to contain silver-and that British lead varies so much in this respect, some veins, as in Derbyshire and elsewhere, containing but a trace, that it was necessary to use such distinctive marks, in order to enhance the market value. But we have yet to consider TR · BR · and T · M · LV. As there is but one example of each of these abbreviations-scil., n. (3) and n. 15-we shall take up the inscriptions themselves.

TI·CL·TR·LVT·BR·EX·ARG·

^{*} And yet excoctum argentum is used in the sense-refined silver.

Another conjecture has occurred to me relative to EX'ARG', that it may be connected with the provincial exactor auri et argenti. See Mommsen. Inscrip., Neapol., n. 3540.

The following readings having been proposed :— Ti[berii Cl[audii]Tr[ibutum] Lut[um] Bri[tannico] ex ar[gento], by the Rev. T.Crane; <math>Ti[berii] Cl[audiani] Lut[udari] Br[itannorum] ex arg[entaria], by Dr. Gifford; and <math>Ti[berii] Cl[audiani] Tr[iumviri]Lut[udari Br[igantum] ex arg[entariis], by Sir Henry Ellis.*The first question which presents itself here is, does this inscription refer to the Emperor Claudius ? I must confess that I have doubts on this point. \pm The absence of any title whatever in this case, whilst in every other instance in which an Emperor is named, we always have some one or other, suggests the suspicion, that the reference to the Emperor Claudius is erroneous, and that TI. CL. TR. are the initials of some private individual, such as those named in nn. (13) and (14).

We have an example of similar abbreviations on the medicine stamp found at Wroxeter in 1808. According to Mr. Wright's readings, Celt, Roman, and Saxon, 2nd ed., p. 249, the name of the empiric who prepared it, was TIB·CL·M·, i. e., Til[erii] Cl[audii] M[edici], but both his readings and expansion seem very doubtful. In the Celt, Roman, and Saxon, 1st ed., p. 244, he read IBCLM, and thus Mr. Way and Dr Simpson, the latter of whom proposes the expansion J[ulii] B[assi] C L[e] m[entis]. Similarly also we find the abbreviations of names on potters' work, in Fabretti, p. 503, and Orelli, ii., p. 372. It is of course impossible to surmise for what cognomen, according to this supposition, TR \cdot stands, but it may have been such as Tr[ophimus]or Tr[ajanus] of which we have examples with Ti[berius] Cl[audius]. And yet n. (15), IMP·CAES·HADRIANI· AVG.T.M.LV, favours the interpretation of TR. as tributum, for I know no more probable expansion of T. As to M·LV· there can, I think, be but little doubt that these letters stand for MET \cdot LVT as in n (10).

46

^{*} The words of Sir Henry Ellis are:-"Dr. Gifford thought this inscription stood for *Tiberii Claudiani Triumviri Lutudari Britannorum ew argentaria.* We are inclined ourselves to read the last words *Lutudari Brigantum ex argentariis.*" From this statement I infer that he adopted Dr. Gifford's readings in the first three words, but in what sense either understood them I am unable to conjecture.

[†] I refer to CAES' or AVG', for Claudius, as is well known, never (except in one colonial coin) had IMP' as a prefixed title.

On comparing nn. (3) and (14) a difference of order—LVT·BR· and BRIT·LVT·—is observable, but this is, I think, nothing more than the variety of collocation of the adjective, which is often found. It, however, proves that Mr. Crane's construction Br[itannico] agreeing with ar[gento] is erroneous.

I would read nn. (3), (14) and (15) thus :---

Ti[berii] Cl[audii] Tr[****] + Lut[**] Br[itannicum] ex arg[entaria];

C[aii] Jul[ii] Proti Brit[annicum] †Lut[**] ex arg[entaria].

Imp[eratoris] Caes[aris] Hadriani Aug[usti]t[ributum] m[etallis] Lu[tudensibus].

In the first two I regard LVT·BR and BRIT·LVT· as meaning "British lead." There may, of course, be either construction —the nominative, or the ablative governed by ex understood. The third I interpret as signifying that it was one of those that belonged to Hadrian as ‡tribute from the lead mines. According to my view the blocks of lead manufactured by proprietors of mines were stamped either with their own names or with those of the reigning emperor—the former being for sale, the latter belonging to the *fiscus* as tribute or as a royalty.

We may now proceed to nn. (10) and (13).

IMP· CAES· HADRIANI· AVG· MET· LVT·

Imp[eratoris] Cæs[aris] Hadriani Aug[usti] [Met[allis] Lut-[udensibus.]

L. ARVCONI. VERECVNDI. METAL. LVTVD.

L[ucii] Aruconi[i] Verecundi Metal[lis] Lutud[ensibus].

The second of them I interpret as denoting that the block was from the lead mines owned or rented by Lucius Aruconius Vere-

[†] I have given asterisks for the termination, as I am not sure what it was in the Latinized form. The neuter Br[itannicum] is equally uncertain.

[‡]I am aware of the difference between *tributum* and *vectigal*, and yet offer this interpretation. The distinction is not always observed, and *tributum* seems more suitable to the circumstances of Britain at the time.

cundus. The first may mean that the block was either from the mines worked for the benefit of the emperor Hadrian or belonged to him as tribute or royalty. I prefer the latter.

Mr. Yates, p. 11, remarks: "Aruconius appears to be a name of British origin. Perhaps this Lucius had removed to Lutudar from Ariconium, the modern Weston in Herefordshire, and an important mining station of the Romans." If there be any connexion between *Aruconius* and *Ariconium*, it seems more probable that the name of the place was derived from the name of the person than v. v.

Nn. (1) and (9) remain for consideration before we proceed to n. (4).

*(1) BRITANNIC**AVG II.

Mr. Way, who was the first that noticed this pig, refers the inscription to Britannicus, the son of Claudius, and assigns the "date about A.D. 44-48." In confirmation of this reference it is stated by Mr. Way that "Mr. Franks, [who had opportunities of examining the block in the British Museum] informed him that the inscription may be read BRITANNIC :: :: :: AVG F:: (Augusti filius)." Mr. Yates, p. 17, remarks: "On examining the object itself, I was satisfied that the last letters are FIL, which is the reading adopted by Mr. Roach Smith, and not II or IMP, as other antiquaries have supposed. Hence, I conclude that the inscription, which is of unusual historical interest, may be thus restored :

BRITANNICI CLAVDII AVGVSTI FILII."

As the wood-cut, illustrating Mr. Way's remarks, presents II \cdot after AVG \cdot , I have so represented those letters in the copy which I have given, but I concur in Mr. Yates's reading and expansion.

It seems probable to me that this block was prepared at the same time as n. (2), and with a similar object—to grace the ceremonies in honour of the enlargement of the *pomurium*.

^{*} On the side of this pig are the letters V-EIF·C or, as they are otherwise read, V-ETP·C or V-FTP·C, which, Mr. Way observes, probably denote its weight. The only ground for this opinion seems to be the occurrence of P, which may stand for *Pondo*. I at one time doubted whether they might not be a misreading for V-EID·O, marking the time, *scil.*, *quinto* (*ante*) *idus* Octobres; but I am now inclined to regard them as the manufacturers' marks, as we have EIPC on the handle of an amphora. See Wright's Celt, Roman, and Saxon, p. 475.

N. (9) CAESAR****VADON.

Mr. Smith, Journal of Archaeol. Assoc., v., p. 556, observes :

"Unfortunately the inscription, which originally had been well cut, has so perished from oxidation, that its restoration cannot with safety be proposed, especially as it exhibits a reading different from those of a similar description, which are yet preserved or on record. Camden mentions, that several of these pigs of lead had been found in Cheshire, inscribed IMP-DOMIT-AVG·GER·DE·CEANG·, and IMP·CAES·DOMITIAN·AVG·COS· VII·BRIG· One similar to the latter of these was found, in the last century, at Hayshaw Moor, in Yorkshire, and one on Hints Moor, near Tamworth, reading IMP·VESP·VII·T·IMP·V·COS·DE·CEANG· The specimen [bearing CAESAR*****VADON] was most probably inscribed to Domitian."

Mr. Smith justly regarded the restoration of the fragment as hazardous. In addition to its imperfection, it has peculiarities which are not found in the other extant inscriptions on pigs of lead. But there are no grounds, so far as I can see, for his reference of it to Domitian. The absence of IMP and AVG would certainly suit his position at one period of his life, but it is impossible to make out his name from the extant letters. DO are the first two letters, but they are followed by a form which seems necessarily to be either N. or VA.* I have myself nothing further to suggest than that it is possible that the last word may have been DOVA, another form of DEVA.

We now proceed to n. (4), the inscription on the block represented in the subjoined *wood-cut.



(Weight nearly 156 lbs; upper, or larger, surface, 24 in. by 5 in.; inscribed surface, 21 in. by 3½ in.; thickness, 5 in.)

† Copied from a wood-cut, in *Journal Arch. Assoc.*, vol. v., illustrating an article, by Mr. C. Roach Smith, which contains much valuable information relative to these blocks.

^{*} In the original, the transverse line is not in the same position as in N, but connects the other extremities of the perpendiculars, *i. e.*, as if it were VA ligulate, without the bar of the A.

In the Journal of the Archaelogical Association, v., p. 227, Mr. C. Roach Smith offers the following remarks on it :---

"It is inscribed on the top, in letters an inch in length, NERONIS AVG-EX BIAN HII COS BRIT ; on one side HVLPMCOS ; on the other EX. ARGENT and CAPASCAS ; with the numerals XXX. This inscription is peculiarly interesting as referring to the Cangi at an earlier date [than on the pigs of the time of Vespasian and Domitian, A.W.] the name being spelt as pronounced, Kiangi, and just previous to the reverses of the Romans in Britain, from the courage and skill of the heroic Boadicea. Nero was the fourth time Consul the year before; and this pig of lead would seem to have been on its way from the country of the Cangi towards the south, for exportation, composing probably part of the tribule, the harsh exaction of which was one of the causes of the insurrection. The Brit. must be considered as referring to the metal or the province, and not intended for Britannicus, as before observed on the Br. in the inscription of Claudius. The lateral marks are not altogether [at all?] to be satisfactorily explained, except the ex argen!., which occurs in other instances and refers to the separation of the silver from the ore."

In Mr. Wright's Celt, Roman, and Saxon, p. 237, we have an additional observation by Mr. Smith on this inscription :

"As Nero never assumed the title of Britannicus, and as the numerals precede the cos, I suspect the inscription should be read —

(Plumbum or Metallum) Neronis Aug. cos, iiii. Ex. Kian. Brit.

The $P\!\cdot\!M\!\cdot\!Cos\cdot$ may belong to the above, and the rest to the name of some superintendent."

The obscurity of this singular inscription fully justified Mr. Smith's resort to conjecture, and the suggestions which he offers are, as is usual with him, worthy of consideration. But the tone of his remarks is likely to mislead; and perhaps did mislead Mr. Yates, when he regarded this inscription as "evidently referring to the Ceangi" Mr. Smith says that "this inscription is peculiarly interesting as referring to the Cangi at an earlier date, the name being spelt as pronounced, *Kuangi*." Now this statement, as to pronunciation and orthography at an earlier date, is wholly conjectural, without any authority to support it.

Nor is the suggested transposition of *ex Kian*. and iiii cos warranted by precedent, or at all probable. Moreover a very strong objection to Mr. Smith's reading is derived from the

difference of the prepositions. In other blocks where the *Ceangi* are named we have the proposition de, whilst here we have ex. Again, in those other blocks we have *Ceang.*, but here K is substituted for C, *i* for *e*, and g is omitted.

But if we give up the reading *ex Kiangis*, what solution is there of the difficulty? The only conjecture which I can offer on the subject is, that the words $EX \cdot KIAN$ express a date, *scil.*, $EX \cdot K[ALENDIS]$ IAN[VARIIS].

It is scarcely necessary to say, that there are examples of $K \cdot IAN \cdot$ being used for *Kalendis Januariis*; and the only enquiry which seems necessary, relative to this reading, is as to the reason of the date being stated in the inscription.

We know from Pliny, xxxiv., ch. 17, that there was a law prohibiting more than a limited production of lead in Britainne plus cer o modo fut-and it seems probable that with a view to this law, the blocks, at least in some reigns, bore marks of the time at which they were made, so that it might be known what blocks were manufactured, and consequently what quantity of lead was produced during the year. The mention of the consuls, or not unfrequently of one, especially the Emperor, was, as is well known, the recognised mode among the Romans of distinguishing the year. But it may be asked-why mention Kalendis Januariis when that day was commonly known to be the first of the consular year ? To this it may be answered that it was not uncommon for the Emperors to enter on the consulship at different periods of the year, and hence it may have been necessary to specify in this case the date of the commencement of the Emperor's fourth consulship. Another reason, peculiar to Nero, for this specification, may be, that it conveyed a flattering reference to his having rejected the proposition of the Senate, that the year should begin with the month of December. Tacitus, Ann. xiii., 10, notices this fact: ----Quamquam censuissent patres ut principium anni inciperet mense Decembri, quo ortus erat, vetcrem religionem Kalendarum Januariarum inchoando anno rctinuit." But there is another and simpler solution, which I shall offer after the consideration of the lateral inscription.

Such forms as $\overline{IIII} \cdot COS \cdot$, instead of $COS \cdot \overline{IIII} \cdot$ —a transposition which Mr. Smith notices—are rare : but both forms seem to have been used. In Henzen, n. 6770, we have :—DOMITIANO $\cdot\overline{II} \cdot COS \cdot$, VESPAS $\cdot \overline{X} \cdot COS \cdot$, DOMIT $\cdot \overline{VIIII} \cdot COS \cdot$, DOMIT $\cdot \overline{XIIII} \cdot COS \cdot$, NERVA $\cdot \overline{II} \cdot COS$. It may, however, be inferred, as I think, when the numeral is placed before instead of after $COS \cdot$, that the date of the inscription is not during but after the expiration of the consulship.

BRIT. I regard as standing for BRIT[ANNICVM], as is common, and agreeing with **lutum* understood. The pig was, most probably, thus marked to distinguish it as the product of Britain, from others manufactured elsewhere, as in Spain.

We now proceed to consider the lateral inscriptions. Mr Smith reads these marks as HULPMCOS \cdot on one side, and EX ARGENT \cdot and CAPASCAS \cdot with the numerals XXX on the other; and thus they were also read by the writer in the *Gentle*man's Magazine, lill, p. 936. In the Monum. Hist. Brit. they are given :—

HUL P M CO, EX ARGE N CAPA OC i IV XXX

and from the wood-cut it seems probable that some letters are effaced before IVLPMCOS. In such uncertainty regarding the true readings, it might, perhaps, be more judicious for me to follow Mr. Smith's example in the *Journal*, and leave them as I found them. But as in such cases even an attempt may be useful, I venture to offer some suggestions. From IVL and COS, I draw the conjecture, that there may be a reference to the circumstance, that Nero held his fourth consulship only for six months. His colleague in that year (A.D. 60) was Cornelius Lentulus, and in their places Velleius Paterculus and Pedanius Salinator were *suffecti* on the Calends of July. See Borghesi, *Bull. Inst. Archaeol.* 1846, p. 174, and Henzen, 5407. This conjecture leads to another, that the date mentioned here indi-

See note, page 47.

cates the end, as ex Kalendis Januariis denoted the beginning of the period during which the set of pigs, of which this was one, were manfactured. Thus in Mommsen., Inscrip. Neapol., n. 697, we have the time marked by the consuls and EX K·IAN· AD·K·IVL. But what of PM? It is plain that the ordinary interpretation of these not a spontifex maximus is inapplicable here, and that we must look for some other more appropriate expansion. They may, possibly, stand for posuit modum, in the sense of "put an end to," "gave up," and COS for consulatui; but I do not recollect having met with a similar form. Or perhaps, P·M·COS· may stand for post mensem consulatum, and the phrase may have been used in accordance with the ordinary ante diem (tertium, S.c.,) Kalendas, S.c., where ante governs Kalendas, and diem is placed in the accusative, although the context would sometimes require a different case. As to CAPASCAS-if that be the true reading-the only conjecture which I can offer, is that it is possible that CAPAS-of which C·AS may be a repetition in a shorter form-may be for CAPI-TARIVS AS, scil., as for tributum, i. e., the capitation tax. It is scarcely necessary to say that the tributum was of three kinds : secundum capita, secundum censum, and extra ordinem.

On the whole, I am inclined to suggest as the most probable reading of the principal inscription :---

NERONIS AVG[VSTI] EX K[ALENDIS] IAN[VARIIS] QVARTVM CO[N]S[VLIS] BRIT[ANNICVM]

whilst it seems not improbable that the lateral inscription IVLPMCOS may stand for IVL[IAS] P[OST][M]ENSEM CO[N]S[VLATVM], some such form as K or N or I being lost before IVLIAS; and it is possible that CAPASCAS may denote that the block was one of those prepared in payment of the capitation tax, and XXX may mark the number of the pig. If the views which I have suggested relative to these obscure inscriptions be adopted, the simplest explanation of the statement of the time—from the first of January to the — of July—seems to be, that it denotes the period for which the imperial tribute was paid by the set of pigs, of which this was one.

P.S.—To these remarks on the pigs of lead found in Britain, I subjoin some observations on one which, although it was not found in the island, bears an inscription of so great interest as to justify my noticing it.

In 1848, Lord Palmerston presented to the British Museum a pig of lead found at Carthagena in Spain, which bears the following inscription :

M.P.ROSCIEIS.M.F.MAIC.

This inscription is identical with that on the block in the collection of antiquities at the Bibliothèque Imperiale at Paris, which was also found in Spain. Mr. Way, Journal of the Archaeological Institute, 1859, notices a reading in extenso suggested by Mr. Newton, scil., Marcus Publius Roscius, Marci filius, Maccia [tribu]. This does not appear to me satisfactory. On comparing it with Henzen's n. 5733, beginning $M \cdot P \cdot VERTV$ -LEIEIS $\cdot C \cdot F \cdot$, I am inclined to regard ROSCIEIS as an archaic form of the nominative plural, Roscii—M $\cdot P \cdot$ as standing for Marcus et Publius—and $M \cdot F$ for Marci filii. MAEC · may be an abbreviation of MAECII, for we know that Maccius was amongst the names borne by members of the Roscian gens, e. gr., Orelli, n. 4952 :

L·ROSCIO·M·F·QVI AELIANO·MAECIO CELERI.

But I prefer Mr. Newton's MAEC[IA] tribu. Thus we have in Fabretti, p. 240.

L.RVSTICELLIVS·C.SCA [i. e., Scaptia tribu] M.CVSINIVS·M·F·VEL [i. e., Velina tribu].

The omission of the cognomen is an evidence of rare antiquity in Latin epigraphy, and the same is indicated by the termination *eis*.

Henzen, (in a paper on the inscription, n. 5733, published in Bulletin dell' Institut. di Correspond. Arch. Rome, 1845, and translated by Mr. Key, in Proceedings of Philological Society,

54

vi., p. 179) states that he has not met with this form of the nominative plural of the 2nd declension at a later date than about the middle of the seventh century of the city, *i. e.*, about 100 years B. C. Hence we may infer the probable age of the block as about 2000 years, in round numbers.

It may be worth while to observe, that the omission of et between the *prænomina* of brothers is not uncommon. We have an example in Henzen, n. 5733,—M·P·VERTVLEIEIS,—*i. e.*, as we express it, *Marcus* and *Publius Vertuleivs*. In Orelli, n. 3121, there is a similar form—Q·M·MINVCIEIS Q·F·RVF· *i. e.*, *Quintus* et *Marcus Minucii*, *Quinti filii*, *Rufi*, or as we express it, *Quintus* and *Marcus Minucius Rufus*, sons of *Quintus*.

The inscription on the block I regard as showing that it was from the mines rented by the two Roscii. It is possible that they may have been public officers, but we should then probably have had their official designation.

§ 17. In Horsley's *Britannia Romana*, Durham nn. xi. and xii., we have copies of two inscriptions on stones found at *Lanchester :---

(XI.)

IMP·CÆS·M·ANT·GORDIA' NVS·P·F·AVG·BALNEVM·CVM BASILICA A SOLO INSTRVXIT PREGNLVCILIANVM·LEG AVG PR·PR CVRANTE M·AVR QVIRINO PRE COHILGOR

(XII.)

IMP·CÆSAR·M·ANTONIVS GORDIANVS·P·F·AVG PRINCIPIA ET ARMAMEN TARIA CONLAPSA RESTITV IT PER MAECILIVM FVSCVM·LEG AVG·PR·PR·CVRANTE·M·AVR QVIRINO PR·COH I·L·GOR.

Horsley reads and expands them thus :

(XI.)

"Imperator Caesar Marcus Antonius Gordianus pius felix Augustus balneum cum basilica a solo instruxit per Gneium Lucilianum legatum Augustalem propraetorem curante Marco Aurelio Quirino præfecto cohortis primæ legionis Gordianæ."

"Imperator Cæsar Marcus Antonius Gordianus pius felix, Augustus principia et armamentaria conlapsa restituit per Maeci-

^{*} Horsley regarded this as the *Glannibanta* of the *Notitia* and the *Glanoventa* of the *Itinerary*; Camden and the Rev. John Hodgson believed it to be the *Longovicus* of the *Notitia*; others identify it with the *Epiacum* of Ptolemy.

lium Fuscum legatum Augustalem propraetorem curante Marco Aurelio Quirino praefecto cohortis primæ legionis Gordianæ."

The points obviously open to objection, in these readings and expansions, are *Gneium Lucilianum*, in n. xi., and *Cohortis primæ legionis Gordianæ* in both. Instead of "*Gneium*," we should read *Egnatium*, as proposed by Mr. Ward, and established by an inscription on an *altar found at High Rochester, in which . the name of *Lucilianus* is given as EGNAT. In the rendering *cohortis primæ legionis Gordianæ*, the absence of the number of the legion at once suggests doubt, and this is strengthened by the consideration that there is no evidence that any legion, known to have been quartered in Britain, bore the title *Gordiana*.

As to Mr. Gale's conjecture, that the "legion here called Gordiana was the legio sexta victrix," there is no other ground than that "the stated quarters [of that legion] were at York, whilst the other legions had theirs at a much greater distance." Mr. Smith, Collect. Antiq. iv., p. 142, with equally little reason, refers the inscriptions to "the twentieth legion, apparently the legio Gordiana."

An examination of the words preceding legion is Gordiana, scil., prefectus cohortis, suggests fresh doubt, for there is no authority for a prafect of a legionary cohort, whilst the term is an usual designation of the commander of an auxiliary cohort. Moreover, the order of the words—cohortis legionis, and not legionis cohortis —is so unusual, if not unprecedented, as in itself to cause disatisfaction. Influenced, probably, by these considerations, Henzen, n. 6626, rejects the expansion—legionis Gordiana—although accepted by Orelli, n. 975, and suggests Ligurum, or Ligurum Gordiana; but neither of these readings appears to me probable

I interpret $COH \cdot I \cdot L \cdot GOR \cdot$ as cohortis prime $\pm Lingonum$ Gordianæ. We know that there were three, probably four, cohorts of the Lingones in Britain. Trajan's tabulæ inform us

^{*} Bruce, Roman Wall, 2nd ed., p. 457.

[†] I do not recollect having seen a similar use of the first letter of the ethnic name of a cohort; but in this case no confusion could arise, for, so far as we have evidence, there was no other corps, that served in Britain, whose initial letter was L.

that the fourth* was serving in Britain in A.D. 104, and the first in A.D. 105-106; whilst Hadrian's diploma notices the second in A.D. 124. According to the *Notitia*, the second was stationed at *Congavata*; and the fourth at *Segedunum*, near which an †altar has been found, erected by a Prefect of that corps.

Horsley, *Durham*, xv. gives the following inscription (on a stone also found at Lanchester), which Dr. Bruce, *Roman Wall*, p. 461, regards as mentioning the first, not the second, cohort of the Lingones :--

GENIO PRAETORI CL EPAPHRODITVS CLAVDIANVS TRIBVNVS CHO I LING VLPM

i. e., Genio[†] Prætorii Claudius Epaphroditus Claudianus § Tribunus cohortis primæ Lingonum votum libens posuit merito.

Dr. Bruce, p. 460, figures a slab, found at High Rochester, which bears the inscription :--

IMP·CAES·T·AELIO HAD·ANTONINO·AVG·PIO PP SVB Q LOL VRBICO LEG·AVG PRO PRAE COH Ī LING E Q F

Dr. Bruce gives equitum as the expansion of EQ; but the letters evidently stand for equitata—a contraction, of which there

58

^{*} It appears that there is a difference in the number of the cohort between the outer and inner inscriptions of this diploma. The latter, it is stated, gives IIII and the former III. It is not easy to decide which is the correct number. Gazzera, Henzen, and Böcking prefer III.

⁺ Bruce, Roman Wall, 2nd ed., p. 85.

[‡]Horsley strangely interprets—Genius the prætor; and the author of the Index to the Inscriptions in *Monum. Hist. Brit.* gives "Genius prætor?" There can be no doubt that *prætorii* is correct.

[¿]Camden and Horsley regarded the cohort, which is named here, as the second, but I prefer Dr. Bruce's opinion. An objection to my reading—*Præfectus cohortis primæ Lin*gonum Gordianæ—may be drawn by some from the designation of the commanding officer

are many examples,* and which, in this particular case, is established by the following inscription in Fabretti, p. 486 :---

> C·CAESIDIO C·F·CRV·DEXTRO EQ·COH·VIII·PRAET COH·I·LINGONVM EQVITAT· &c.

Camden gives an inscription, found at Moresby in Cumberland, which mentioned the second cohort—and it is believed that the same corps was noticed in two inscriptions, Horsley's, nn. xiii. and xiv., found at Ilkley in Yorkshire. One of these is so remarkable, that it deserves special notice, and I shall therefore consider it in a separate article. But to return to the Lanchester inscriptions—an obvious suggestion relative to L·GOR is, that it may be a misreading of LINGON ·; but we may not disregard the leaf-stops in n. xii., after COH, I, and L.

There remains but one other point requiring notice—the use of the word *principa*, of which I have never seen any other example except on a stone found near Bath, on which the letters between PR and PIA are illegible. See my notes on inscriptions found in *Somersetshire*. Mr. Gale regarded the *principia* as "either the quarters of the legionary soldiers called the *principes*, or the place where the ensigns were kept;" whilst Mr. Horsley "rather concludes it to be the General's pavilion." Dr. Bruce interprets the term as denoting "the chief military quarters," or "officers' barracks."

Mr. Smith, Collect. Antiq. iv., p. 142, observes :

"The principia mentioned in the inscription, it need scarcely be observed, means the quarters of the chief officers, and place of deposit of the standards. The word occurs in an inscription of the time of Elagabalus [?] lately dug up near Bath, and published in the *Journal* of the Archwological Institute."

being here *tribunus*, not *præfectus*: but there is no doubt that both terms are applied to the commanding officer of the same auxiliary cohort. In the *Notilia*, the second and fourth of the Lingones are each under a *tribunus*, whilst it appears, from inscriptions on stones found in Britain, that they were each under a *præfectus*.

^{*}In Horsley's Britannia Romana, Cumberland, lxi, we have the same mistake. He reads T:HIS:EQ primas Hispanorum equitum; it should be primas Hispanorum equitatas. In Cumberland, liii, and in Northumberland, lxxxviii, his reading is Gallorum equitum, instead of Gallorum equitata.

DURHAM.

Mr. Smith doubtless inferred the meaning of the word *principia*, as found in the Lanchester and Bath inscriptions, from its signification, when applied to a place in a camp. But there is no authority, so far as I am aware, either in *ancient authors or in inscriptions, whereby this or any other interpretation of the term, as applied to a *building*, can be confirmed.

P.S.—Since the foregoing was in type, I have observed in Henzen's Index, "Coh. I. Lingonum Gordiana," with the reference to Orelli's n. 975=Horsley's *Durham*, n. xii., but it does not appear whether this statement was made through inadvertence or with the intention of correcting the opinion expressed in n. 6626.

§ 18. In the Archaeologia \not Eliana, i., p. 142, a sepulchral stone, found near +Binchester, is figured. It bears the inscription :

D M S NEMMONTANVS DEC VIXITANN·XL·NEM SANCTVSFR·ET·COHERR EX TESTAMENTO FECERT

Mr. Skene expanded it thus :

"Diis Manibus Sacrum. Nemmontanus Decius vixit annos quadraginta; Nemmontanus Sanctus frater et coheredes ex testamento fecerunt." Instead of Nemmontanus Decius I would read Nem[esius] Montanus Dec[urio], and instead of Nemmontanus Sanctus, Nem[esius] Sanctus. Decurio, as the designation of a military officer, signified the commander of a turma, or, as we may call it, a troop of cavalry. It also was used as the designation of a municipal officer. We have examples of both uses in the inscriptions found in Britain.

In Horsley, Brit. Rom., p. 305, we have DEC·AL·AST, i. e.,

60

^{*} There is a passage in Tacitus, *Hist.* ii., 43, which at first sight seems to supply an example. The words are—*primani* stratis *unetvicesimanorum* principiis *aquilam* abstulers. Plutarch, however, translates it as it is understood by commentators— τ ods $\pi \rho \rho \mu d \chi ous d\pi \rho \kappa \tau \epsilon i \nu a \tau \epsilon s.$ See Sallust, *Jugurtha*, 54; Livy, ii., 65, iii., 22.

[†] The Vinovium of Antoninus.

DURHAM.

decurio alce Asturum. In his n. iii., Somersetshire, he finds a decurio equitum, who was also a miles $leg \cdot xx \cdot v \cdot v$, but this reading is unquestionably erroneous. See my notes on inscriptions found in Somersetshire.

Dr. Bruce, *Roman Wall*, 2nd ed., p. 398, figures an inscribed altar, on which DEC. also occurs :

DIS MOVNTI BVSIVL FIRMIN VSDECE.

Dr. Bruce remarks "The inscription reads-" To the gods of the *mountains, Julius Firminus, the decurion, erected this.'" In this, as in the preceding inscription, it is uncertain whether decurio is used in the municipal or in the military sense. Dr. Bruce understands it in the latter, but the observation in his note does not give a correct impression as to the use of the term in the age in which it is probable that the inscription was cut. His observation is-" Decurion, a commander of a troop of ten men." This originally was the sense of decurio, and there were three officers so designated in each turma. See Polybius, vi., 25. But between the times of Augustus and Hadrian, it began to be used for the commander of each turma, consisting of three decuries. The officers under him in the troop were the duplicarius and the scsquiplicarius. See Lange, Hist. mut. rei milit. Rom., p. 38. In the Journal of the Arch. Institute, 1860, we find the word in its municipal sense in one of the Lincoln inscriptions-AVR·SENECIO·DEC· Thus, also, in Horsley's n. v., Somersetshire, DEC · COLONIÆ · GLEV.

^{*} The rendering of *Dis mountibus*, as "the gods of the mountains," or "the gods the mountains," seems to me very questionable. There is no doubt that mountains were worshipped as gods, *e.gr.*, Orelli, n. 2107, but I do not recollect having ever seen an example of the spelling-mountibus. It suspect that the true reading is monentibus. Firminus created the altar *ex monitu deorum*, but did not know who the gods were that directed him. There are many examples of altars erected to unknown deities, such as those bearing the inscription, size deus size dea. Of the same class, in my opinion, was that noticed in the *Acts of the Apostles*, xvii., 23, inscribed AFNOXTOI ΘΕΩΙ.

§ 19. Mr. Wright, Celt, Roman, and Saxon, p. 252, *remarks relative to +Circencester in this county:

"Uriconium (Wrozeter) appears to have been occupied by Thracians: Cirencester by Thracians and Indians."

There is no doubt that an inscription has been found at each of those places, which furnishes evidence that a horseman of a Thracian cohort was buried in each, but there is no ground for the assertion that there were "Indians" at Cirencester. An inscription, indeed, was found there, commemorating *Dannicius* (or *Dannicus*), a horseman *alæ Indianæ*; but this body did not derive its name from the nationality of the men composing it. It was probably called after *Julius Indus*, mentioned in *Tacit. Ann.*, iii., 42; and there is reason to believe that the men serving in it were, for the most part, *Treviri*. The *alæ* seem to have received such ‡designations as *Indiana*, *Frontoniana*, *Sebosiana*, from the names of the officers who first raised or organized them, and in this respect resembled the military bodies in our own service in the East Indies, known by such names as "Jacob's," or "Hodgson's Horse."

§ 20. The discovery of inscribed stones has made a large addition to the number of the deities in the ancient Pantheon. Besides those noticed in Gruter's great work, Spon made a collection of inscriptions on altars *ignotorum atque obscurorum quorundam deorum*; and in DeWal's *Mythologiæ Septentrionalis monumenta epigraphica Latina*, we have notices of most of the northern deities, who were known up to the time of the publica-

^{*} In the 2nd ed., p. 256, Mr. Wright gives the following modification of this remark-"Cirencester appears to have been occupied by Thracisus."

[†]Horsley identifies it with Ptolemy's Corinium and the Durocornovium of Antoninus.

[‡] Vide Henzen, nn. 5412 and 6722; also Roulez, Mem. de l'Acad. Royale de Belgique xxvii., p. 12.

tion of the volume in 1847, but no complete list has yet been published. Horsley furnishes an index of "names and attributes of deities," but it is limited to those mentioned in the inscriptions found in Britain which are given in his work, and is not without mistakes, e. gr., "bono generis humani," "genio Romæ." Mr. Roach Smith, Collectanea Antiqua, ii., p. 200, introduces a list of the "names of deities occurring in dedicatory inscriptions found on the line of the wall, including some from the Antonine wall," but it also is incomplete and requires emendation, e. gr., "Apollini Graniæ," "Heroi." In the Monumenta Historica Britannica there is an Index-" Deorum dearum et rerum sacrarum nomina quibus templa vel altaria dicata erant in Britannia," -but this is, of course, very limited, relating, merely, to the preceding selection of inscriptions, and is strangely inaccurate-e. gr., "Deæ Malvisiæ," "Nehallenia," "Dea Vagdavera," who are not named in any inscription found in Britain, nor is there any evidence that they had any temple or altar dedicated to them in the island. The most comprehensive catalogue, of which I am aware, is to be found in Henzen's Index to Orelli's Inscriptions, vol. iii., but even it, although very carefully prepared, and giving information up to 1856, is defective. There are some deities, named in inscriptions found in Britain, that are not mentioned in it. Amongst these is a god, whose name appears in three inscriptions found on the site of a Roman villa at Lydney (or Lidney), in this The name in one is NODONTI, in the dative case; in county. another NVDENTE, which seems to be used for NVDENTI in the dative case ; and in the third, NODENTI, also in the dative case, and NODENTIS in the genitive case. The only *explanation which I have seen relative to this deity, is contained in "The Romans in Gloucestershire," a Lecture by the Rev. Samuel Lysons, M. A., London, 1860. Mr. L. regards the name of the deity as NODONS or NODENS, and identifies him with Æsculapius, on the following grounds :

"The remains of a very considerable Roman building was discovered on an eminence in Lidney Park, on the forest side of our county, and carefully explored by the late Right Hon. Charles Bragge Bathurst. A very good

^{*} The inscriptions are, I believe, given in Lysons' Reliquic, but I am not able to consult that work.

series of interesting coins was thus discovered, which is, I believe, still in possession of the present proprietor: but what adds great interest to that discovery was the finding of several votive tablets to a divinity,—which has caused no little speculation among antiquaries—the god Nodens or Nodons. The difficulty was, to identify his name with the statues of the god himself, which were discovered at the same place, and bore all the characteristics of Æsculapius, viz.:—a dog, a cock, and serpents twining round a rod or staff, reminding one of Moses' contest with the magicians of Egypt. Pausanias relates that Æsculapius was represented in his temple at Epidaurus, as leaning on a serpent, with a dog at his feet; and Plato, in his Phaedo, mentions the cock as sacred to the god of Medicine. * * * But a little reflection shows us how the Romans in their later occupation of this island had perverted Æsculapius's Greek attribute of àráðuros, the alleviator of pain (whence our term anodyne) into the deity Nodons."

The explanation of the name offered by Mr. Lysons, does not commend itself to me : I am not aware of any authority for ἀνώδυνος or νώδυνος as an epithet of Æsculapius.

It is not easy to arrive at any definite conclusion relative to this god—*Nodons, Nodens, or *Nudens.* It seems not improbable that he was a British deity, such as *Maponus,* and *Cocidius.* But it is extremely difficult to draw a distinction between the deities of the native Britons and of the Roman auxiliaries, especially as some of those auxiliaries were of the same stock as the original settlers in the island. On this point Mr. Roach Smith has, in my judgment, pursued the proper course—in looking, in the first instance, to the native countries of the auxiliaries for the origin of the tbarbarous deities mentioned in Britanno-Roman

SANCTO CO CIDEO TAVRVNC FELICISSI MVS'TRIBVN EX EVOCATO V'S'L'M

^{*} The nominative may also end in on or is, as Nodon or Nodontis.

[†] The number of these has, I suspect, been unduly increased by misrcadings. Thus in Wright's *Celt, Roman, and Saxon*, p. 293 (p. 297, 2nd ed.), we find the statement that "an altar was found at Bewcastle dedicated SANCTO COCIDIO TAVRVNC," from which we would naturally infer that TAVRVNC was an epithet of the god *Cocidius*, or the name of some identified deity. On turning, however, to *Archaeologia*, xi., pl. vi., p. 67, we find the inscription, which Mr. Wright misunderstood, *scil*.:---

i. e., Sancto Cocideo T[itus] Aurunc[eius] (not Auruncus) Felicissimus Tribun[us] ex Evocato v[otum]s[olvit] [libens]m[erito]. There is another name of a deity supposed to be

epigraphy. It is possible, however, as seems to me, to push this opinion too far. Mr. Wright, *Celt, Roman, and Saxon*, p. 294 (p. 298, 2nd ed.), supplies an example :---

"At Birrens, in Scotland, is a dedication to a goddess Brigantia, with a winged figure of the deity, holding a spear in her right hand, and a globe in the left. It was supposed that this was the deity of the country of the Brigantes, but I am not aware that this country was ever called Brigantia, and it is not probable that the conqueror would worship the deity of a vanquished tribe. I feel more inclined to suppose the name was taken from Brigantium, in Switzerland, a town which occupied the site of the modern Bregentz. An altar found at Chester was dedicated DEAE NYMPHAE BRIG, which in this case would be "to the nymph goddess of Brigantium."

As there was a people of Britain called Brigantes, it appears much more probable that Brigantia was their goddess. It is immaterial whether the country was called "Brigantia" or not; and there are many examples of the Roman conquerors worshipping the deities of vanquished tribes.

Prof. D. Wilson, in his valuable work, *Prehistoric Annals of* Scotland, p. 399, seems to have erred on the other side :

"In the obscure gods and goddesses thus commemorated, we most probably recognise the names of favourite local divinities of the Romanized Britons, originating for the most part from the adoption into the tolerant Pantheon of Rome of the older objects of native superstitious reverence."

There can, I think, be no reasonable doubt that the gods and

mentioned on an altar, also found in Cumberland, regarding which I have some doubts The following is the inscription, as given by Dr. Bruce, p. 400;---

Dr. B. remarks—" Nothing is known of the goddess Setlocenia, to whom the altar seems to have been dedicated by Lucius Abareus, a centurion." Is the true reading that which I suggested in my notes—DEAE S[ANCTAE] ET LOC[1] GEN[10] T[1TVS[AEL[1VS] ABAREVS, &c.? An objection to it arises from the strangeness of the collocation, loci genio instead of genio loci. De Wal, Mytholog, Septentrion., n. 343, gives the following inscription on a fragment of an altar found at Binchester:—

MANDVS EX-C FRIS
VINOVIE V·S·L·M·

He expands it thus:—Amandus ex civitate Frisiorum Vinovix votum solvit lubens merito. The same view is taken by Dr. Leemans, Archxologia, xxvii., p. 224, who also takes VINOVIE for the name of a goddess. I regard it as another form of VINOVIVM, the ancient name of Binchester, and would expand it thus:—Amandus ex cohorte Frisiorum

goddesses referred to in this passage, such as VIRADESTHI RICAGMBEDA, HARIMELLA, and others noticed in altars erected by auxiliaries, were deities of the localities from which those auxiliaries came. At the same time it seems reasonable to believe that there were some divinities which were peculiar to the island and were unknown on the continent. Such a deity the god noticed in the Lydney inscriptions may have been, nor can it be denied that there is ground for the designation-"the British Æsculapius"-which has been applied to him by that able antiquary Mr. A. Franks. If we turn to the Roman divinities, the only god, whose name is at all similar, is Nodutis or Nodutus, a rural god presiding over the nodi culmorum. As but very little is known of this deity, the following references may be found useful : Arnobius, adversus gentes, iv., p. 131, ed. Leyden, 1651-" Nodutis dicitur Deus, qui ad nodos perducit res satas." Augustine, de civ. Dei, iv., 8, p. 94, ed. Paris, 1685-" Præfecerunt ergo Proserpinam frumentis germinantibus, geniculis nodisque culmorum deum Nodotum." "Quando Nodotus, adjuvaret in bello, qui nec ad folliculum spicæ, sed tantum ad nodum geniculi pertinebat ?" Another reading of the name is Nodinus, which more nearly approaches that in the inscriptions. See also Tomasinus, de donar. ac tab. vot. c. 26; Voss., de Idololatria, 11, 61; Lexicon Etymol. in Nodus; Rhodiginus, Ant. Lect., xxv., 30, and Struvius, Ant. Rom. 1, p. 151.

Let us now examine the inscriptions found at Lydney. Of the three the following seems to be the clearest :---

> D·M·NODONTI FL·BLANDINVS ARMATVRA V·S·L·M

which I read,—Deo Magno Nodonti Flavius Blandinus armatura votum solvit libens merito. The epithet Magnus suggests Mithras, but it is also applied to other deities. See Orelli, n. 3596. For armatura in the sense of miles, see Muratori, 801, 8; and

Vinoviæ, &c., i. e., Amandus [a soldier] of the cohort of the Frisii [stationed] at Vinovia, &c. According to this view I suppose the name of the deity to whom the altar was erected to have been above AMANDVS on a lost portio 1 of the stone. On this use of ex see Steiner, Inscrip. Rom. Rhen., n. 288.

compare Steiner, i. *Rhen.*, n. 332, and n. 473; Henzen, n. 6794; and Borghesi (cited by Henzen), *Ann. Inst. Arch.*, 1839, *Iscr. Renane*, p. 5. It is not easy to determine the characteristics of the *armatura*. They are mentioned by Vegetius, ii., 7, 15, 17; and Ammianus Marcellinus, xiv., 11; xv., 4 and 5; and xxvii., 2.

According to the former, they seem to have been younger soldiers, lightly armed; and according to the latter, body-guardsmen. As light infantry, they may have been connected with a legion, as our light company forms a part of one of our regiments. From the *Notitia*, it appears that there was a *cuneus armaturarum* in Britain, at *Bremetenracum*, possibly (as Böcking suggests) detached from the sixth legion. According to this view, *armatura* in the inscription may be translated, a light-infantry soldier;^{*} according to the other, a life-guardsman.

Another stone found here bore the inscription :

PECTILLVS VOTVMQVOD PROMISSIT DEO NVDENTE M DEDIT

which I read,—Pectillus votum quod promisit Deo Nudenti magno (or merito) dedit. Promissit is used for promisit, and Nudente for Nudenti, by orthographical irregularities not uncommon in epigraphy.

But the most interesting, and most difficult, of the inscriptions is the following, which is engraved on a leaden or pewter tablet :---

DIVO NODENTI SILVIANVS ANVLVM PERDEDIT

^{*} Some have regarded the armaturæ as cavalry; e. g., Camden, Brit, ed. Gibson, p. S35, "those armaturæ were horse armed cap-apee, but whether they were duplares or simplares (Veget. 11, 7), my author has not told us." Thus also Vales, in his note on Ammianus Marcellinus, xv., 5, citing Julian in Orat. 1, ad Constantium, p. 48, ed. Spanh. and Orat. 11., i. f., asserts—"Armaturas equites fuisse apparet;" but the examination of the "passages, cited by Vales, shows that they do not warrant his inference. The term cuneus, however, designating the body at Bremetenracum favours the opinion that they were cavalry, for cuneus in the Notitia is very rarely, if ever, applied to infantry; although Vegetius, iii., 19, defines it as "multitudo peditum."

DEMEDIAM PARTEM DONAVIT NODENTI INTER QVIBVS NOMEN SENICIANI NVLLIS PERMITTAS SANITA TEM DONEC PERF * RA * VSQVE TEMPLVM NO DENTIS

Mr. Lysons, Romans in Gloucestershire, p. 54, reads and explains the words thus :

"Divo Nodenti Silvianus annulum perdidit dimidiam partem donavit Nodenti. Inter quibus nomen Seneciani nullis permittas sanitatem donce perferant usque templum Nodentis. It is, in short, nothing more nor less than a handbill,* issued by a certain Silvianus, for the recovery of a ring which he had lost. He promises to give half its value, on recovery, to the god Nodens, and seems rather to insinuate that a certain Senecianus must know something about it, and threatens him with the loss of health until he shall bring it back to the temple of Nodens; thus identifying that deity with power over the diseases of the body."

To the reading of Mr. Lysons I see no objection, but his explanation does not at all satisfy me. Nor can I understand what construction or translation he proposes for the words *inter quibus nomen Seniciani*.

The interpretation of this singular inscription is a work of no little difficulty. The only feasible suggestion which I can offer is, that the erection of the tablet was the result of a wager. Silvianus made a bet with Senecianus—he put down his ring, as was usual, as his stake or in lieu of the amount that he had bet, and vowed to the deity one-half of the value of the ring. Senecianus won the bet, and refusing to be bound by the vow of Silvianus, left the performance of it to him. Silvianus, lest he should incur the anger of the god by neglect of his vow, erected this tablet recording his prayer for the punishment of Senecianus.

Let us now examine the inscription in detail.

68

^{*} The only example which I have seen of a Latin advertisement of this kind is amongst the *grafiti* of Pompeii, and it does not at all resemble this inscription. Vide Wordsworth's Inscr. Pomp., p. 26.

DIVO NODONTI. Divus instead of Deus is unusual, but not unprecedented. ANVLVM PERDEDIT. The orthography of these words is not rare. Both annulus and anulus are written, and the use of E for I is common. As to the meaning, there can, I think, be but little doubt that the sense is, threw away a ring, i. e., lost it, not accidentally, but through his own fault. If, then, the meaning be threw away a ring, the question is-in what way? A probable answer seems to be, by making a foolish bet. The ancient custom of using the ring in bets or wagers may be illustrated from the following passages :--" Celebratior quidem anulorum usus cum fænore cæpisse debet : argumento est consuetudo vulgi ad sponsiones etiamnum anulo exsiliente."-Pliny, Nat. Hist. xxxiii., 1 (Arab). "Si quis sponsionis causa, anulum accepit, nec reddidit victori."-Ulpian, Dig. xix., 5, 18.

"Provocat me in aleam, ut ego ludam : pono pallium, Ille suum anulum opposuit." Plautus, Curcul. ii., 3, 76.

DEMEDIAM PARTEM DONAVIT NODONTI. The construction of *donare* either with the accusative of the person and the ablative of the thing, or (as here) with the accusative of the thing and the dative of the person is well known. The plain sense is—" he presented one half to *Nodens*;" and the words furnish no ground for the interpretation of Mr. Lysons, "he promises to give half its value, on recovery, to the god." The meaning of the words, according to the view that the ring was staked in a wager, seems to be—Silvianus, to obtain the aid of the deity in winning the wager, presented him with one-half of the ring, *i. e.*, vowed that he would give him one-half of its value.

INTER QUIBVS SENICIANI NOMEN NVLLIS PER-MITTAS SANITATEM. The construction from quibus to sanitatem is plain, and the sense is clearly, —grant health to none of those who bear the name Senecianus—quibus Seniciani nomen est. But inter remains unexplained. Probably the simplest suggestion is, that the construction is, inter eos quibus, i. e., permittas sanitatem nullis inter eos quibus Seneciani nomen est. But I am not satisfied with *this explanation.

^{*} When I first examined these inscriptions, it also occurred to me that possibly INTER might stand for IN TER[MINO] i. e., Nodenti in termino, to Nodens, whose terminal

PERFERANT VSQVE TEMPLVM NODENTIS. The selection of the words *perferant* and *usque* seems to indicate the distance of the temple, and the consequent labour in reaching it. The use of *usque* without *ad* is well known. But what were they to carry to the temple ? According to the view already taken, it was the *dimidia pars* of the value of the ring, which Silvianus had presented to the deity by a vow, the obligation of which Senecianus had refused to acknowledge.

It is right that I should add that I have never met with a *similar inscription, and that I have offered the foregoing conjectural interpretation in the absence of any thing more satisfactory.

"Lord Arden exhibited a gold ring of a singular form, which was lately found in ploughing a field at Silchester. The hoop is formed into several squares, in the uppermost of which is a head, rudely engraved with the letters VENVS, in Roman capitals around it, and in the several other compartments the following inscription:

SE | NI | CIA | NE | VI | VA | S | II | NDE."

On this Mr. Kempe, Gentleman's Magazine, 1833, p. 124, remarks:-"The reading of the above legend, either from its blundered or its barbarous Latinity, appears very doubtful. Considering the two Is in the eighth compartment as to be coupled with the N in the ninth, with a slight correction, we have perhaps 'ne vivas in indecentia,' [!] the head being that of Venns Urania, the patroness of pure love and chaste enjoyments." In the Archaologia, xxvii, p. 417, Mr. Kempe very judiciously abandons this reading, and "by comparison with a ring found at Brancaster, Norfolk," suggests another, which, he believes, is right. Ilis words are : "The relic was, I consider, a sort of annulus Amicitiae, the gift of some Christian of the Roman times to his friend Senecianus; the legend a pious aspiration-'Seneciane vivas in Deo.' In the ring was set an antique intaglio of Venus Urania: this addition was merely ornamental." This is a pleasing, but, I fear, untenable expansion. So far as the reading-" Seneciane vivae"-it is unquestionably correct, and there is no doubt that there are ancient rings bearing the motto "vivas in Deo." But it does not seem probable that the head and name of Venus would have been on a ring, " the gift of a Christian;" nor is there any example, so far as I recollect, of two Is standing for one, whilst the use of them for E is common.

I am unable, however, to offer any more plausible reading of HNDE. If we regard the ring as that mentioned in the inscription found at Lydney—and the identity of the name and spelling, scil., SENICIANUS, suggests the conjecture—we shall, of course, be obliged to find explanations for *perdidit*, *dimidiam partem donacit* and *iinde*, differing from those already noticed. As such explanations can readily be invented, and at best can be but conjectural, it seems sufficient to have called attention to the curious coincidence.

figure stands here. This interpretation was suggested by the information which I had received, that two terminal figures had been found on this site, one regarded as that of Pan, and the other probably as that of Diana. From this statement I drew the conjectures that INTER might stand for IN-TER[MINO]. and that the terminal figure believed to be that of *Pan* was really that of *Nodens*. Since that time I have seen the inscription, noticed in the P.S., from which I derive what I believe to be the correct expansion of INTER.

^{*} Since the publication of these notes in the *Canadian Journal* I have observed a notice in the *Archwologia*, viii., p. 448, which may, perhaps, be regarded as throwing some light on this inscription. The notice is in the following terms:

P. S.—Since the publication of the preceding article, I have had the opportunity of perusing extracts of letters from the late Sir S. Rush Meyrick to the late Samuel Lysons, Esq., and from the late Sir Wm. Drummond to the late Rev. Dan. Lysons, on the subject of the God Nodons or Nodens.

Sir Samuel Meyrick was of opinion that "Deus Nodens seems to be Romanised British, which correctly written in its original language would be Deus Noddyns, *i. e.*, the god of the abyss, or it may be, 'God the preserver,' from the verb *noddi*, to preserve, both words being derived from *Naudd* which signifies 'protection.' I think the latter translation best expresses the idea of Silvianus, and it exactly answers to another epithet of the British deity, as mentioned on an altar in Camden, found at Wigton, in Cumberland (Gough's edit. iii., p. 172)—DEO CEADIO, &c. Instead of Ceadio Camden writes Ceaico, but as in numerous instances he puts *IEO* for DEO, and such like, I think he may be presumed to have mistaken the *d* for an *i*. Duw Ceidiaw is 'God the preserver.'" There are but few, I think, who will view this etymology with any favour.

Sir Wm. Drummond in his first letter on this subject regards the deity as the Roman Nodutus, and cites almost the same passages which I advanced in illustration. Subsequently, however, whilst retaining the opinion that the Nodinus of Varro, otherwise the Nodutus of St. Augustine and Arnobius, was originally the same deity as the Nodens of the inscription, he identifies him with Æsculapius. "The emblems," he remarks. "said to have been found along with the inscription, serpents, cocks, and dogs, seem strongly to confirm, nay, even to prove, the truth of this supposition." [Originally advanced by Mr. Bathurst, that the deity in question could be no other than Æsculapius]. This leads him to search for another etymology for the name of the god as given in the inscriptions, and, with the help of certain peculiarities of the Etruscan language and letters, to which he believes the Latin "bore a considerable resemblance until about the 5th century after the foundation of Rome," and the further aid of the fact, that the worship of

Æsculapius was introduced into Rome about that period, scil., 461, A. U. C., he arrives at the conclusion that Nodens or Nodons is a corruption of Nodunos, i.e., νώδυνος, alleviator of pain, than which "no name or epithet was more likely to be given by the Greeks to Æsculapius, who was supposed to be the inventor of medicine, and to whose salutary influence was ascribed the restoration of health." Of this theory it seems unnecessary to say more than that there is no authority for the application of the epithet váduvos to Æsculapius, and there is no ground for questioning the received opinion, that the deity Nodutus, or Nodinus, derived his name from his office of presiding over the nodi. Since the publication of the preceding article my attention has also been directed to a notice of the site of the deity's temple in "The Proceedings of the Archaelogical Institute, Bristol, 1851." In an elaborate paper on "the British and Roman Roads communicating with Caerwent," Dr. Ormerod observes : "Between the town of Lydney and Ailburton, it [the road] appears next as a hollow way between the present road and the hill on the right crowned with two Roman camps, of which one contains the remains of the once splendid temple dedicated to a deity of supposed sanitary powers, and is most rich in antiquities."

To this is subjoined the following note :--

"Within the greater camp, when excavated under directions of its owner, the late Right Hon. Charles Bathurst, were discovered the foundation walls of an irregular quadrangle, the sides of which average severally about 200 feet, exclusive of a range of offices along the N. W. side, and of a Palatial fabric on its upper or N. E. side.

"This fabric, once, possibly, the residence of Flavius Senilis, hereafter mentioned, had a portico along its west front, and an open court in the centre, surrounded by corridors, in which, and in various other departments, tesselated pavements occurred. This building measured about 150 by 135 feet.

"On the north side of this building, separated from it by an open space, were baths and Hypocausts, with a detached building measuring about 125 feet in length by 70 in greatest breadth.

"Near the centre of the principal quadrangle was (as is supposed) the temple of the tutelary deity, the "TEMPLUM NODENTIS," mentioned in the inscription below. It was about 95 feet long by 75 broad, and in it were

three tesselated pavements, the largest having the name of the erector (as in IV.) placed over a fanciful border representing the twisted bodies of salmons, the fish of the Severn.

"The whole was excavated under the direction of its late owner, the relics and coins carefully preserved, plans and drawings taken, and a series of engravings (of very limited number) executed, in which were cleven tesselated pavements. All was then covered again for preservation. Among the relics are coins to the time of Allectus inclusive, a statuette, votive offerings of limbs supposed to be acknowledgments of the sanitary powers of Nodens or Nodons, and three votive inscriptions given below, together with the inscription in the temple. No. III. has been printed by Lysons, the others are not known to have been published, and are given with their errors of grammar and spelling.

I.	D.M.NODONTI.
	I.L.BLANDINVS.
	ARMATVRA
	V.SLM
II.	PECTILLVS.
	VOTUM. QVOD.

VOTUM. QVOD. PROMISSIT. DEO. NVDENTE. M. DEDIT.

III.

DIVO NODENTI . SILVIANVS. ANILVM . PERDEDIT . DEMEDIAM . PARTEM . DONAVIT . NODENTI . INTERQVIBVS . NOMEN . SENICIANI . NOLLIS . PERMITTAS . SANITA TEM . DONEC . PERFERAT . VSQE . TEMPLVM . NO DENTIS .

IV. Imperfect, but the seeming number of the deficient letters is shewn by points, as follows:

D. A...FLAVIVS. SENILIS.PR.REL.EX.STEPIBVS. POSSVIT O....ANTE.VICTORINO.INTER...ATE."

From these statements, it may, I think, be reasonably inferred that this temple was the resort of persons seeking relief from

к

sickness, and that the cocks, serpents, and dogs, as well as the limbs found there, were votive offerings of those who gratefully acknowledged the sanatory powers of the deity worshipped in the place.

The circumstance that limbs were offered, leads to the conjecture that the diseases cured here were such as affect these portions of the body, perhaps rheumatism and gout, the influence of which is felt in the joints, the *nodi*, whence we find *nodosa cheragra* or *podugra*. And this further suggests the query whether the same deity—*Nodutus*—presided over vegetable and animal *nodi*? But—to turn from mere conjecture to something more certain—the inscriptions marked I., II., and III., are the same as those which formed the subjects of the preceding article, 35, 36, and 37.

The only thing worth noticing regarding them is, that, as given by Dr. Ormerod, they present one or two different readings. They are, however, of no importance; but n. IV. is particularly The beginning is unfortunately so imperdeserving of attention. fect, that I can offer no explanation which satisfies me. If the D be regarded as standing for Deo or Dei, it is not easy to find a suitable word or abbreviation of four* letters, commencing with A. Aram or Ædem is the most plausible that occurs to me. It is possible that D. A... may be prænomina of Flavius Senilis, scil., Decimus Aulus, the A and V being ligulate. The abbreviations PR·REL· are also doubtful, from the want of authority. It seems probable to me, however, that they stand for PR[ETIO]+ REL[ATO], the cost [of the structure or altar] having been obtained ex stipibus, i. e., the small pieces of money offered by the votaries of the god, either voluntarily or at the solicitation of the priests, who, like others of their order, during a portion of the day-"post templi apertionem stipes emendicabant." The portion of the inscription-ex stepibus [stipibus] possuit [posuit]may be well illustrated by an inscription to Mercurius Augustus, found at Yverdun, in Switzerland, Orelli, n. 348,

^{*} This limitation excludes the conjectures, otherwise plausible, AGREST or AGRIC.

[†] The following may be suggested : pr[æses], pr[æsul], or pr[æfectus] rel[igionis].

DONA VENIBVNT AD ORNAMENTA EIVS ET EX STIPIBVS PONENTVR•

This I interpret as meaning that the gifts offered to Mercury, whose statue is referred to in the preceding portion of the inscription, shall be sold to purchase decorations, and the cost of putting them up shall be defrayed from the money-offerings, or what we may call penny contributions.

O.... ANTE · VICTORINO · INTER ... ATE · I regard as standing for OP · CVRANTE · VICTORINO · INTER-AMNATE, *i.e.*, Opus curante Victorino Interamnate, *Victorinus, an Interamnian—*i.e.*, as I understand it, a native of the country between the rivers, Wye and Severn—or, it may be, the native of a town called Interamnæ, between those rivers directing the work.

The word INTER.... ATE seems to me to explain INTER, in line six of the third inscription, about the meaning of which I expressed doubts in my article on the subject. I now regard it as an abbreviation of INTERAMNATI, an epithet given to Nodon, from the position of his temple, *i.e.*, NODENTI-INTERAMNATI; as we find *Hercules Tiburtinus*, Juno Albana, Jupiter Poeninus, Apollo Actiacus, &c.

I avail myself of this opportunity to add what I inadvertently omitted mentioning in my article, that I trace the use of a tablet of lead for this inscription to the fact, that this material was used in recording execrations and for magical defixiones. Thus in Tacitus Ann., ii., 69—nomen Germanici plumbeis tabulis insculptum, is noticed amongst the maleficia quiscreditur animas numinibus infernis sacrari; and Dio Cassius, lvii. 18, whilst telling the same story of Piso's machinations against the life of Germanicus says: $\partial \lambda a \sigma \mu o \lambda (\beta \delta i voi d \rho d \varsigma \tau i v a \varsigma \mu \epsilon \tau d \tau o v$ $<math>\partial v \delta \mu a \tau o \varsigma a \partial \tau o v \delta \epsilon \varsigma$.

^{*} As Victorinus has no other name, I am inclined to regard him as a native Briton; especially as there is reason to believe that this name was common amongst the Silures See Archeologia, vii., p. 209, Camden's Britannia, ed. Gough, iii., p. 103. This notice of the birth-place with the name is not uncommon. Thus Sallust, Cutilina, 27, Septimium quendum Camertem; 44, Volturcium quendam Crotoniensem; and Cicero, pro Milone, C. Cassinius, cognomento Scola, Interamnas.

§ 21. In the same lecture by the Rev. S. Lysons, we find the following account of a tombstone, which was discovered (at Cirencester, I believe) "near the old London road in 1825 or 1826" :---

"On the lower part of the stone was the following inscription—RVFVS SITA-EQVES CHO-VI-TRACVM · AN·XI · STIP · XXII-HEREDES EX S. TEST-E · CVRAVE·H·S·E·, may be read thus:—Rufus Sitarchus Eques cohortis sexti Thracum annos undecim stipendii viginti duo. Heredes ex suo testamento erigere curaverunt. It may be thus translated:—Rufus, a Commissary-General of the Equestrian Order, and Officer of Cavalry, commanding the Sixth Legion, having served eleven years in the Thracian regiment of cavalry, and twenty-two years in the army, is buried here. This monument his heirs have carefully erected according to the terms of his will."

On this reading and translation it is unnecessary to offer any criticism : it is sufficient to observe that this inscription has been correctly read and translated by Mr. Wright, *Celt, Roman and Saxon*, p. 315, (p. 319, 2nd ed.)—

" RVFVS SITA EQVES CHO VI TRACVM ANN XL STIP XXII HEREDES EXS TEST F CVRAVE H S E

[i. e., Rvfus Sita eques coh[ortis] sextæ Tracum, ann[orum] quadraginta, stip[endiorum] vigintiduorum, heredes * ex testamento fuciendum curaverunt. H[ic] s[itus] e[st.]—J. McC.].

"It may be translated 'Rufus Sita, a horseman of the sixth cohort of Thracians, aged forty years, served twenty-two years. His heirs, in accordance with his will, have caused this monument to be erected. He is laid here."

Mr. Lysons seems to think that this horseman was the same as the Rufus, mentioned in St. Paul's *Epist. ad Rom.* xvi., 13, and as Pudens Rufus, the husband of Claudia Ruffina, "a noble British lady, professing the Christian faith." The conjectures have not the semblance of probability to recommend them.

HAMPSHIRE.

§ 22. In the year 1783 a pig of lead was found near Stockbridge, in this county. It bore the following inscription :

NERONIS · AVG · EX · KIAN · IIII · COS · BRIT

On it see my notes on inscriptions found in Derbyshire, p. 49.

§ 23. In the year 1789 an ancient ring was found at *Silchester, in this county. It bore the following inscription:

SENICIANEVIVASIINDE

On it see my notes on inscriptions found in *Gloucestershire*, p. 70.

* Most probably the Calleva of the Itinerary.

§ 24. Camden, ed. Gough, iii., p. 129, gives the following inscription on an altar found at Ribchester in this county :

> SEOESAM ROLNASON OSALVEDN AL.Q.Q.SAR BREVENM BEDIANIS ANTONI VS MEG.VI IC DOMV ELITER

Dr. Bruce, Journal of the Archeeological Institute, xii., p. 223, figures it and offers the following observations :

"Never, perhaps, was so unmeaning a concatenation of letters submitted to the gaze of a bewildered antiquary. Camden could make nothing of the inscription, but suggests somewhat waggishly that it contained little more than the *British* names of places adjoining. Horsley grappled with Camden's corrupted copy, and elicited one portion of truth. He says, 'I believe the fourth line may be 'Alæ equitum Sarmatarum.' The altar seems soon after its discovery to have been used as a common building stone in the erection of Salisbury Hall. In 1815 it was disentombed and fell into the hands of Dr. Whitaker, who bequeathed it to St. John's College, Cambridge. Dr. Whitaker, (History of Richmondshire, vol. ii., p. 461), thus expands the inscription:—Deo sancto Apollini Apono ob salutem Domini nostri ala equitum Sarmatarum Breneten, sub Dianio Antonino centurione legionis sextæ victricis."

In a paper on "Roman "Ribchester," in "the Journal of the

^{*} Confidently believed by the authors to be the *Coccium* of the Itinerary, and regarded by Mr. Hodgson Hinde as the *Bremetenacum* of the *Notitia* and *Bremetonacum* of the Itinerary. Gough, Camden's *Britannia*, iii., p. 303, remarks: "All antiquaries agree in placing *Bremetonacu* at Overboro." This remark is not at present correct. Before Mr. Hinde's statement of the claims of Ribchester, Reynolds. *Her Britanniarum*, had advanced those of Lancaster. Camden adopted the distinction of *Bremetonacum* and *Brementu*-

Archeological Association, by John Just, Esq., and John Harland, Esq., vi., p. 233, Dr. Whitaker's reading of the inscription is given thus :—*" DEO SANCTO APOLLONI [sic] APONO OB SALVTEM DN AL.Q.Q.SARM. BRENETEN.SVB DIANIO ANTONINO D.LEG.VI.VIC.DOMV ELIBER., whilst in the Archeologia Æliana, iv., p. 111, Mr. Hodgson Hinde cites as †Whitaker's words :—

"After the most attentive consideration, I think the inscription should be read as follows:—Deo sancto Apolloni [sic] Apono pro salute Domini nostri, Ala Equitum Sarmatarum Brennetennorum, Diânius Antonius, Centurio Legionis sextæ Victricis, Domu Velitris. I suspect the word which follows Samatarum to express a subordinate tribe of that widely spread nation, the Sarmatæ Brenetenni; at least I can assign no other meaning to it."

Mr. Hinde, in the paper already mentioned, suggests the emendation (which has been confirmed on closer examination of the stone) BREMETEN for BRENETEN and hence argues that Ribchester was the *Bremetenracum* of the *Notitia*. Mr. Roach Smith introduced another improvement—MAPONO for AP-ONO—regarding Maponus as the British name of Apollo as Belatucader is of Mars. Dr Bruce adopts both these corrections, and adds another—the substitution of N for A in the 4th line. The whole inscription, as it appears in his wood-cut, may be given thus :

racum. The first he placed at Overborough, the second at Brampton. Horsley, also, making the same distinction, assigns *Bremetonacae* to Overborough, and *Bremetenracum* to old Penrith or Brampton. The similarity of the names favours the opinion of Mr. Hinde that they designated the same place, but an obvious objection to his view that Ribchester was that place is that we are thus obliged to strain the words *per lineau valli* so as to include a station "upwards of eighty miles to the south of it."

* Mr. Wright, Celt, Roman, and Saxon, p. 257, 2nd ed., adopts t	his erroneous reading
and translates the inscription thus :	

"DEO SANCTO	To the holy god
APOLLONI [sic] APONO	Apollo Aponus,
OB SALVTEM DN	for the health of our lord (the emperor)
AL EQ SARM	the wing of Sarmatian horse
BRENETEN	of Brenetum, (?)
SVB DIANIO	under Dianius
ANTONINO	Antoninus,
D LEG VI V	Centurion of the sixth legion, called
IC DOMV	the conquering, his native town
ELIBER	was Eliber."

† I am unable to consult Dr. Whitaker's work.

DEO·SAN POLINIMPON **OSALTED** · N N·EQQ·SAR BREMETENN **OR** • DIANI +)ANTONI NVS LEG·VI VIC · DOMO MELITEN^{VS}

"Besides the inscription, the altar is sculptured on two of its The subject of one of these carvings is the youthful sides. Apollo resting upon his lyre," according to Dr. Whitaker, "Apollo Aponus, or the indolent Apollo, (or it may be read Apollo the healer), the god of medicine, who restores health by relaxation or repose," or "Apollo Aponus," deriving his name from the fontes Aponi, near Padua, "which he supposes to be the waters from which a cure was in this case supplicated." The other sculpture represents, as Whitaker thought, "the figures of two priests in long robes, holding the head of some horned animal between them ;" but, according to Bruce, "two females, the one fully draped, the other only partially so," holding some object between them, which is so much injured as to be undistinguishable ; it may have been a basket of fruit or an offering of flowers;" or, as seems to me, a male and female.

Let us now proceed to consider the interpretation of this obscure inscription. Dr. Bruce offers no reading of his own, but strangely accepts, as in the main correct, Dr. Whitaker's expansion, as cited by him, with the exception of the three emendations already noticed. DEO·SAN[CTO] APOL[L]INI may, I think, be accepted without doubt. Dr. Whitaker's APONO, whether as derived from the Greek anovos, or from the Latin, *Aponus*, should be rejected, as being without authority and as much inferior to Mr. Roach Smith's *MAPONO, *i. e.*, as I understand, MAPON· for MAPONO. The O in the third line may be

80

^{*} This use of the Roman designation of a god with that of the identified barbarian deity—APOLLINI MAPONA—is common. See my notes on inscriptions found in *Somer*setshire. Sometimes it happened that the barbarian deity was differently identified by different individuals.

regarded as the last letter of MAPONO, but it seems preferable to reserve it as an element of the preposition PRO-PR being regarded as lost by the fracture of the stone. OB seems to me not as probable, for we have to supply not only B but also *M after D·N· of course, stand for Domini nostri. SALVTE. The omission of the name of the emperor is not common. In the fourth line EQQ SAR are clearly Equitum Sarmatarum: this is confirmed by other inscriptions found here mentioning ala Sarmatarum. But the interpretation of N is not equally certain. Numerus at once presents itself, but there is a question, who erected the altar ? According to Whitaker's view, as stated by Bruce, it was the ala (or, if we read N, the numerus) sub Dianio Antonino centurione." But this is evidently erroneous : there is not the shadow of authority for sub, and besides we have Antoninus in the nominative case. But it appears from the extract given by Mr. Hinde, that Whitaker proposed another reading—Dianius Antonius Centurio. If we adopt this, it would appear that an et is to be supplied and the altar was erected jointly by the ala or numerus and Dianius Antoninus. This seems to me very unsatisfactory; if Whitaker's views on the other portions of the inscription be accepted. the N more probably stands for nomine, as in Horsley's Northumberland, xcv. His reading Brennetennorum should be at once rejected, as being without authority, and Hinde's temen-

81

Hence I would explain the remarkable fact that on one altar we find DEO MARTI COCIDIO, on another DEO SILVANO COCIDIO. See a statement by Mr. Clayton, Gentleman's Magazine, 1855, p. 83; and my notes on inscriptions found in Dumfriesshire. Dr. Bruce's solution—" that the Roman soldier who was dedicating an altar to one of his own divinities, pursuing the practice of adopting the deities of the conquered country, inscribed on the same stone the name of a popular native god, without any particular inquiry as to his attributes"—does not seem to me probable.

^{*} Not necessarily, for we have examples in inscriptions of the ablative after ob, e. gr., ob luminibus restitutis, Orelli, n. 1518; and also of the accusative after pro, e. gr., Pro salutem et victorias, Orelli, n. 2360.

[†] Mr. Hinde also suggests an emendation of the passage in the Notitia, which deserves consideration, scil., "supplying the initial S, and making a trifling alteration in the latter part of the word," i.e., reading Cuneus Sarmatarum for Cuneus Armaturarum. In favour of this it may be stated, that the reading of at least five MSS. of the Notitia is armotarum, and that this application of cuneus to cavalry is more consistent with the usage in the Notitia. See note p. 67 An objection to the reading may also be drawn from the usage in the Notitia, according to which we should have equitum before Sarmatarum. Böcking's conjecture that the armatura stationed at Bremetenracum were a detachment of the 6th legion supplies an explanation of the presence of ANTGNINVS LEG-VI-VIO: at the place.

dation, BREMETENN, adopted. I cannot concur with him, however, that OR in the next line should be joined to this, as if Bremetennor stood for Bremetennoraci, i.e., another form of Bremetenraci, the genitive of Bremetenracum. But Whitaker's readings, Dianius Antonius Centurio, must also be rejected. There is no authority for the name Dianius; the cognomen, as is evident from Bruce's wood-cut, is Antoninus ; and there is nothing on the stone to warrant centurio. There are, indeed, portions of letters at the beginning of the 7th line, one of which resembles a reversed C, such as is used for centurio, but it is impossible that this view of it can be correct, as instead of preceding it ought to These portions of letters are, I fear, too defecfollow Antoninus. tive to admit of any certain reading, but they may reasonably be regarded as representing the name or names of Antoninus. LEG.VI. VIC are, as usual, legionis sextce victricis; and the Whitaker's domu Eliber and omission of *miles* is not uncommon. domu Velitris are evidently erroneous. The last line is MELI-TENVS or MELITEN·VS, most probably the former. For this reading we are indebted, I believe, to Dr. Bruce, but he does not notice it, and omits in his citation Dr. Whitakers' domu Eliber. From what has been stated it is plain that the most obscure parts of the inscription are the sixth line and the beginning of the seventh. As to the latter, I have already stated the most feasible suggestion which I can offer; and I now venture to propose a conjecture which seems to to throw some light on the former. OR · DIANI may be regarded as standing for OR[ESTEAE] DIANI, i. e., DIAN[A]E, and it may be urged that this view derives considerable support from the country of Antoninus, scil., Melitenus, and from the sculpture of the two figures on one side of the altar. Diana, as Orestea Diana, was worshipped at Aricia, to which place Orestes, with his sister, was reported to have taken her image from Tauris. See Ovid, Met., xv., 489; Virgil, Æn., vii., At Comana, not far from Melitene, there was a similar 764. tradition, that Orestes, with his sister, had brought to the *celebrated temple in that city the sacred rites of Tauropolos Artemis. See Strabo, xii.; Dio, Frag., xxxvi. Hence Antoninus may have adopted the deity of Aricia as identical with that of Comana.

^{*} See Cicero, pro leg. Manil., c 9.

Thus the sculpture may represent Iphigenia and Orestes carrying the basket, or casket, containing the sacred symbols or utensils; or, perhaps, the *coma lugubris* to which the name of the city— *Comana*—has been traced; and the altar may have been jointly raised, by a *numerus equitum Sarmatarum* to Apollo Maponus, and by Antoninus to Orestea Diana. According to these suggestions the whole inscription may be read and expanded thus:—

> DEO·SAN[CTO] APOL[L]INI·MAPON[O] PRO·SALVTE·D[OMINI] N[OSTRI] N[VMERVS]·EQ[VITVM] SAR[MATARVM] BREMETENN[ACI] OR[ESTEAE]·DIAN[A]E ? ? ANTONI NVS·LEG[IONIS]·SEXTAE VIC[TRICIS] DOMO MELITENVS.

i. e., to the holy god [called] Apollo [by the Romans and] Maponus [by the Britons] for the health of our Lord [the Emperor] the detachment of Sarmatian cavalry [stationed] at Bremetennacum : to the Orestean Diana ? ? Antoninus, [a soldier] of the sixth legion [styled] the victorious, a native of Melitene, [erected this altar].

The union of Apollo and Diana on the same altar is common; and there are examples of dedications to different deities on the same stone, e. gr., on one found at Rutchester, Archaeologia \pounds liana, iv., pl. 1, fig. 4.

It has also occurred to me that G may have preceded the letters in the 6th line, thus forming an epithet of the equites Sarmata, derived, as is common, from the emperor Gordian. Similarly we have in Henzen, n. 6730, NVMERI·EXPLORA-TORVM·DIVITIESIVM·ANTONINIANORVM. If this be adopted, we should regard N·as standing for nomine. I am not satisfied that *either of these views is correct, but they seemed not unworthy of notice.

^{*} I have never met with an inscription to "the Orestean Diana."

§ 25. In the Journal of the Archaeological Association, vi., p. 344., we have the following account of an inscription on a votive tablet found at Halton in this county :---

"It is as follows (allowing for the letters between parenthesis, and which are doubtful); DEO MART(I) SABI(NVS) P.P. ET MILIT(ES)N·BARC. S... EIL V·S·P.O. This is usually read "Deo Marti Sabinus Pater Patrie," [sic] or, as Mr. Just read it, pro prætor, "a [sic] milites numeri Barcorum [sic] (S.... EII) voto saluto [sic] posuit."

The only other notice which I have seen of this inscription is in the same volume, p. 341, in the report of Dr. Johnson's paper on ancient Lancaster. His remarks relative to it are :--

"The name of Sabinus occurs on an altar to Mars, found near a mound two miles above Lancaster, and also on this altar an inscription referring to the Notitia." "Halton the place on the Lune where the altar to Mars was found, in connection with the numerus Barcarii [sic], appears, &c."

It is evident that the author of the account first cited was so imperfectly acquainted with the subject that no reliance can be placed on his reading of the inscription. Enough, however, is clear to prove that Dr. Johnson was correct in referring to the numerus Barcariorum, which served in Britain and is mentioned in the Notitia in the following terms :-- Prafectus numeri Barcariorum Tigrisiensium Arbeia. It is difficult to explain the meaning or origin of the terms Barcarii Tigrisienses. Horsley, an accurate and diligent enquirer after truth, gives up the search with the remark-" I can meet with nothing satisfactory about these Barcarii Tigrisienses." Böcking, p. 863, seems to me to have given the most probable explanation of the term Barcarii. He traces it to barca, "a barge," and hence interprets "bargemen." We know from various passages that the Romans employed a military and naval force in vessels on the rivers in the provinces. In the Notitia in partibus orientis we find mention of nauclarii, liburnarii, and naves amnicæ et milites ibidem depu-Tigrisienses he traces to Tigris either as the designation tati. of a particular kind of vessel, or as the name of a vessel-derived either from the animal, as we apply "the Tiger" to one of our ships, or from the river Tigris. Hence he explains the designation as denoting that these Tigrisienses served in barcae, either resembling the kind of vessel thus called, or, rather, attending on such vessels.

I am by no means satisfied with Böcking's explanation of *Tigrisienses*. It is, in my judgment, better to trace the designation to the river *Tigris*, with the meaning that these *barcarii* were from that river on which they had been accustomed to act in that capacity.

The numerus Barcariorum, as is plain from this inscription, included soldiers as well as sailors : their duties were discharged in vessels of light draught—probably as Böcking thinks, "lighters" or "tenders"—suitable for river service.

§ 26. Camden, ed. Gough, iii., p. 375, gives the following inscriptions found near Manchester :---

> CANDIDI FIDES·XX IIII COHO·I·FRISIN O MASAVONIS P·XXIII.

On these see my notes on inscriptions found in Monmouthshire.

LEICESTERSHIRE.

§ 27. About the year 1776, a cylinder of stone was dug up about two miles to the north of Leicester, near the ancient road called the Fosseway; it is now preserved in the local museum in that town. According to Mr. Wright, *Cett, Roman and Saxon*, p. 183 (p. 185, 2nd ed.), it bore the following inscription :---

"IMP·CAESAR DIV TRAIAN PARTH F DIV TRAIAN HADRIAN AVG PONT IV COS III A RATIS II "

From this copy it is impossible to extract any sense : PONT is unintelligible, and there is no intimation of the portions which are defective. In the *Monum. Hist. Brit.*, n. 8 *a*, the inscription stands thus :--

IMP CAES DIVI TRAIAN PARTH F DIV*NEP. TRAJAN HADRIAN * * * * B. POT.IV. COS. III. A RATIS*H

From the plate given in the Archaeologia, vii., p. 85, it would appear that the only legible parts were—

IMPCAES DIVTRAIANPARTHFDI TRAIANHADRIANAVG POTIVCOSIIIARATIS H

It seems plain that the defects in the style of Hadrian must be thus supplied :---

IMP·CAES DIVI·TRAIAN·PARTH·F·DIVI·NERVAE·NEP·

LEICESTERSHIRE.

TRAIAN • HADRIAN • AVG • P • M • TRIB POT • IV • COS • III

i. e., Imp[erator] Cas[ar], Divi Trajan[i] Parth[iei] f [ilius], Divi Nervæ nep[os], Trajan[us] Hadrian[us] Aug[ustus] P[ontifex] M[aximus] trib[unitiæ] pot[estatis] iv co[n] s[ul] iii, *i. e.*, A. D. 120, after August the 11th. The remaining portions of the inscription—A·RATIS H—have been correctly explained as denoting that the mile-stone was distant two miles (*i. e.*, H for II) from *Rata*, *i. e.*, Leicester. Mr. Newton, *Monum. Hist. Brit.*, supplies M·P· between RATIS and H: they are often omitted on mile-stones.

§ 28. In 1830, an ancient grave-stone was found in excavating the foundations of Mr. J. S. Padley's house in Lincoln. It is figured in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for 1842, p. ii., p. 351; and the inscription is given in the *Monumenta Historica Britannica*, p. cxii. n. 53*a*; and by Henzen, n. 6676, as follows:

> L·SEMPRONI·FLA VINI·MILTIS·LEGVIIII Q (?) ALAVDI SEVERI AER VIIANOR XXX ISPANICA LERIA CIVI MA

It is plain that the first two lines are to be read :

L[ucii] Semproni[i] Flavini mil[i]tis leg[ionis] nonæ

but there is considerable doubt as to the word or words preceding SEVERI, in the third line. Mr. Padley remarks, that if the first letter in the line be Q, it may stand for quadrate, i. e., legionis nonæ quadratæ; and reads the following word as "Alaudæ (a lark), a name given to legions, the soldiers of which wore tufted helmets, supposed to resemble the crest of the lark." The Editor of the Magazine suggests that the letter is G (not Q), "and is certainly some epithet of the legio Alauda. Perhaps galeatæ alaudâ." The rest of the line, I SEVERI, is read by Mr. Padley as Julii Severi, and the reading is illustrated by the observation that "Julius Severus was a governor of Britain under Hadrian." Mr. Newton, Monumenta Historica Britannica, adopts Alaudae, but doubts whether "I" should be read as Julius or Junius, as there were two proprætors of Britain named Severus; the one, Julius, under Hadrian, the other,

Junius, under Commodus. Henzen is of opinion that the latent reading of the line is "Sub cur A (or something similar) cLAVDI SEVERI." Henzen's emendation CLAVDI seems very probable, but the *appearance of the stone does not favour it. One of the cognomina of the 5th legion was Alaudæ; whilst those of the 9th were Hispanica, Macedonica. The first letter of the line, which is stated to resemble "the letter q inverted," and "the Etruscan G, the Roman G reversed," appears to me to be an inverted C, standing, as it often does, for centuria, and denoting that Lucius Sempronius Flavinus was a soldier in that century of the 9th legion, which was under the command of Claudius Severus. To Mr. Padley's reading of the next line, "aerum vii; annorum xxx," there can be no objection, as aerum is sometimes used for stipendiorum. See Orelli, nn. 3551, 3552; and Henzen, nn. 5202, 6841. The fifth line is read by Mr, Padley as "Ispanica Leria;" and the sixth as " Civitas Materna." Henzen adopts this reading of the fifth line, remarking that Leria was a city of Hispania Tarraconensis; but suggests, for the sixth, instead of "Civitas Materna," "Civi Ma[ximi exempli.]" There are, I think, but few who would regard either of these interpretations of the last line as satisfactory; and on reference to the copy of the inscription in the Magazine, I find that there is no authority on the stone for the second I in CIVI, and that MA is probably an erroneous reading of NIA. It appears to me, then, that we may read the last line thus: C.IVNIA, curante Junia, denoting the person who had caused the memorial of Flavinus to be executed. For the reasons which I have stated, I would read the whole inscription in extenso thus :

$L \cdot SEMPRONI \cdot FLA$	L[ucii] Semproni[i] Fla-
VINI · MILITIS · LEG VII	II vini, mil[i]tis leg[ionis] viiii,
) CLAVDI · SEVERI	c[enturiâ] Claudi[i] Severi,
AER·VII ANOR·XXX	aer[um] vii, an [n] or [um] xxx,
ISPANICA LERIA	[H]ispanicâ Leriâ,
C·IVNIA•	c[urante] Juniâ.

^{*} The three letters before VDI resemble AAA.

§ 29. In the Journal of the Archaelogical Institute, 1860, there is an interesting and carefully prepared paper by the Rev. Edward and Mr. Arthur Trollope, on "The Roman Inscriptions and Sepulchral Remains at Lincoln." As there are some points on which I differ in opinion from the learned authors, I purpose devoting two or three articles to the consideration of the doubtful readings or interpretations.

In p. 4 we have the inscription:

D·M FL·HELIVS NATI ONE GRECVS VI XIT ANNOS XXXX FL·INGENVA CO NIVGI POSVIT

It is thus interpreted :--- "To the divine shades,-Flavius Helius, a Greek by nation, lived forty years. The free-born Flavia erected this stone to her husband."

I cannot perceive any reason for rejecting the obvious interpretation of *Ingenua* as a *cognomen*. It is not rare: Mommsen, *Inscript. Neapol.*, furnishes several examples.

§ 30. In p. 6 we have the inscription that formed the subject of $\S 28:$

L·SEMPRONI·FLA VINI·MILTIS·LEGVIIII * ALAVDISEVERI AERVIIANORXXX ISPANICA LERIA CIVMA

The *reading and interpretation of the third line, which seem to be most favourably received by the Messrs. Trollope, are the same as those which I suggested; but a preference is expressed for ISPANI.GALERIA, instead of ISPANICA.LERIA. It is remarkable that, when I first saw the inscription, this reading sug-

90

^{*} From Utibner's article in *Rheinische Museum für Philologie*, n. 1, 1856, p. 18, it appears that Mommsen has anticipated both them and me.

gested itself to me; but although recommended by the circumstance that the Galerian tribe was common amongst the Spaniards, as noticed by Henzen, n. 5598, I rejected it on the ground, that there is no example, so far as I am aware, of such a position of the tribe, not only after the birth-place, but also after the years of age and of service. But the existence of *Leria*, as a town of *Hispania Turraconensis*, seems to be questioned apparently on the ground that it is "not found in Dr. Smith's Dictionary of Roman Geography." There can be no doubt, however, that it did exist: it is mentioned by Ptolemy, cited by Cellarius, i., p. 106.

The readings civis [or civitate] maximi exempli for CIVMA seem to me very improbable. I prefer my own suggestion—C· IVNIA c[urante] Junia. In support of this it may be added that the Junia gens was common amongst the Spaniards, whence we may assume that IVNIA was an ordinary name amongst them. See Reinesii Syntag, p. 137.

§ 31. In p. 15 the stone is figured on which is the inscription given by Horsley, Brit. Rom., Lincolnshire, n. 1:--

DIS MNIBVS NOMINI SACRI BRVSCI·FNI CIVIS SENONI·H CARSS NAE CONIVGIS * * * * * * * * *

"The memorial has been thus read:-----

DIS MANIBVS NOMINA (or NOMINII) SACRI BRVSCI FILI CIVIS SENONII ET CARISS IMAE CONIVGIS EIVS ET QVINTI F.

"The slub is broken of just below the last line [marked by asterisks], and the inscription may be imperfect."

Mr. Ward read the four middle lines : Nominii Sacri Bruscifili civis Senonii et charissimæ Vaniæ conjugis.

Horsley gives the expansion: "Dis Manibus Nominii Sacri Bruscifili civis Senonii et carissimæ Vaniæ conjugis ejus et Quintiæ."

Gough, *Camden's Britannia*, ii., p. 374, offers the astonishing note—that the first word in the fourth line "may as well be read LINCOLNI as SENONI."

I am inclined to suggest the reading: Diis manibus Nominii Sacri *Brusci filii, civis Senonii, et carissimæ conjugis, Lucii Quinti filiæ. This is favoured by the appearance of the remaining portions of the letters as given in the wood-cut, but it may be LVCIE [scil. E for AE]QVINTI F [ILIAE], a reading which is recommended by having the name of the conjux.

§ 32. In p. 17 the inscription on the grave-stone presented by Mr. Arthur Trollope to the British Muscum, in 1853, is noticed :---

> I·VALERIVS·I·F CLA·PVDENS·SAV· MIL·LEG·II·A·P.F. >·DOSSENNI PROCVLI·A·XXX AERA * I D·SP H·S·E

"The following reading of the inscription may be suggested—Julius (or Titus) Valerius, Julii (or Titi) filius, Claudia (*tribu*), Savia, miles legionis II Augustæ (or adjutricis) piæ, fidelis, centuriæ Dossenni Proculi, annorum xxx, ærum ii, de sua pecunia hoc sibi fecit (or hic situs est.)"

The appearance of the letters on the stone, as figured in the *Journal*, leads me to regard *Titus* as more probable than *Julius*. I also prefer *adjutricis* and *hic situs est*. For *de sua pecunia*, I would suggest *de suo peculio*, as in Orelli, n. 5553; and for *centuriæ*, *centuriâ*, as the usual construction seems to have been—the legion, cohort, or *ala* in the genitive, and the century or troop in

92

^{*} The letters BRVSCFIL are inscribed on a piece of pottery found at Duntocher Fort, in Stirlingshire. See Camden's Brit. ed. Gough, iv. p. 103, Stuart's Caledonia Romana, pl. viii., fig. 4.

the ablative. Thus in Renier, Inscriptions de'l Algèrie, nu. 3938, 3939, centuria and turma are given in extenso. On p. 17, the observations of Mr. Franks on this inscription is cited :

"It records Julius Valerius Pudens, son of Julius, of the Claudian tribe, and a native of Savia, a city in Spain; he appears to have been a soldier of the second legion, and of the century of Dossennus Proculus, and to have lived thirty years, two of them as a pensioner."

The tribe, being the Claudian, leads me to prefer, both here and in Gruter, 547, 10, Savaria, a town in Pannonia. See Reinesius. cl. viii., n. 5, and Orelli, n. 500. On the same ground I regard SAVA in Steiner, Corl. In. Rom. Rhen., nn. 373, 387, as standing for the same town. The interpretation, "two of them as a pensioner," is liable to the objections, that there is no number on the stone, which can be clearly read, and that there is no authority for "a pensioner." I am not sure that I correctly understand the use of the term by Mr. Franks, but if his meaning be, that Julius Valerius Pudens received pay for two years, as some of our discharged soldiers receive pensions, he has not at all expressed the sense of the Latin. The phrase AERA MERVIT means the same as STIPENDIA MERVIT, *i.e.*, served [the stated number of] years.

But it is more important to notice the construction of the word in this inscription. Instead of AERVM we have AERA, for the last letter seems to be A. The number is so obliterated that it appears scarcely possible to propose a certain restoration; but perhaps in this injured portion of the stone there was, besides the number, M standing for *meruit*.

Below the inscription is the representation of the *ascia*, so common on tombstones in the south of France. The Messrs. Trollope are the first, so far as I am aware, who have noticed it in Britanno-Roman epigraphy.

§ 33. In p. 19, we find an imperfect inscription, which has been thus read :

· · · · · AELIVS· · · · VS·M·AVRE · · · VM·ILIB · · · CINO·

.... XXV. ENIVS.VE EX.LEG.XIIII H E.TEST.P.

"The concluding formula"— $H \cdot E \cdot TEST \cdot P \cdot$ " may be thus explained—Hic ex testamento positus. (?)" I prefer "Heres ex testamento posuit," the heir being the veteran named in the sixth line. This inscription is of much interest, as supplying another notice of the 14th legion. The only other stone found in Britain, which mentions this cclebrated corps, is that dug up at Wroxeter, and now in the Library of the Grammar School at Shrewsbury.

§ 34. In p. 19 a stone is noticed, which was found at Lincoln during the early part of last year.

"The inscription, which is perfect, may be thus read :---

DIIS·MANIB C·IVLI GAL CALEN·F LVC VET EX LEG·VI VIC·PF NASEMF

"The person here commemorated may have been Caius Julius, of the Galerian tribe, son of Galenus, a native of Lucca (?), and a veteran of the sixth legion, styled Victrix, pia fidelis (?). The concluding letters are inaccurately formed, and their import is obscure. Nepos a suo bene merenti fecil, has been proposed, but we confess our inability to offer any satisfactory explanation. The sixth legion, however, it must be observed, was styled * firma and ferrata, which may suggest the more correct reading. It is doubtful whether it was ever styled pia fidelis.

The inscription, although apparently plain, and moreover accurately represented in a woodcut prepared with great care from a photograph, presents more than ordinary difficulty. The objections to the readings proposed by Messrs. Trollope for the first three lines, are : that C. Julius has no cognomen—that the normal arrangement of the name of the father and the tribe is inverted – and that the sixth letter in the third line seems clearly to be I, not F.

^{[*} There is but one example of this epithet connected with the 6th Legion, scil., in Orelli, n. 364. Henzen emends it by reading ferrata.-J. McC.]

I am inclined to suggest the following expansion :— DiisManibus Caii Julii, Galeria tribu, Caleni, (or Galeni), Lugduno, *i.e.*, of Caius Julius Calenus (or Galenus,) of the Galerian tribe, a native of Lugdunum. The only objection, worth noticing, which I see to this, is, that in the woodcut there is a mark resembling a point between N and I; but it seems probable to me that the mark is the result of injury or of age. It is remarkable that there is a similar mark between L and I in the fifth line of the inscription noticed in § 32.

LVG is a common abbreviation for Lugdunum, and in that city the Galerian appears to have been the ordinary tribe. See Horsley, Brit. Rom., Monmouthshire, n. iii, and Orelli, n. 4020.

But the principal difficulty remains for consideration. To the reading of the last line,

VIC·PF·NASEMF

the Messrs. Trollope suggest the serious objections, that PIA FIDELIS can scarcely be accepted as an expansion of $\mathbf{P} \cdot \mathbf{F}$, as it is doubtful whether the sixth legion was over styled pia fidelis; and that the concluding letters are so inaccurately formed, and their import so obscure, that they are unable to offer any satisfactory explanation. Let us first consider the question as to the application of the epithets pia fidelis to the sixth legion. Henzen certainly seems to have been of the opinion that this legion was not styled *pia fidelis*, for, in his index, whilst giving other titles, he omits mentioning these, and corrects two inscriptions in which those letters are found in connexion with the sixth. In his emendations I concur, for the use of CLAVD. in each of these cases shows that LEG.VII was intended; but the opinion that $P \cdot F$, standing for *pia fidelis*, were never applied to LEG. VI, may be refuted by several examples. In Britain, omitting some instances which may be questioned, we find examples in Northumberland, n. xliv.; Cumberland, nn. xxiv. and xlii.; and Westmoreland, n. vi., of Horsley's collection. In Stuart's Caledonia Romana, p. 349, we find an inscription in which the words piæ fidelis, applied to the sixth, are almost in extenso.

LINCOLNSHIRE.

Again, in Bruce's Roman Wall, pp. 270 and 274, we have other examples of the application of $P \cdot F \cdot$ to the same. Nor is the usage limited to Britain. Steiner, n. 611; Lersch, C. Mus. i., p. 14; and Dureau de Lamalle, Annal. dell' Inst. Arch. iv., 1832, p. 151, supply examples found on the continent.

In Bruce's *Roman Wall*, p. 250, we have *fidelis* in extenso; and in Mommsen's *Inscrip. Neap.*, n. 2852, "*fidel.*," but in both cases without "*pia*."

As it has now, I conceive, been established, that $\mathbf{P} \cdot \mathbf{F}$ in the last line of the inscription under consideration should be read *pia fideli*, we may proceed to the last letters, read by the Messrs. Trollope as NASEMF. The ligulate form, read by them as NA, seems to me to be VM. It is not uncommon, and is noticed by Horsley in his table of abbreviations. Assuming, then, that these letters are VM, and adopting the reading of the others by Messrs. Trollope, I would suggest vivus monumentum sibi et maritæ fecit. But I am not satisfied that E, after S, is the correct reading. The letter, as it appears in the wood-cut, looks very like P. If this be the fact, then I would suggest:—Vivus mandavit sua pecunia monumentum fieri. According to my view the inscription may most probably be read thus:

DIIS MANIB[VS] C[AII] IVLI[I] GAL[ERIA] CALENI LVG[DVNO] VET[ERANI] EX LEG[IONE] VI VIC[TRICE] P[IA] F[IDELI] V[IVVS] M[ANDAVIT] S[VA] P[ECVNIA] M[ONUMENTVM] F[IERI].

$\mathbf{M} \mathbf{I} \mathbf{D} \mathbf{D} \mathbf{L} \mathbf{E} \mathbf{S} \mathbf{E} \mathbf{X}.$

§ 35. In Mr. C. Roach Smith's *Collectanea Antiqua*, i., p. 135, a grave-stone, which was found some sixty years ago in Whitechapel, London, is figured; and the following explanation is given of the inscription which is on it:

"D.M. IVL.VALIVS MIL.LEG.XXVV AN.XL.H.S.E. C.A.FLAVIO ATTIO.HER

Düs Manibus. Julius Valius miles legionis vicesimæ valentis victricis, anno quadragesimo, hic sepultus est. Caio Aurelio herede."

There is no difference between this expansion and that proposed in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, vol. liv., p. 672, excepting the emendation of the number of the legion, which Mr. Smith correctly gives as xx, instead of xxx, and the accidental omission of *Flavio Attio* between *Aurelio* and *herede*.

As there are obvious objections to this rendering, I would read the inscription thus:

D·M·	D[iis] M[anibus];
IVL·VALIVS	Jul[ius] Valius,
$\texttt{MIL}{\cdot}\texttt{LEG}{\cdot}\texttt{XX}{\cdot}\texttt{V}{\cdot}\texttt{V}$	Mil[es] leg[ionis] xx V]aleriæ] V[ictricis],
$AN \cdot XL \cdot H \cdot S \cdot E$	An[norum] xl, h[ic] s[itus] e st],
C·A·FLAVIO	c[uram] a[gente] Flavio
ATTIO·HER·	Attio her[ede].

§ 36. In the Journal of the Archaeological Association, ix., p. 91, there is a description of various articles of the Roman period, which were exhibited by Mr. Gunston, who stated that he was informed that they had been found in London. In addition to the reasons which are there given for believing that the infor-N

MIDDLESEX.

mation communicated to that gentleman was incorrect, there seems to me to be in one of the inscriptions ground for suspicion, that it was not found in Britain. The inscription, to which I refer, is

L·AVTRONI VRBANI·OL·II

The reading of this is evidently:—Lucii Autronii Urbani ollæ duæ. Now there is no example, so far as I am aware, of any British inscription mentioning the ollæ, which are so commonly noticed in inscriptions found in Italy. The only sepulchral desigtions in inscriptions found in Britain, so far as I recollect, are monimentum, tumulus, and memoria. There is, however, a sepulchral stone, which, if my reading be correct, furnishes a term that I have never met with in any other inscription. As the examination of it may be of some interest, I shall devote a separate *article to the consideration of it.

* See my notes on inscriptions found in Yorkshire.

§ 37. In the Journal of the Archeeological Institute, 1860, p. 270, a tile from *Caerwent is figured, which bears the name BEL-LICIANVS, four times written, in "what may be called the cursive hand [?] of the British Romans. The name Belicianus (with a single l) occurs on one of the tomb-stones from Bulmore, near Caerleon, and may possibly refer to the same individual."

To these observations of Mr. J. E. Lee, the following remarks are subjoined:

"The sepulchral stone found at Bulmore, to which Mr. Lee refers, is figured in his *Delineations of Roman Antiquities found at Caerleon*, pl. xxiv., p. 37. It bears an inscription in memory of Julia Veneria; it was erected by Alesander (*sic*) her husband and Julius Belicianus her son. The upper part of the stone forms a pediment, on which a dolphin is sculptured. The names Bellicius, Bellicinus, Beelicus, and also Bellianus, Bellicnus, &c., occur in inscriptions given by Gruter. Bellienus was the name of a family of the *Annia gens*; Bellicianus may have been a name derived from that of the town in Gaul, of some note in Cæsar's campaign against the Allobroges, Bellicium, or Belica, now known as Belley. It is situated about forty miles E. of Lyons."

I am unable to consult Mr Lee's work, as above referred to; but the incription, which is cited, is the same as that given in Mr. Wright's *Celt, Roman, and Saxon*, p. 315 (p. 320, 2nd ed.):

" D.M	To the gods of the shades.
IVLIA VENERI	Julia Veneria,
I AN XXXII	aged thirty-three years,
I.ALESAN.CON	Alexander, her husband
PIENTISSIMA	most attached,
ET·I·BELICIANVS	and Julius Belicianus
F·MONIME	her son, this monument
F·C	caused to be made."
•	

With this reading and translation I am by no means satisfied. The I at the beginning of the third line seems to me to be not a

* The Venta Siluram of Antoninus.

numeral, to be joined to XXXII in the preceding line, but the ordinary nota for Julius, scil., "Julius Alexander." "Her husband most attached" is evidently a casual slip, as a translation of CON[IVGI] PIENTISSIMA[E], which, of course means "to his most attached wife." The* name BELICIANVS may perhaps be nothing more than the ordinary cognomen FELICIANVS, the B being used for F. MONIME is so strange an abbreviation of MONIMENTUM, that it excites suspicion as to the correctness of the reading. I venture to suggest—M·OP-TIME, —i.e. M[ATRI] OPTIM[A]E. According to this view, the inscription denotes that "Julius Alexander to his most affectionate wife, and Julius Felicianus to his excellent mother, caused [this memorial] to be made."

P. S.-Since the foregoing article was published Mr. Lee has favoured me with copies of his works-" Delineations of Roman Antiquities found at Caerleon (the ancient Isca Silurum) and the neighbourhood, by John Edward Lee," London, 1845; and "Description of a Roman building and other remains lately discovered at Caerleon, by John Edward Lee," London, 1850. I now find, from p. 37 of the first of these works, that Mr. Wright's translation-"her husband most attached"-was founded on Mr. Lee's expansion-conjux pientissima. Mr. L. remarks : "There is some little difficulty with respect to the word pientissima, the gender of which is evidently incorrect; but, as it is well known that the ancients, in their inscriptions, did not always adhere strictly to the rules of grammar, it probably may be considered as an terror of the mason." There can, I think, be no reasonable doubt that the expansion which I propose-con[jugi] pientissima[e]-is correct. Mr. Lee's lithographic drawing, however, has satisfied me that his reading of MONIME should not have been questioned. The letters are uninjured, and are distinctly MONIME.⁺

^{*} It is worthy of remark that we have another example of a female named Julia Veneria on an olla found at Naples. See Orelli, n. 4537.

[†] See note p. 27.

[‡] Since this postscript was written, I am indebted to Mr. Lee's courtesy for a copy of his new work—"*Isca Silurum*"—which "combines the substance of the two former volumes, with an account of recent discoveries, in the shape of an 'Illustrated Catalogue of the Museum." From p. 15 of this volume, I perceive that Mr. Lee accepts my first two emenda-

§ 38. Horsley, Britannia Romana, p. 321, gives the following inscription, on a stone which was found at Caerleon :---

"PRO SALVTE	Pro salute
AVGG N·N·	Augustorum nostrorum
SEVERI ET ANTONI	Severi et Antoni—
NI ET GETÆ CÆS	ni et Getæ Cæsaris
P·SALTIENVS P·F. MAE	Publius Saltienus Publii filius
	[Mae-
CIA THALAMVS HADRI	cia Thalamus Hadrianus
PRAEF·LEG·II·AVG pr	æfectus legionis secundæ Augustæ
C.VAMPEIANO ET	Caio Vampeiano et
LVCILIAN	Luciliano [consulibus]."

His remarks on it are :---

"Camden gives us this inscription from a votive altar, out of which the name of Geta (as he says,) has been erased, yet so as that some shadews of the letters remain. According to the Fusti, it should be Claudius Pompeianus et Lollianus Avitus, that is in the year 209. I don't find that in any Roman inscription in Britain Geta is styled Augustus, unless it may have been in some of those in which the name is erased; and then, perhaps, for this very reason it has been struck out."

In the *Monum. Hist. Brit.*, 39 *a*, we have another inscription found at the same place, which enables us to explain the preceding :

SALVTI RE GINAE·P·SAL LIENIVS·P·F· MAECIAET * * MVS HAD PRAEF·LEG·II * CVM FILIIS SVIS AMPEIANO ET LV CILIANO D·D·

tions--scil. I as standing for Julius, and CON-PIENTISSIMA for conjugi pientissima, but rejects the conjectural reading M·OPTIME, *i. s.*, M[ATRI] OPTIM[A]E. I have already stated my opinion on this last point, since I had the opportunity of seeing a drawing of the stone. Mr. Lee, however, has misunderstood the ground of my "suspicion ns to the correctness of the reading and of my venturing to suggest another,"-as he has failed to notice the difference between MONIM and MONIME. The former is a common abbreviation of monimentum, but I had never met with an instance of the latter.

It is evident that these two stones were erected by the same person, a Præfect of the second legion, with his sons. The only doubt about his names arises from a variance in the inscriptions as to his nomen gentilitium. From one it appears to be SALTI-ENVS, from the other SALLIENIVS. The omission or insertion of I before the final VS presents no serious difficulty, for there are similar examples, such as ALFENVS or ALFENIVS; but I know not how to explain the difference of T and L. It is strange that the variety should occur in two inscriptions cut in the same place, and not improbably by the same mason, under the eye of the person himself. Has the fourth letter in both been misread ! and should it be either V or E ! In Mommsen's Inscrip, Neapol., n. 6625, we have SALLIENVS as a nomen gentilitium.

The other portions of the Præfect's style are clear, so that we may expand them thus :—P[VBLIVS] SALTIENVS or SALLIENIVS P[VBLII] F[ILIVS] MAECIA [TRIBV] *THALAMVS·HADRIA. Horsley suggests HADRIA[NVS] and Orelli HADRIA[NALIS]. Neither seems to me as probable as *Hadria*, scil. Hadria in Picenum as his birth-place. As to the tribe, see Mommsen, *Inscrip. Neapol.*, nn. 6133, 6138. A very strong argument in favour of my reading is that all the names are thus in the normal order.

From the 7th, 8th, and 9th lines of the second inscription we learn that Horsley's idea, that the persons named in the 8th and 9th of of the first were consuls, is erroneous. It is clear that they were sons of the Præfect, and that their names were *Ampeianus* and *Lucilianus*. From the 7th line of the second we may derive an emendation of the 8th line of the first—*scil*. CVM for C·V, and reject Orelli's conjecture—cu[rantibus]. It is, perhaps, worth while adding that there is no other example, so far as I am aware, of *regina* being applied to *Salus*.

102

^{*} In the 4th line of the second inscription, as given in the Monum. Hist. Brit., there is an E between the final A of MAECIA and the initial T of THALAMVS. I am persuaded that this is a misreading, caused, perhaps, by the accidental prolongation of the bar of the II, which was probably tied to the T. The idea, which is suggested by the reading et, that two persons erected the altar cannot for a moment be entertained. Independently of objections to their names—seil. P-SALTIENVS or SALLIENIVS.P.F. MAECIA and THALAMVS HADRI[ANVS]—the words projectus cum filits suis prove that there was but one person mentioned. See p. 4.

P. S.—On reference to Mr. Lee's Delineations of Antiquities, &c., I find that he accounts for the variance in the nomen gentilitium, by supposing "an error of the mason," for "the fourth letter in one case is decidedly T and in the other decidedly L." In the second inscription "an I has evidently been inserted between the N and the V, whereas there is no such letter in the other; but in the former it is rather indistinct and has the appearance of having been partially erased; it is possible that in the [first] inscription there may originally have been a small I joined to the N, but it must be confessed that at present there is no appearance of it." With regard to the ET, rejected in my note, p. 102, Mr. Lee finds it in both inscriptions, and consequently believes the stones to have been erected by two persons-"Publius Sallienus Publi filius Macia et Thalamus Hadrianus. In that given by Camden (although he omits it) Mr. L. discovers it "hidden under certainly a very complicated *nexus*. The T and H are united, and a small obscure letter, which now looks like an I very much widened at the top, is placed above the left upright stroke." In the other on the altar, he regards "the combination of these letters as somewhat different : there is no appearance of any letter above the line, and though the lower parts of the letter are lost, sufficient remains to show that the first letter in the nexus is a reversed E (as is evident from the central horizontal stroke), and that the T and H are united ; the letter T must therefore stand for the last letter in ET, and the first in THALAMVS." In p. 4, I have noticed errors caused by the intrusion of this conjunction, and will now merely add that sometimes mistakes also arise from assigning a double duty to one letter, as Mr. Lee does here to T, which he regards as at once the final of ET and the initial of THALAMVS. We have an example in Mr. Ward's reading of a part of the inscription given by Horsley, Somersetshire, n. iv.-ETVICT. Mr. W. observes-"the T at the beginning of the word TVICTIA is to be twice read, as L in the Middlesex inscription." I have no doubt that the true reading is ET. VICT[ORIA].

I am persuaded that the names in the two inscriptions are not of two persons, but of one; and I cannot but think that Mr. Lee, on *further examination, will find that he is mistaken. In

^{*} In his new work-Isca Silurum-he adheres to the readings of these inscriptions as

the emendation CVM I have been anticipated by the Rev. C. W. King. p. 42; and Mr. Lee also notices the singularity of the epithet *regina* as applied to *Salus*.

§ 39. In the Monum. Hist. Brit., p. cix., n. 26 b, we have a copy of an inscription on a stone found at Caerleon :

IMPP·VALERIANVS ET GALLIENVS AVGG·ET VALERIANVS NOBILISSIMVS CAES·COHORTI VII·CENTVRIAS·A SO LO RESTITVERVNT·PER·DESTICIVM IVBAM VC·LEGATVM AVGG·PR·ET VITVLASIVM LAETINIANVM LEG·LEG II·AVG·CVRANTE·DOMIT·POTENTINO PRAEF·LEG EIVSDEM

[*i.e.*, imperatores Valerianus et Gallienus, Augusti, et Valerianus nobilissimus Cæsar, cohorti septimæ centurias a solo restituerunt, per Desticium Jubam, virum clarissimum, legatum Augustorum, proprætore, et Vitulasium Lætinianum, legatum legionis secundæ Augustæ, curante Domitio Potentino præfecto legionis ejusdem].

The only *difficulties in this inscription are in the words centurias and prafileg ejusdem. C. F. Hermann, Gött. Gel. Anz., 1846, p. 1422, suggests the reading tentoria for centurias, and this is accepted by Lange, Hist. Mut., rei. mil., p. 89.

Henzen, n. 6746, asks—" num ædificia, in quibus singulæ centuriæ habitabant ?" The explanation, which he has so doubtfully suggested, seems to me to be correct.

given in the "Delineations." My opinion, however, remains unshaken, that but one person with his sons erected the altar; nor do I see any reason for changing my views relative to his names. In the Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, n. 1, 1856, Dr. E. Hübner has anticipated me by proposing exactly the same reading of the names as I have given. He rejects the ET with the remark; "ET in line 4 is a common evasion of Englishmen, when the nomen gentilitium [?] is too much for them." In pp. 3, 4, I have noticed a reading, which proves that the resort to "ET" in difficulties is not peculiar to the island.

^{*} Hübner, Rheinisches Museum, n. 1, 1856, p. 6, takes the right view as to centurias, and has anticipated me in the reference to the Museum Veronense.

In this sense I understand the same term, as it is used by Cicero, de leg. Agrar. ii., 13 := -practerea mulis, tabernaculis, centuriis, supellectili. The rarity of this signification is such that Turnebus proposed to substitute for centuriis, tentoriis, and Pantagathus read canteriis, whilst Professor Long, in his edition of Cicero's Orations, London, 1855, remarks---" there is no meaning in the word."

The difficulty regarding a *legate and a *prefect being at the same time in the same legion leads Lange to suggest the reading praef. fab. leg. ejusdem [i. e., prefecto fabrûm legionis ejusdem], as if fab. had been omitted by mistake. Henzen regards the inscription as proving that the prefecti of legions were under the legati, and acted as their deputies. I am inclined to think that Domitius Potentinus was prefectus castrorum, on whom, from his official position, the duty of 'superintending the restoration of the soldiers' quarters would devolve. In the Journal of the Archaeological Institute, viii., p. 158, an altar to Fortune, which was found at Caerleon, is figured. It was erected by PRAEF CAS-TRO, i. c., præfectus castrorum. Desticius Juba, mentioned here, was probably the same noticed in the Museum Veronense, p. ccclxxvii, 2:

T·DESTICIO T·F·CL IVBAE·C·V· PRAETORIO ORDO·CONCORD PATRONO

P. S.—Mr. Lee, Delineations of Antiquities, p. 43, was the first who correctly interpreted centurias. His words are—"the same word may have stood for a century or company, and for its quarters." In his expansion he gives cohortis, instead of cohorti, which is plainly on the stone. There is no reason for this change, for the Latinity of cohorti septimæ, in the sense "to or for the seventh cohort," is unexceptionable.[†]

^{*} In Dr. Bruce's reading of an inscription on an altar found at Kirk Steads, Roman Wall, 2nd ed., p. 274, there is a greater novelty—a legion having two legates at the same time. Dr. B.'s reading of ET (which he himself queries), must be incorrect.

[†] In my copy of the inscription on the opposite page, the second PR., in the 5th line, is omitted by a typographical mistake.

§ 40. In the Journal of the Archaeological Institute, viii., p. 158, a stone resembling part of a column, or a mile-stone, is figured, bearing the imperfect inscription :

NCTO HRAE SFVSTVS HIAVG M·F

Mr. Lee remarks: "the usual formula, INVICTO MITH-RAE, seems to be discernible." As the first letter seems clearly to be N, the word was more probably *SANCTO, an epithet which is also, though not so commonly, applied to Mithras. In the third line we have the remains of the names of the dedicator, and in the penult there was, perhaps, besides LEG·II·AVG, the designation of his military rank. It is not easy to decide what expansion to give to M·F. If the inscription had been sepulchral, there could be no doubt, but it is evidently dedicatory to Mithras. Of the readings which occur to me the most feasible are monitus fecit, and miliarium fecit. The erection of altars ex monitu was common; and in Henzen's n. 6134 a we have, I think, an example, of the offering of a *miliarium.

P. S.—In the *Isca Sulurum* Mr. L. observes :—"the first words seem to have been *Soncto Mithræ*, but they may, as Mr. Way appears to think, have been in the usual formula, *Invicto Mithræ*." He passes over $M \cdot F$ in silence and does not even mention II AVG.

§ 41. In Mr. Lee's *Delineations of Roman Antiquities*, &c., plate xi., fig. 3, we find the following inscription on the handle of an amphora :---

MÆMRVS.

106

[•] The inscription is-

C.FABERIVS.MIL.ET.SEDILIA IVNONI DAT.

Henzen, in uncertainty about the meaning of MIL[,], asks whether it can be MIL*iarium*. I am not sure that I understand what he meant by this word—whether "a mile-stone" or "a caldron." I have somewhere met with another example of an offering of a *miliarium*, which I conjectured to be a designation of a cylindrical altar or table, but I know no authority for the conjecture. In the *Iscal Silurum* Mr. Lee regards the Caerleon stone as "a round altar," as "the top or capital is partially hollowed out."

I am inclined to read and expand the letters thus: M[AR-CVS] ÆM[ILIVS] RVS[TICVS?], or M[ANV] ÆM[ILII] RVS[TICI?].

§ 42. In plate xiii., fig. 3, is the representation of a fragment of a tile stamped with the usual legionary impress II AVG, with the addition of two tied letters followed by T. Mr. Lee observes that "the whole stamp may be read either IIAVGMVT, or IIAVGMAT," and adds that the opinion of Mr. King and Mr. Bunbury were in favour of the first.

Neither MVT nor MAT is intelligible; I have no doubt that the *true reading is ANT, *i. e.*, ANTONINIANA. I have not met with an example of this epithet as borne by the *legio secunda Augusta*; but Orelli, n. 2129, supplies one of the *legio secunda adjutrix pia fidelis*, the same mentioned in one of the Bath and one of the Lincoln inscriptions.

§ 43. In plate xviii., an altar is figured, bearing the following inscription:-

... TVNE ETFBONOEVE NTOCORNELI·CASTVSETIVLI BELISIM.VS CONIVGES POS . . R

"Above this are two figures, the left one of which is so defaced as to render it difficult to say whether it was intended for a male or a female. When Mr. King first saw it, the outline was far more clearly defined than at present, and he has little doubt that the two figures represented the mcn mentioned in the inscription." Mr. Lee further observes :—

"The inscription may be read as follows:--Fortuna et Bono Evento Cornelius Castus et Julius Belisimnus conjugesque posuerunt.

[•] Mr. Lee, Isca Sllumum, p. 44, observes that this "doubtless is the correct reading of this stamp."

[†] The author of the review in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, August, 1862, offers a singular conjecture regarding them; "These figures we consider to be intended for Fortune and Bonus Eventus."

It is singular that this inscription seems never to have been completely finished, although there was sufficient room after the last R for the remaining letters VNT. The lines between which the letters were placed may be traced here very distinctly, but in the other parts of the inscription they have been obliterated; there are also no letters for the *que* after conjuges, though there appears to be an indefinite mark, as if the workman had begun to chisel out some abbreviation."

Of the worship of *Bonus Eventus* there are many examples; nor is the use of *Evento* for *Eventui* rare. See Orelli, nn. 1783, 1788, &c.

The unauthorised introduction of the que does not at all satisfy me. I do not recollect having met in any inscription with such a form as conjugesque, or conjuxque: either et conjuges or cum conjugibus suis (as cum filiis suis), is more in accordance with epigraphic usage. See Orelli, nn. 1238, 2047, 2504; Zell, Delectus, n. 182; and Museum Vcronense, p. 237. I am inclined to regard the inscription as similar to that noticed in note, p. 4, *i. e.*, as requiring that the word or words (voverunt or votum susceperunt) meaning "vowed" should be supplied: scil., Cornelius Castus, et Julius Belisimnus voverunt—conjuges posuerunt. We may, indeed, regard the VS before CONIVGES as standing for v[otum] s[usceperunt], and the one or two letters which are lost before the VS as forming the end of the name BELISIM, but I much prefer my first suggestion.

P. S.—In the *Isca Silurum* Mr. Lee adds the following conjecture :—" Mr. King suggests that this tablet may have been erected by the two individuals named, on taking possession of allotted lands—Fortune being a popular deity, and Bonus Eventus one of the patrons of agriculture (Varro, i.), as a symbol of which he is represented with a patera in his hand holding fruit, or with ears of corn." He also notices other interpretations, whilst both he and Mr. King adhere to that originally given. One suggested by "a leading member of the University of Cambridge" is that *conjuges* refers to the two men named in the inscription in the sense—" intimate friends and companions." It is strange that this view seems to have been so generally received with approval. It is accepted by the author of a critique on Mr.

Lee's work in the *Parthenon*, July 19, 1862, who remarks : "They were perhaps something like the 'sworn brethren' of the Middle Ages."

The *author of the review in the Gentleman's Magazine, August, 1862, also receives and defends it.

"To us it seems there is no necessity to suppose either an omission, [scil. of que], or that conjuges here implies 'wives'; or can mean other than contubernales 'yoke-fellows, friends or companions." We therefore submit an example of this use of the word, from Fabretti, p. 318:—

DIS·M PALLADIS T·STABERI FAVENTINI·SER· T·STABERIVS FAVENTINI·L CHARITO·CON IVGI·DE·SE·B·M. V·A·XXXII.

Here Charito, a *libertus* of T. Staberius calls Pallas, the deceased servus [serva] of the same patronus, his conjuz."

This inscription does not prove the point for which it was cited. Neither in it nor in any other, is one man said to be the *conjux* of another man.

Relative to such inscriptions, as given by Fabretti, Mr. Lee, p. 20, had remarked :—" The Rev. C. W. King informs me that the inscriptions referred to only speak of *contubernales* as people who have contracted illegal marriages (such as that of a slave with a freedman), and that there are no instances in Fabretti of the use of the word *conjuges* in any other than its usual sense." Mr. King's statement, as given by Mr. Lee, is not accurate. Fabretti, by a series of inscriptions, beginning at p. 307, and of which that cited from p. 318 is one, proves that the term *conjug*

^{*} From p. 151, I learn that he holds the same opinion that I do as to the erection of the tablet and altar, noticed in §38, by one person. The only variance is as to Hadrianus, "As in the engravings no *et* is visible in either, between the words Macia and Thalamus, we suggest the readings as above, [P Sallienus, P. filius Macia (tribu) Thalamus Hadrianus], considering P. Sallienus Thalamus Hadrianus as one name, that of the Prefect."

was often applied in cases in which contubernalis should have been used, and even rice versa. As there was no legal marriage between slaves, neither of the pair cohabiting could be called the conjux of the other. The man was said to be the contubernalis of the woman, and the same term was applied to the latter; and yet, as he shews, this distinction of terms was not observed.

It is in a totally different sense that soldiers were said to be contubernales. The term as thus applied means "comrades occupying the same tent." Neither Fabretti, nor, so far as I am aware, any other author, furnishes any authority for the use of conjuges applied to two men in the sense "intimate companions" or "yoke-fellows." In the same review we find the following passage :

"Mr. Lee and most of his friends, including Professor Mommsen of Berlin, consider the word *que* has been omitted at the end of the third line, and they read *conjuges* as "wives," judging the entire inscription to mean that Cornelius Castus and Julius Belisimnus, with their wives, erected the altar to Fortune and Bonus Eventus. Dr. E. Hübner also agrees with Mr. Lee, and says, 'There can be no doubt about the word *conjuges* being only applicable to a matrimonial couple."

There is no evidence in Mr. Lee's published statements on the subject that either of those scholars agreed with him as to supplying the que. On the contrary, Prof. Mommsen "asks if there is any probability of the inscription being read BELISAMA EIVS CONIVGES; that is (as I understand him) Cornelius Castus et Julia Belisama ejus conjuges—Cornelius Castus and his Julia Belisama (Julia Belisama his wife), a married couple. The omission of uxor is not uncommon, but I do not recollect having ever met with an example of conjuges applied to both husband and wife, although conjux is an ordinary term for either separately. The reading Belisama is not warranted by the stone : the sixth letter seems clearly to be I.

Another view of the inscription has been suggested—that "the stone was a sepulchral memorial to Cornelius Castus, and Julius Belisimnus, dedicated to Fortune and Bonus Eventus, and erected by their widows." Mr. Lee judiciously rejects this extraordinary interpretation: it is wholly unprecedented.

And now, having reviewed the opinions of others, I must express my preference for the interpretation—"Cornelius Castus and Julius Belisimnus vowed the altar—their wives erected it." In addition to the example, which I have given, of the omission of the verb in the first clause, I now add another.

In the Archaeologia Æliana, iv., pl. i., fig. 2, we have the following inscription on an altar found at Rochester :

> DEO SOLINVIC TIBCL DECMVS CORNELANTO NIVS·PRAEF TEMPL·RESTIT

Mr. Thos. Hodgson thinks that the following reading should be adopted : Deo Soli invicto Tiberius Claudius Decimus Cornelius Antonius prœfectus templum restituit Instead of taking the five names as belonging to one person, I would supply posuit or instituit, or some such verb after Decimus, and regard Cornelius Antonius as the names of the præfect, i. c., Tiberius Claudius Decimus instituit—Cornelius Antonius præfectus templum restituit.

§ 43. In plate xx. a sepulchral inscription is figured :---

D M Q·IVLI·SEVERI· DINIA·VETERANI LEG·II·AVG·CONIVX·F·C·

Mr. Lee reads it : Dis Manibus Quinti Juli Severi Dinia Veterani legionis secundæ Augustæ conjux faciendum curavit.

To this I would merely add in explanation that *Dinia*, (scil. *Dinia*), the veteran's *birth-place, was a town in Gallia Narbonensis, now *Digne*.

^{*} The author of the review in the *Gentleman's Magazine* observes: "It is not improbable that *Dinia* indicates the birth-place of Julius Severus." It is certain that it does: the use of the ablative of the birth-place without *domo* is common. See Fabretti, pp. 340, 341, and *Reinesii Syntag*, pp. 528, 529.

§ 44. Plates xxi. and xxii. contain delineations of four inscribed stones of the class called "centurial." Previously to entering on the general discussion of this subject, which may be conveniently introduced here, I shall notice plate xxi., fig. 2, as this presents peculiar difficulty. Mr. Lee's observations on it are :---

"This inscription is now on the walls of a ruined bath-house near a small stream, on the lane leading from Caerleon to Malpas; the letters are so rudely executed, and the stone has suffered so much from time, that it is nearly, if not quite, impossible to decipher it. On this account, the greatest care has been taken to give an accurate fac-simile of it on a reduced scale, in order to afford a chance of its being interpreted by some person accustomed to ancient inscriptions."

It appears to me that the stone has been placed in the wall upside down. If we "invert the delineation, we may read the inscription thus :----

O+C+IVLII CAECINIANI+

i. e., centuria Caii Julii Cæciniani.

There is a similar rectification of an inverted inscription in Horsley's Northumberland, n. iii.

§ 45. The other inscriptions, in plates xxi., xxii., are the following :—

CHOR. \overline{VI} . HAST. PRI. > ROESIMODERA

CHO·V >PAETINI

 $\begin{array}{c} \text{COH} \cdot \overline{\text{II}} \\ > \mathbb{V} \text{ALERI} \cdot \text{FL} \\ \mathbf{A} \mathbb{V} \mathbb{I} \end{array}$

^{*} Prom the Isca Silurum, p. 17, it appears that I have been anticipated by Mr. King, Mr. Franks, and Mr. Roach Smith.

Mr. Lee's remarks on the first are, "An inscription erected by the sixth cohort, in honour of Roesus Moderatus, the first centurion of the Hastati. Cohors sexta Hastati primi centurionis Roesi Moderati." To these remarks a note is subjoined :

"Horsley, (Br. Rom., p. 207), thinks that when the name of the conturion is in the genitive, the centurial mark is to be read, not 'centurionis,' but centuria; thus making the century or company called after the name of one of its officers; the present inscription seems to disprove his opinion, as it is difficult to interpret it in any other way than by supplying words for 'In memory' or 'In honour of' Roesus Moderatus."

On the second Mr. Lee's remarks are, "A stone erected by the fifth cohort, in memory of the centurion Paetinius [Pætinus] —cohors quinta centurionis Pactini;" and on the third—"Inscription in memory of the centurion Valerius Flavus, by the second cohort : it may be read thus :—

Cohors secunda centurionis Valerii Flavi."

Horsley, *Brit. Rom.*, p. 127, makes the following remark relative to the inscriptions of this class, called "centurial," which have been found in or near the wall of the lower istlanus :---

"These inscriptions were doubtless inserted in the face of the wall, when it was building, and in all probability erected by those centuries or cohorts who built that part of the wall." "These centurial inscriptions," he further remarks "found upon the face of the wall, and a passage in Vegetius mutually illustrate each other. According to Vegetius every century took their share in proportion in digging, building, and other works. His words are, singulæ centuriæ accipiunt pedaturas."

Influenced by this view he supplies in many cases the verb *posuit*. See *Scotland*, n. xxiv., *Northumberland*, i., ii., iii., iv., x., xi., xii., &c., &c. In the following astonishing expansions, p. 301, he varies from both the opinions, expressed by him in pp. 127, and 207:

··) CANDIDI	Centurionis Candidi
FIDES, XX	Fidesii annorum viginti
1111	mensium quatuor.

In the note on the opposite page, I indivertently omitted mentioning that Mr. Lee has adopted this view and changed the drawing accordingly.

The other is thus:

COHO.I.FRISIN.	Cohors prima Frisingensium	
O MASAVONIS	[or Frisonum]	
P. XXIII.	Centurioni Marco Savonio sti-	
	pendiorum viginti trium.	

If these copies have been rightly taken, the former looks like a sepulchral inscription for a centurion. The XX most probably express the number of years he lived; the IIII either the number of months, or else of days, the number of months being quite effaced. The other also refers to a centurion, and seems to be an honorary monument erected to him by the whole cohort." [!]

For my part I have no doubt that there is not one of such inscriptions that was "in honour" or "in memory" of any one, and that the meaning of the centurial mark, under other circumstances often used for "centurion," stands in all such inscriptions for *"century." Nor does Horsley's view of the *pedatura* furnish a satisfactory explanation of the great majority of examples. It is doubtless true that there are inscriptions marking the number of fect—the *pedatura*—in the work appointed to be executed or executed by a century, but there is not one of this kind in Horsley's collection.

As the number of such inscriptions is considerable and much misapprehension seems to exist regarding them, it may be useful to consider the subject at large, and state the varieties, so far as I have noticed them, not only of centuries, but also of legions and cohorts. The legions, as is well known, were distinguished by numbers, i., ii., iii, &c., and when there were more

≻ MVN AXSV

He expands it—"Centurio Munax votum solvit. In n. lxxv a, we have another of this class:

⊳mv
NATI
MAX.

I have but little doubt that both stones recorded the same century, scil., centuria Munatii Maximi. In the first we have MVN. for Munatii and the M before MAXSV is lost, i. e., MAXSV[MI] stood for MAXIMI.

114

^{*}Horsley, Northumberland, lxxiv., gives an inscription of this class, in which he regards > as standing for centurio :

than one of the same number, they were distinguished by their epithets or titles—e. gr., LEG·II·AVG·—legio secunda Augusta and LEG·II·A·P·F·—legio secunda adjutrix pia fidelis. The cohorts of the same legion were also distinguished by numbers from I to X, e. gr., COH·X, cohors decima; and the cohorts of different legions, when stationed together, by the addition of the legionary mark—e.gr., LEG·II·AVG·COH·X—legionis secundæ Augustæ cohors decima. It cannot be inferred, however, from the appearance of the marks of both legion and cohort on a stone, that there was more than one legion in that locality. The centuries of the same legion were distinguished not by number but by the names of their respective centurions, to which the number of their cohorts was sometimes prefixed—e.gr., >VALERI VERI, centuria Valerii Veri, *COH·VI· O STATII SOLONIS-cohortis sextæ centuria Statii Solonis-i. e., as we should say, Captain Smith's company of the first or second battalion. When different legions were stationed together it would be necessary to add the legionary marks, but in this case the cohort is scarcely, if ever, mentioned : the type is LEG·II·AVG >IVLI·TERTVLLI-**†A[NI]**—legionis secundie Augusta centuria Julii Tertulliani. The names of the centurion, which are usually given, are the nomen gentilitium and the cognomen; but we sometimes have the prænomen also, and there are examples of the cognomen alone. There is also another form in which the centurion's name is given -scil., as an adjective formed from his nomen gentilitium-thus O VOLVSIANA-centuria Volusiana. It is, perhaps, impossible to give a satisfactory reason for this variety. It may have been on account of the number of officers or men of that gens in the century, or that there had been a succession of centurions of that gens.

Of the stones which are thus inscribed there are some, of which there can be no question that they were intended to mark work that was executed. There are many examples of such legionary inscriptions of considerable length, which have been found in

^{*} There is also another but rare form of this, such as Horsley's Cumberland, n. xviii.--> CASSI PRISCI COH VI; and a still rarer, Northumberland, n. lxiii.--> COH VII [MA]XI[M]IAN[A].

[†] See Horsley, Cumberland, n. xx.

Scotland along the wall of Antoninus; and to this *class also belong the following more briefly expressed :----

LEG	Legio
Π	$\mathbf{secunda}$
AVG	\mathbf{A} ugusta
FEC	fecit.
	Horsley, Scotland, ix.
LII •AVG	Legionis secundæ Augustæ
CHO VIII	cohors octava
\mathbf{FEC}	fecit.
	Horsley, Northumberland, ix.

In the *Archaeologia Æliana*, new series, i., p. 257, we have a similar example of an auxiliary cohort :

COH·I·BAT	Cohors prima Bat-
AVORVM F	avorum fecit.

I do not recollect having ever seen in British inscriptions an *undoubted* instance of such a centurial stone, *i. e.*, one designating the work executed, or to be executed by a particular century, except, probably, that given by Mr. Smith, *Journal of Archaeological Association*, v., p. 223, *scil.*:

COH·I·>OCRATI MAXIMI QL.M.P

There is not one of those given by Horsley, in the Britannia Romana, in which he supplies "posuit," nor by Dr. Bruce, in the Newcastle Catalogue, in which he supplies "crected," that seems to me to be a record of this character.

* In Horsley's Cumberland, n. xlii., we have what appears to be another variety of this class:-

LEG·V1· VIC·PF G·P·R·F·

116

Horsley expands it—" Legio sexta victrix pia fidelis Genio populi Romani fecit;" but G may be a misrcading for G, and thus the expansion may be—"Legio sexta victrix pia fidelis centum passus refecit." See Northumberland, cxi., and Archaelogata Eliana. new series, i., p. 243, n. 80. The letters, however, more probably stand for "Genio Populi Romani feliciter," as they are read by Visconti in the inscription given by Orelli, n. 4947.

The true explanation of such inscriptions, as I think, is, that they were intended to mark the space set apart for quarters in an encampment, *i. e.*, to define the *pedaturæ* not in the sense in which it is used by Vegetius in the passage cited by Horsley, but in that in which Hyginus employs it. An examination of the varieties bearing numbers will support my opinion.

) CANDIDI	COHO·I·FRISIN
FIDES·XX	D MASAVONIS
IIII	P•XXIII

Horsley, Lancashire, p. 301.

>VALERI) FLORINI	>CLAVDI
CASSIA	PXXII	P•XXX•S
N ? ? PXIX		

Newcastle Catalogue, nn. 57, 73.

>ANTONR ? M N CXX

Wellbeloved, Eburacum, p. 59.

The P in these examples stands, as I believe, not for *passus* but for *pedes*; and I have but little doubt that in the first of them this word should have been given instead of the misreading FIDES. It appears then that the numbers of feet on these stones are 24, 23, 19, 22, 30 and 120. Now according to the calculation of Hyginus in his distribution of a camp the space to be set apart for a century is 30×120 feet. Hence we can at once explain the last two numbers in the inscriptions above given. As to the others they may be regarded as examples of what must have often happened, either that a particular century did not require or could not be allowed the full space. This will seem more probable if we bear in mind that of the 30 feet 6 were left vacant. The arrangement for a century is so well described by Lange, *Hist. mut. rei mil. Rom.*, p. 65, that I subjoin his words:

"Jam igitur apparet, hemistrigia, in quorum latitudine 10 pedes tentoriis, 5 armis, 9 jumentis dantur, 6 vacui manent, contenos pedites continere debere, si 120 pedes longa sint. Unius autem strigæ hemistrigia ita inter se conjunguntur, ut utriusque hemistrigii jumenta contigua sint, et, cum

seni pedes vacui singulorum hemistrigiorum ante hemistrigia sint, singulæ strigæ, ubi via vicinaria data non est, pedibus 12 vacuis diremtæ sint. In talibus autem hemistrigiis revera non 100 homines tendunt, sed singulæ centuriæ, ita ut, cum singulæ centuriæ 80 hominum sint, centurioni quoque in centuriæ pedatura locus assignari possit. Singulæ autem centuriæ octona tentoria habent, ita ut in singula 10 homines, qui contubernii ejusdem sunt, computentur, quorum tamen bini quoque tempore in excubiis sunt. Ex hac centuriarum distributione sequitur, ut singulis cohortibus legionariis 6 hemistrigia pedum 120 danda sint."

I would read the inscriptions thus :

O CANDIDI PEDES·XX IIII	*Centuria Candidi pedes xxiiii.
COHO·I·FRISIN	Cohortis primæ †Frisinonum
O MASAVONIS	centuria Masavonis
P·XXIII	pedes xxiii
>VALERI CASSIA N ! ? PXIX	Centuria Valerii Cassiani [?] pedes xix.
O FLORINI	Centuria Florini
PXXII	pedes xxii.
> CLAVDII	Centuria Claudii
P·XXX·S	pedes xxx. ‡s[emis ?] .
>ANTONR ? M	Centuria Antonii §R ? m ?
N CXX	n[i] pedes cxx.

But we have yet to consider-

COH·I·>OCRATI MAXIMI8L.M.P

^{*} The construction may also be that of the genitive, scil., centuriæ : where LEG or COH precede the century they seem plainly to be in the genitive—*i. e., legionis* cohors, legionis centuria, cohortis centuria. In Horsley's Northumberland, n. XXXI., we have, as I think, an example of locus expressed. The inscription as given by him is—COHVI LOVS SUAVIS. In explanation of it he observes, that he "had once suspected that the last two words might be LAVS SVAVIS, but that he rather inclined to Mr. Ward's opinion, that it is to be read Logus Suaris; both which names occur several times in Gruter." Accordingly

As far as MAXIMI all is plain, *scil.*, Cohortis prime centuria Ocratii Maximi, but the difficulty begins with the next letter, which resembles a Q with two tails. Mr. Roach Smith observes relative to the inscription :—

"It resembles in character the centurial commemorations on the stones of the great northern wall, and, like them, apparently refers to the completion of a certain quantity of building."

As it seems almost impossible that any building of a single century could be 50 miles long, it is better to separate the L from the $\mathbf{M} \cdot \mathbf{P}$ so that the latter shall mean but one mile, *scil.*, mille passus. I would then take L as standing for L[IMITIS] and regard the letter before it either as 0 for *opus*, or as 8 the *symbol of the direction of the *limes*, either from east to west or *v. v.* See Facciolati in *limes*, and Mr. Yates's paper on the *limes Rhaticotransrhenanus*, in the *Proceedings of the Arch. Instit.*, 1852, p. 104. The whole may thus be read : Cohortis prime centuria Ocratii Maximi 8 limitis mille passus, and the meaning would be that this century was to execute or did execute one thousand paces of the boundary running from east to west or west to east.

Let us now take up the inscription in Mr. Lee's delineations :

CHOR·VI·HAST·PRI > ROESIMODERA

He regards it as "an inscription erected by the sixth cohort

[†] See my notes on inscriptions found in Scotland.

§ Mr. Wellbeloved, p. 59, strangely reads "ANTONius PRefectus Militum." The defective letter after ANTON seems plainly to have been R, and the other letters probably formed the cognomen.

he expands it—Cohortis sextre Logus Suavis *posuit*. I incline to the opinion of Dr. Hunter, noticed but rejected by Horsley, that the words should be read *locus suaris*, and think that they were used ironically, as the Terentian *homo* suavis. The use of *locus* favours my opinion that such stones were used to mark the spaces that were set apart for each cohort or century.

[†] This is doubtless the cohors prima Frisianonum of the tabulæ honestæ missionis of Trajan, 105-6, and of Hadrian, 124, and the cohors prima Frizagorum of the Notitia. Frisii is also written Frisci and Friscii, and we also find Friscivones. See Dr. Leemans, Archæologia, xxvii., p. 224.

^{*} I know no authority for regarding it as such. In the difficulty I have resorted to conjecture.

in honour of Roesus Moderatus, the first centurion of the Hastati :—*Cohors sexta Hastati primi centurionis Roesi Moderati.*" This expansion is unquestionably erroneous—but the correct reading is by no means clear. In Horsley's *Cumberland*, n. xxxviii., we have an exactly similar inscription :

COH IIII PR·POS > IVL·VITALIS.

He has wholly mistaken its meaning, for he expands it— "cohortis quartæ prætorianæ posuit centuria Julii Vitalis;" whereas it is evident that as IIAST·PRI denote the hastatus primus, or prior, so PR·POS denote the princeps posterior.

It seems then that in the first inscription we have the hastatus primus, or prior, of the 6th cohort, and in the second the princeps posterior of the 4th cohort. Thus in Orelli, n. 3452, we find PRINCIPEM POSTERIOREM and ASTATUM POSTERI-OREM of the 1st cohort of the XIth legion. But it must be observed that all such designations of centurions apply strictly only to those belonging to the first cohort. Thus, if we find hastatus primus alone, we understand by it the centurion who commanded the first century of the Hastati in the 1st cohort. But here we have COH·VI·HAST·PRI, whence it would appear that this was another form of HASTATVS SEXTVS. See p. 17. But, again, the terms admit two interpretations. By the hast. pri. of the 6th cohort may be meant either the centurion commanding the first century of the hastali of the 6th cohort; or that ordo itself, for the terms are used for either centurion or ordo. See Livy, xlii., 34, and Cicero, de Divinat. i., 35. Similarly by the pr. pos. of the 4th cohort may be meant either the centurion commanding the second century of the principes of the 4th cohort; or that century itself. Thus we may render the first line of one inscription-the first hastatus of the 6th cohort, and of the other-the second princeps of the fourth cohort, with either of the two significations above mentioned. As it seems almost certain that the centurions named in the second lines were respectively the hastatus primus, or prior, and the princeps posterior, the construction may have

been hastati primi, or prioris, and principis posterioris, in apposition with their names : but 1 am inclined to prefer regarding them as standing for the ordines, or centuries, and consequently take the construction to be cohortis sextæ hastatus primus (or "prior)—centuria Roesi Moderati—and cohortis quartæ princeps posterior—centuria Julii Vitalis

P. S.—In the *Isca Silurum*, Mr. Lee offers the following observations on the subject :—

"The general opinion now seems to be that the reversed C stands not for centurionis but for centuria, as Horsley considered it when the name was in the genitive. (Br. Rom. p. 207). In this case the company or century would be called after the name of its officer, and the centurial inscription will simply mean that a certain portion of work was done (as in the inscriptions on the Roman wall) by such a century, or that the stone pointed out its quarters."

In p. 6, Mr. Roach Smith's opinion is given that "it was set up on account of some work done by order or direction of Roefus, a centurion *primus hastatus* in the sixth cohort." I have no doubt that > stands for century, not for centurion; and I am persuaded that the stone marked the space set apart for the quarters of that century of the 6th cohort. As to the change of *Roefus* for *Roesus*, I can see no reason. I would prefer either *Roefus* or *Roesus*, as the name is the *nomen gentilitium*.

§ 46. Mr. Lee, in his observations on the sepulchral inscription in pl. xxiii., fig. 1, notices the great age of the veteran—100 years. There is no other example, so far as I am aware, in Britanno-Roman epigraphy of so great an age. Indeed, as Mr. Wright remarks, "the average at which the Romans in Britain died, seems to be not much more than thirty." This remark is confirmed on examination of twelve sepulchral inscriptions as they appear in the plates of the *Britannia Romana*. A remarkable contrast is presented by the inscriptions in Algeria. If we take the first

^{*} I prefer print as the expansion of pri. in this inscription to Mr. Lee's primus, as I am not aware of any authority for the use of hastatus primus as denoting any other than the centurion commanding the first century of the hastati in the first cohort. He was also colled simply hastatus, i.e., "the" hastatus, as the centurion commanding the first cohort was called princeps. See p. 17. Henzen, n. 6783, gives an inscription, from which some might infer that he was also called the hastatus prior of the legion. It is possible that he may have been, but the inscription, as given by Henzen, does not prove it.

twelve, as they appear in Renier's collection, at Lambases, Verecunda, Cirta, and Sitifis we find the average for the first place 39, for the second 50, for the 3rd 49, and for the fourth 40*i. e.*, an average for the four of over 44. But it is not safe to draw inferences from small numbers.

§ 47. In pl. xxv., fig. 2, is the representation of a tombstone. It bears the following inscription :---

> AIBERNAVX'S TANNOSXVIMESSEXF CFLAFLAVINAMATER

Mr. Lee reads it thus :--Julia Iberna vixit annos sexdecim menses ser faciendum curavit Flava Flavina mater. For Flava read Flavia.

§ 48. In pl. xxvi., fig. 2, we have a very defective sepulchral inscription :---

AL EG·II·AVG "E'RO·SE IV ECIANVS F· C

"Fortunately, however, an exact [?] copy was taken by Mr. Jones at the time it was found, which shows it to be a sepulchral inscription for some person connected with the second legion: it is as follows:

> M GENIALIS EG·II·AVG·EX FERO* SE IV NECIANVS FC "

I am inclined to suggest as a conjectural reading :

D M ? GENIALIS LEG·II·AVG·EX T·HERS·SEC·?·IV MECIANVS F· C

i. e., Diis Manibus ? Genialis legionis secundæ Augustæ ex testamento heres secundus ? Julius Mecianus faciendum curavit. I am not satisfied with it, however, as the collocation is objectionable.

M ORVI

NISXVII

Mr. Lee reads it :--- "Dis Manibus * * * orvi annis septendecim." OR is more probably the ending of a name, such as Victor, and VI the beginning of VIXIT.

§ 50. On p. 53, Mr. Lee copies the restoration of an imperfect inscription, found at Caerleon, as given by Camden, ed. *Gough*, iii., p. 109 :---



i. e., Imperatori Marco Aurelio Antonino Augusto Severi Lucii filio legio secunda Augusta posuit. It is impossible that the reading Lucii can be correct. I suspect that the letter read as L was really I, i. e., SEVERI, and that AVG followed it.

P. S.—In the *Isca Silurum*, pl. vii., the stone is figured, from which it appears that the letters in the 5th, 6th, and 7th lines are now so injured that no reliable reading can be given of them. Hübner, *Rhein. Mus*, n. i, 1856, p. 6, suggests the following restoration :--

IMp caes M AVr·antonino AVG SEVERI aug FILIO LEG·II Aug

If he had adhered to the model which he proposed, viz. : n. 5943 of Mommsen's *Inscrip. Neapol.*, his restoration would have more nearly accorded with the Caerleon stone, for ANTONINO forms in both a separate line.

§ 51. In the same page the following *inscription is given :----

```
DEDICATV
VRF
OG ES
VE NIO
MAXIMOIE
FVRPANo
COS
```

It is evident that the inscription records a dedication or inauguration, probably of a building. In the 2nd and 3rd lines the day seems to have been mentioned, for it is not improbable that the third should be read—OCTOBRES. The fourth probably contained the names of the dedicator ; and the remaining stated the year, for there can, I think, be but little doubt that the 5th and 6th are misreadings of MANIMO II ET VRBANO, who were consuls in A.D. 234.

§ 52. In p. 54 we find a similar inscription, but of a different date :—

DD VIIII OCCB PRCR EIML COS CVR VRSO AGT*œ* EI : IVS.

DD stand either for DEDICATVM as in the preceding, or are the end of the formula "in honorem $D \cdot D$ ", scil., domus divinæ.

124

^{*} This and the two next are copied from Coxe's History of Monmouthshire. The stones are lost.

The 2nd and 3rd lines are plainly VIIII OCTOB., *i. e.*, September 23rd, whilst the 4th and 5th are misreadings of letters standing for PEREGRINO ET AEMILIANO, who were consuls in A.D. 244. CVR in the 7th line is probably a contraction of CURANTE, and the last three lines gave the names and titles of the individual.

The dates that may be collected from inscribed stones found at Caerleon include about fifty years, from the beginning to the middle of the third century. The notices of Severus and his sons indicate probably the time during which they were in Britain, *i. e.*, between 207 and 211; whilst the tablet, naming Valerian, Gallienus, and Valerian the Cæsar, must be referred to some year from 254 to 260. The author of the review of *Isca Silurum*, in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, August, 1862, p. 152, says that "the date of the inscription [on the tablet] must be between A. D. 253 and A. D. 259, just before the revolt of Postumus, in Gaul, when the young Cæsar was murdered." These statements are "erroneous: Gallienus was not associated in the empire until A. D. 254, nor was his son, Saloninus, "the young Cæsar," killed until A. D. 260.

§ 53. On p. 53 there is a most interesting inscription, which, if my reading of it be correct, supplies the Roman designation of *Isca* as a *colonia*.

NN AVGG GENIO LEG II AVG IN H⁰N⁰ RENMI⁰T M VA FH IV LE SC PP DD

* Mr. Newton, Monum. Hist. Brit., gives the correct dates.

The first five lines are evidently to be read: Numinibus Augustorum et Genio legionis secundæ Augustæ. The emperors are, probably, either Severus and Caracalla, or Valerian and Gallienus. The 6th, 7th, and 8th lines, I have but little doubt, are misreadings of the common formula :

IN·HONO REM·TOT· DOM·DIVIN.

i. e, *in honorem totius domus divina*, *scil.* the imperial family. The reading of the next four lines is not so clear, but I strongly suspect that they were—

 $FEL \cdot IV$ $L \cdot E$ SC

i. e., Felix, or rather Felicitas, Julia Esca; *Esca being, as I think, another form of Isca.

Of the readings *Fclix Julia* and *Felicitas Julia*, I prefer the latter. Thus we have the colonial designation of *Lisbon* in Orelli, n. 819---

SABINAE AVG IMP·CAES·TRAIA NI HADRIANI AVGVSTI DIVI NERVAE NEPOTIS DIVI TRAIANI·DAC·PAR FIL·D·D·FELICITAS IVLIA OLISIPO·PER M·GELLIVM·RVTILIVM ET L·IVLIVM AVITVM

It seems not improbable that *Isca* was called *Julia*, after +Julia*Domna*, the wife of Severus, and that we should trace the origin of the name +Julia, applied to $\pm strata$ in this part of the country,

126

^{*}The E is preserved in Exeter. At Caerleon *lsca* remains in the name of the river "Usk," on which the town is situated. The Latin word is evidently formed from the old Celtic or British *Wysg*, signifying "water."

[†] Thus Beneventum was styled in honour of her IVLIA CONCORDIA AVGVSTA FELIX BENEVENTVM.

[‡] Camden traces the name Julia, as thus applied, to Julius Frontinus, and others perhaps may prefer Julius Agricola.

MONMOÜTHSHIRÉ.

either to it or to her. PP and DD are, I think, to be read *pecuniâ publicâ dono dedit*, or *decreto decurionum*. The reading, which I have proposed, in itself very probable, is favoured by the circumstance that *Richard of Cirencester* names *Isca* as one of the *Colonia* in Britain.

§ 54. In a "description of a Roman building and other remains, lately discovered at Caerleon, by John Edward Lee," pl. ii., fig. 4, we have "a mark on the fragment of a mortarium : it is reversed, and most probably may be read CATTIVS MANSINVS." Read C·ATTIVS ·MANSINVS, *i. e.*, *Cuius Attius Mansinus*. The cognomen is doubtful.

§ 55. In pl. vii., fig. 1, a sepulchral stone is figured, bearing the following inscription :—

D M TADIA·VALLAVNIVS·VIXIT ANN·LXV·ET TADIVS EXVPERTVS FILIVS·VIXIT·ANN·XXXVII·DEFVN TVS·EXPEDITIONE GERMANICA TADIA EXUPERATA FILIA MATRI ET FRATRI·PIISSIMA SECVS TVMVLVM PATRIS POSVIT

There are but two points in this inscription which require explanation. One—the meaning of defuntus, i. e., defunctus has already engaged the attention of Mr. Lee, and of the Rev. H. H. Knight. They both prefer interpreting the word as *deceased in the German expedition to having completed, or served in the German expedition.

"In this case," Mr. Lee observes, "the tomb would be merely a cenotaph to his manes." On first view it seemed to me more

probable that the stone marked the place of *interment of the three near each other. I was also inclined to prefer the interpretation, "having served in the German expedition to the end of it," as *fungor* with its compounds seems to be the proper term in this connexion. Thus Orelli, n. 3556:—

OMNIBVS EXPE DITIONIBVS FVNCTO

and n. 3523 :

OMNIB·EXPEDIT·ET HONORIB·PERFVNCTO

but Henzen regards the latter as spurious. In n. 3201, also, where we have a notice of death in a German expedition, a different term is used :---

OBIIT IN EX PEDITIONE GERMANICA

I am now, however, disposed to regard the stone as a sepulchral memorial, placed by the daughter near the grave of her father in memory of her mother and brother, whose bodies were interred elsewhere, probably on the continent. In this change of opinion I am influenced chiefly by the position of *defunctus*. If it had been used in the sense "having served in to the end," or "having completed," it would, I think, have been placed after *expeditione Germanica*.

There were so many German expeditions that is impossible to determine to which reference is made.

The other point requiring explanation is the use of +VAL-LAVNIVS in the masculine with TADIA in the feminine. The author of the review in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, already referred to, suggests, with a query, *Vallauniusa* or *Vallaunusa*, but on the stone there is certainly no A after the S.

[•] Mr. Wright's idea that the body of the son was brought from Germany to Isca is very improbable.

 $[\]dagger$ Mr. Wright, Cell, Roman, and Sazon, p. 254, (p. 258 2nd ed.) remarks—"In an inscription at Carleon an adjective in the feminine gender is joined with a masculine name." If his observation refers to this inscription, he has mistaken the adjective, for Tadia is certainly not one.

P. S.—Since writing the foregoing, I have had the opportunity of reading the remarks in Mr. Lee's *Delineations of Antiquities*, and have reason to think that Mr. Wright intended to refer to Mr. Lee's reading of CON PIENTISSIMA, as noticed in article 37.

Marini, Atti, i., p. 331, gives the following examples of masculine cognomina of females: Ælia Demetrus, Cassia Mus, Julia Barachus, Mucia Antiochus, Calidia Antiochus, Clodia Optatus, Acilia Carnus, Sallustia Helpidus, Flavia Chrysophorus. And yet I am not satisfied with this explanation of VALLAVNIVS. There is no example, so far as I am aware, of a cognomen of a female ending in IVS. The word resembles an *ethnic adjective, *i. e.*, the Vallaunian, and this view of it may in some degree account for the mistake of gender; but it may also be read VALLA, or rather VALLIA, VNIV·S, *i. e.*, VNIV[IRA] S[ANCTA]. Fabretti, p. 323, gives other examples of this and the corresponding term virginius. I am inclined to prefer the view that Vallaunius was an ethnic adjective.

P. S.—In the *Isca Silurum* Mr. King remarks—"Unless the stone were a cenotaph the deceased hero must have fallen in the neighbourhood. Now Carausius, whose empire was confined to Britain, boasts on his coins of a 'victoria Germanica,' and displays also a trophy with 'de Germanis.' Can these allude to the repulse of any Saxon pirates? The charge brought against Carausius, when admiral of the German ocean, was his allowing the Saxon pirates full impunity to plunder the British and Gallic coasts, and then catching them on their return home and re-capturing their booty for himself. This 'expeditio Germanica' must have been an important event in the British history of the third century for it to appear thus nakedly as a *date* upon a monument."

I can see no reason for believing that the *expeditio Germanica* mentioned here was more important than other such expeditions noticed in inscriptions. The words of course meant the latest German expedition. See Orelli, nn., 798, 2919, 3201, 3569, 5477, 6482.

§ 56. In pl. xi., we have a copy of what "appears to have formed part of a long inscription :"

CAESARES · L · SEPTI VG * * * SEPTIMIVS ORRVPTVM

^{*} See my notes on inscriptions found in Dumfriesshire.

Mr. Lee offers the following observations on it :---

"The inscription refers to some building which had gone to decay and had been restored by Severus and Geta his son. Instances will be found in Gruter (p. 172, No. 5), of a similar use of the word *corruptum*: in the present instance it takes the place in the sentence, which is usually occupied by the word *restiluerunt*, or some expression of a similar import.

From a comparison of the space which would have been occupied by the letters wanting to complete the imperial title, and also the name of Severus, thus,

IMPERATORES MIVS SEVERVS A

it appears probable that the name of Caracalla has not been mentioned, and that the title AVG refers to Severus only. If we suppose that the inscription began with the word *Imperatores* there can be little doubt about the matter, and it is rather singular that this supposition is borne out by an inscription recorded by Maundrell in his "Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem," in 1697, p. 47. It was found near Sidon and is as follows:—

> IMPERATORES CAESARES L SEPTIMVS SE VERVS PIVS PER TINAX AVG ARA BICVS ADIABENICVS PARTHICVS MAXI MVS TRIBVNICIA POTES VI IMP XI COS PRO COS·P·P· ET M AVREL ANTONI NVS AVG FILIVS EIVS

It will be observed that the commencement of the inscription in both cases is the same, Imperatores Cæsares; and also, that in the inscription in Palestine, the name of Caracalla, or Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, as he is usually named, stands alone, his brother's name being omitted, while in the present inscription found at Caerleon there is every probability that the name of Geta has stood alone, that of Caracalla his brother having been omitted.

It is well known that in many inscriptions the name of Geta has been designedly erased * * * [in this] there still remain decided traces of the ET and also of the letter P.

The unhappy disputes in the family of Severus are well known to every one; they continued for many years, and were a constant source of dis-

130

quietude to the emperor. We also learn from Herodian, iii., 48, that Severus, when he went northward in Britain took Caracalla with him, leaving Geta his younger son to regulate the affairs of the south of Britain, which was more settled, and for which duty he was better qualified than for the hardships of warfare in the north. While his father and brother were absent, and he had undisputed sway, may not Geta, under a feeling of irritation against his brother, have erected this inscription, leaving out Caracalla's name; in the same manner as his brother, in Palestine, had omitted that of Geta? This seems at least a probable supposition, in endeavouring to account for the omission; the subsequent erasure or attempt at erasure needs no explanation."

I cannot see any grounds for the opinion that in the inscription only Severus and Geta were named. We have examples of Severus, Caracalla, and Geta together and separately, and also of Severus and Caracalla and of Caracalla and Geta together, but there is no instance, so far as I am aware, of Severus and Geta, unless this be taken to be one. In my judgment the AVG of the second line belonged to Caracalla, *i. e.*, M·AVREL·ANTO-NINVS, as in the inscription cited by Mr. Lee, and the inscription when complete contained the names of the three, of which there are well known examples.

The word *corruptum* suggests the conjecture that the building, which was restored, may have been the amphitheatre, of which remains have been found here. Thus in Henzen, n. 6597 :---

IMP CAESARES M AVRELIVS ANTONINVS ET L AVRELIVS [COMMODVS] AVGG GERMANICI SARMATICI FORTISSIMI AMPHITHEATRVM VETVSTATE CORRVPTVM A SOLO REST TVERVNT, &c., &c.

§ 57. Pl. xv. is a copy of a stone "found in the ruins of the large building," which bears the following inscription :---

PRIMVSTES ERA

Mr. Lee observes : "It is in memory of the first *Tesserarius*, probably of the Augustan legion, though this is not expressly stated. The actual inscription is *Primus Tesera*, evidently an abbreviation for *Primus Tesserarius*."

MONMOUTHSHIRE.

There is no ground for the statement that "it is in memory" of the first Tesserarius: to me it seems much more probable that it marked his quarters. Under the emperors there was a *tesserarius* in each century, whose duty it was to communicate the watchword, inscribed on a square piece of wood called a *tessera*, to the men of his century. The *primus tesserarius* would be the *tesserarius* of the first century of the *triarii* of the first cohort.*

"BELLICIA FIDELISSIMA VIRGO IMPACE IIIIX CALENDAS BENTVRAS SEPTEMBRES QVE VIXIT ANNOS XVIII."

^{*} Since the preceding sheets were printed, I have had the opportunity of reading "Letters from Rome," by the Rev. J. W. Burgon, M. A., and now subjoin an inscription given by him, p. 195, as it supports my view that *Belicianus* and *Belicianus* were merely other forms of *Felicianus*.

[&]quot;Felicia, a most faithful maiden. In peace. 6th of the coming Kalends of September; who lived 18 years."

§ 58. In Horsley's *Britannia Romana*, Northumberland, ix. a, we find the following copy of an inscription on a stone found at *Benwell:---

VICTORIAE ·· GG AIFE NSSENECIO N COS FELIX ALAIASTOM PRA

Horsley reads it thus : Victoriæ Augustorum nostrorum fecit nepos Sosii Senecionis consulis Felix alæ primæ Astorum præfectus.

There can, I think, be no doubt that this reading should be at once rejected. It is plain that the names in the second and third lines after AVGG are \pm ALFENVS SENECIO; and the only real difficulty in the inscription is the initial letter or letters of the fourth line before COS. To me it seems most probable that we should read instead of N either VC or V alone. In a mural tablet found at Risingham, as given by Bruce, *Roman Wall*, p. 287, and Surridge, *Notices*, &c., Pl. iii., we find the words ALFENI SENECI[O]NIS VOCOS, which, with Henzen, n. 6701, I would read, as here, VC COS, *i. e., vir clarissimus consularis.*

Alfenus Senecio was *legatus Augustorum* in Britain under Severus and Caracalla, the two *Augusti* noticed in the Benwell inscription. He is mentioned also on two other stones found at Greta Bridge and Brough.

As the Risingham tablet gives the 3rd Consulship of Severus

^{*} The Condercum of the Notitia.

[†] Hübner, Rheinische Museum für Philologie, n. 1, 1856, has anticipated me.

and the 2nd of Caracalla as the date of its erection, it may be inferred that Senecio was in the island at some time between 205 and 207 A.D.

From an inscription found at Naples, and given by Gruter, p. 208, Orelli, n. 4405, and Mommsen, n. 2646, it also appears that he was Sub-Præfect of the fleet at Misenum.

Horsley offers a suggestion as to tracing ASTORVM to Asta in Liguria, not to the Astures, a people of Spain. There can be no reasonable doubt, however, that the latter are intended. In Bruce's Roman Wall, p. 110, we have an inscription on a stone found at the same place, Benwell, which is decisive on the point:—

> MATRIBVS CAMPEST ET GENIO ALAE PR HISPANO RVM ASTVRVM, &c.

As to the grammatical construction of the inscription, which forms the subject of this article, I supply *jussit* after COS, and *curavit* after PRAEF, *i. e.*, Senecio jussit, Felix curavit.

§ 59. Horsley's n. xviii. is an inscription on a fragment of a grave-stone found at *Halton Chesters :---

IS NORICIAN ESSORIVS·MAGNVS RATER EIVS DVPLALVE SABINIANAE

He expands it thus : "Norici annorum triginta Messorius Magnus frater ejus duplaris alæ Sabinianæ," and offers the following observations :—

"The cut of the letters is neither very good nor exact, nor are they very regular as to their magnitude or distances one from another, and the whole savours of the lower empire. The original of this inscription is now at *Connington*, and there are some defects in the copy which *Cambden* has given us: particularly the S in the beginning of the second line, and the imperfect letters at the top are wholly omitted by him.

^{*} The Hunnum of the Notitia.

Noricus is a Roman name, that occurs several times in *Gruter*. And the name Messorius is found also in an inscription at Risingham in this county. The V in ALVE is manifestly an A inverted by mistake. There appears but one I in Sabiniana connected with the last stroke of the N, which, however, must be sounded both before the N and after it, or else we must suppose the former I to be included in the preceding B, as before in the R.

The mark at the bottom looked like a part of a letter, as if this stone had been parted from another, upon which there was some inscription, though perhaps it may be only an accidental flaw. *Cambden* supposes that *Sabina*, *Hadrian's* wife, gave the name to this *ala*. But it seems more probable to me that it was taken from *Sabina*, the wife of the emperor *Gordian*, to whose time this inscription much better agrees."

I have but little doubt that IS are the last two letters of CIVIS, and that NORICI is the ethnic adjective. Neither Camden's nor Horsley's derivation of the name *Sabiniana* seems to me probable. I would trace it, like other similar designations of *alæ*, to *Sabinus*, who raised or organised the corps.

§ 60. Horsley, Britannia Romana, p. 21.5, notices "another inscription in Cambden referred to Halton Chesters," and gives the following expansion and explanation of it :---

" M•MARI	Marcus Mari	
VS VELLI	us Vellia [tribu]	
A LONG	Longus	
$VS \cdot AQVI$	eques	
S HANC	hanc [aram]	
POSVIT	posuit	
$V \cdot S \cdot L \cdot M$	votum solvit libens merito	

"I take it for granted that AQVIS here is used for EQVES, so EQVIS for EQVES we meet with in other instances: and perhaps A for the E has been an error of the transcriber. This horseman might also belong to the *ala Sabiniana*." AQVIS, in my judgment, is the ablative of AQVAE, the name of the birthplace of *M. Marius Longus*; and (although it would be agreeable to refer it to the English AQVAE, *scil.*, Bath or Wells), I am inclined to think that it stands for some continental springs, perhaps Aix, which was known as *Aquæ Sextiæ*. See *Marini*, *Atti*, p. 434, and Steiner, *Cod. In. Rom. Rhen.*, n. 398.

§ 61. Horsley's n. lii. is an inscription on a tablet found at *Little Chesters. The inscription is imperfect, but the following portions were legible :—

He expands it thus :Gallorum.....vota numini ejus principis optimi turribus.....fundamenta posuerunt sub Claudio Xenephonte legato Augustali proprætore curante.....

VOTA are plainly the last two syllables of *devota*, and POP, in my judgment, should have been read POR, *i. e., portæ turribus*, "for the towers of the gate." *Devota* would agree with cohors before *Gallorum*, but it is strange that we have the verb in the plural—*posuerunt*.

§ 62. Some inscriptions have been found in this county which seem to warrant the belief that amongst the Roman auxiliaries in Britain were cohortes Brittonum. See Horsley, Northumberland, nn. lxxii., lxxvi., and compare Scotland, n. xx., Bruce's Roman Wall, pp. 121, 317, and Camden, ed. Gough, iii., p. 236. There can be little doubt that some of the natives of the island served in it as auxiliaries of the Romans. A passage in the Agricola of Tacitus, c. 18, favours this view : lectissimi auxiliarium quibus nota vada et patrius nandi usus; and it is probably to such that the terms commilitonum barbarcrum in the inscription found at Carlisle, p. 30, refer. Nor is it improbable that the cohors prima Cornaviorum, mentioned in the Notitia as stationed ponte Æli, was composed of Cornavii, the Kopvaúioi or Kopváßioi of Ptolemy, in whose territory Deva (Chester) and Viroconium (Wroxeter) were situated. This supposition seems to me much more probable than that they were either the Cornavii of Scotland or the Cornubii

^{*} Otherwise Chesterholm, the Vindolana of the Notitia.

Damnonici. See Böcking, p. 902. But whilst I admit that there is sufficient evidence to prove that some of the auxiliary bodies that served in the island were composed of natives of Britain, I am not satisfied that the cohortes or numeri Brittonum, that served either there or on the continent, were of this character. On the contrary, there is reason to believe that Britannica was the proper term for a British corps, whether ala or cohors, and that Brittones denoted a continental people. Thus in a diploma of Domitian's, Henzen, n. 5430, we find \overline{I} BRITAN-NICA MILLIARIA immediately followed by \overline{I} BRITTONVM MILLIARIA, from which Henzen, with justice as appears to me, draws the inference—"Britannos et Brittones diversos esse, hinc apparet."

§ 63. Horsley's n. lxxxvi. is an imperfect inscription on an altar :---

MILC PRAEEST·M PEREGRINIV SVPER·TRIB

He expands it thus: "militum cui pracest Marcus Peregrinius Superstes tribunus." I prefer, instead of *militum*, *miliaria*; and instead of *Superstes*, *Super*. We find this name in Orelli, nn. 455 and 3555. See *Mus. Veron.*, p. exxiii. There is a similar mistake in the expansion of MIL· in Horsley's nn. xxxvi. and xli. Dr. Bruce, *Roman Wall*, 2nd edit., p. 50, gives the second inscription and corrects the error.

§ 64. Horsley's n. xcv. is an inscription on an altar found at *Riechester :---

D R S DVPL·N·EXPLOR BREMENARAM INSTITVERVNT N·EIVS C·CAEP CHARITINO TRIB V S L M

^{*}Otherwise High-Rochester, the Bremenium of Ptolemy and Antoninus. I regard the agreement of the distance between this place and Corbridge or Colcester, with that stated

His expansion and observations are :---

Dez Romæ sacrum duplares numeri exploratorum Bremenii aram instituerunt numini ejus Caio Cæpione Charitino tribuno votum solverunt libentes merito.

"The reading I have given of the body of the inscription is the same with Cambden's, which I take to be right, but nobody (that I know of) has given a satisfactory explication of the DRS at the top: I think it plain that they are to be read deæ Romæ sacrum. That they made a goddess of Rome, and erected altars and temples to her, needs no proof to those who have any acquaintance with medals, and other Roman antiquities.

There is a curious altar at Elenborcugh, erected GENIO LOCI FOR-TVNAE REDVCI ROMAE AETERNAE, &c. I once thought of diis Romanis sacrum, but this suits not with numini ejus in the body of the inscription; for which reason the learned Dr. Gale's reading, deabus Rumabus sacrum, cannot be admitted. The altar then is sacred to the goddess Rome, erected by the duplares of a detachment of exploratores or scouts at Bremenium, under the command of Caius Capio Charitinus the tribune. Capio is a consular name, and we read in the Notilia of a prafectus numeri exploratorum Lavatris. Whether they were the same with these, I will not undertake to determine. The duplares were soldiers who had a double allowance of corn, of which a part of the Roman soldier's pay consisted. The exploratores were like our scouts, sent to discover the enemy or their country."

The difficulties in the inscription are in D R and N·EIVS. Muratori explained D.R. as *Dianæ Reginæ*, and Orelli doubts between *Deæ Romæ*, *Deæ respicienti*, *scil.*, *Fortunæ*, and *Deæ Reginæ*, citing in favour of the last, Muratori, 112, 9. I am inclined to suggest *Dianæ Reduci*, as more appropriate to the circumstances. Hagenbuch, Orelli, n. 206, explains N·EIVS as standing for nomine ejus, scil., numeri, i. e., the duplares erected the altar, in the name of the numerus, acting for the numerus. This I much prefer to numini. In n. 2166, Inscriptions de l' Algerie, N is used in the same sense. Dr. Bruce, Roman Wall, 2nd edit., p. 457, gives an inscription on another altar found in, I believe, 1852, at the same place :

in the Itinerary to have been between *Bremenium* and *Corstopitum*, as a more satisfactory proof of its identity with *Bremenium* than the fact that two altars have been found there with the letters BREMEN and BREM inscribed on them. The legitimate inference from such a record of the place in connection with a corps seems to be that the fixed quarters of that corps were in the place thus named, and not that the place in which the record was found was their quarters, for it is possible and even probable that such a record may have been given with the object of marking distance from the usual station.

G D N ET SIGNORVM COHIVARDVL ET N EXPLORA TOR BREMCOR EGNATLVCILI ANVSLEGAVGPRPR CVRANTECASSIO SABINIANOTRIB

He expands it thus :

"G[ENIO] D[OMINI] N[OSTRI] ET To the genius of our SIGNORVM Emperor and of the standards CO[HORTIS] PRIMAE VARDVL[ORVM] of the first

[cohort of the Varduli ET N[VMERI] EXPLORA- and of the Detachment of pio-TOR[VM] BREM[ENII] COR[NELIVS] neers of Bremen-[ium, Cornelius]

 EGNAT[IVS] LVCILI Egnatius Lucili

 ANVS LEG[ATVS] AVG[VSTALIS] PR[O]PR[AETOR]
 anus, the imperial legate, proprætor,

 CVRANTE CASSIO
 under the superintendence of Cassius

 SABINIANO TRIB[VNO]
 Sabinianus the Tribune

 aram posuit
 erected this altar."

The only doubtful points in this expansion are in line five. I am inclined to think that we should read *Bremeniensium*, instead of * *Bremenii*, both here and in Horsley's reading of the preceding inscription; whilst my objection to *Cornelius* is that it is never used as a *prænomen*. It may be that *Lucilianus* had two *nomina gentilitia*, as we find in examples cited by Fabretti, p. 203, but we should then, I think, have had his *prænomen*.

There are two other readings of $COR \cdot$ which have occurred to me—GOR, standing for +Gordianorum, or $COR \cdot$, the first syllable of *Corstopitum*. The latter of these I would regard as denoting that the two.bodies occupied *Bremenium* and *Corstopitum*, or had charge of the road between those places. In the *Itinerary* of *Antoninus*, *Corstopitum* is given, in his first route from the wall, as the next place to *Bremenium*, and set

[•] If Bremenii be adopted, I would translate, not "of Bremenium," but "at Bremenium." † See p. 83.

down as $M \cdot P \cdot XX$. distant from it. This distance nearly agrees with the distance of *Corbridge* from *Riechester*.

65. Horsley, n. xcvi., is an inscription on an altar also found at Riechester :—

SILVANO PANTHEO PRO·SAL RVFIN·TRIB·ET LVCILLAE·EIVS EVTYCHVS LIB·COS V·S·L·M·

Horsley expands it thus: "Silvano Pantheo pro salute Rufini tribuni et Lucillæ ejus Eutychus libertus consulis votum solvit libens merito," and supplies *uxoris* after *ejus*, in the fifth line. The only doubt, which I have as to the accuracy of this expansion, relates to LIB·COS. If Eutychus had been a freedman of the Consul, as Horsley believed, the order, according to usage, would have been COS·LIB; and instead of the office, *consul*, the name of the individual would have been given, for consuls, as such, had no *liberti*. I regard LIB· as standing for *Librarius*, and COS· for *consulis*. The *librarius* was a book-keeper, who had charge of the accounts, and is mentioned in many inscriptions, in connection with the officer or body in whose service he was, *e. gr.*, LIB·PRAEF·*Librarius Prafecti*, LIB·CH., *Librarius cohortis*.

§ 66. Horsley's n. xeviii. is an inscription on a stone found at Elsdon :---

B*NOGENERIS HVMAN·IMPE RANTE·C..... AVG·PR·PR·POSVIT AC·DEDICAVIT C·A·ACIL

He expands it thus: "Bono generis humani imperante Calpurnio Agricola legato Augustali proprætore posuit ac dedicavit Caius Aulus Acilius;" and offers the following remarks on it:

"The first words in the fifth line are undoubtedly Augustali propratore, which makes it certain that *legato*, and the name of the lieutenant, have gone before, according to the usual form. If we suppose Calpurnius Agricola to be the name that has been designedly erased, I believe that as the letters will exactly fill up the empty space, so that supply will suit very well both with what goes before and what follows. The inscription then, I believe, has been thus:—

BONO GENERIS HVMAN IMPE RANTE CALPVR NIO AGRICOLA AVG PR PR POSVIT-AC DEDICAVIT C·A·ACILIVS......

This will make all easy and plain; and there is nothing in the cut of the letters, which is partly good both in this and the next, or any other circumstances of the inscription, but what suits well enough with the time of this legate. And *imperante Calpurnio Agricola*, I take to be the same with sub *Calpurnio Agricola* or perhaps *jussu Calpurnii Agricola*, which so frequently occurs in such sort of inscriptions. Mr. *Gordon* reads it *bono genio humano imperanti*; but this is contrary to the plain letters upon the stone. There is some difficulty in forming a notion of the meaning of an altar erected *bono generis humani*; but this may seem as intelligible as an altar erected *bono fato, bono eventui, &c.,* and perhaps has much the same meaning. There are coins with Salus generis humani upon them."

The phrases *bono reipublicæ* or *generis humani natus* were no uncommon compliments of the emperor.

Thus we have in Renier, Inscriptions de l'Algerie, n. 109 :---

BONO GENERIS HVMANI PROGE NITO D·N·FLAV IO CONSTAN TIO NOB AC FLORENTIS SIMO CAES &c.

Horsley, Northumberland, lix., has-

BON REI PVBLIC NATO

It seems probable that the same is on the stone found at Wroxeter, said to bear the words BONA REIPVBLICÆ NATVS. See Journal of British Archaeological Association, 1859, p. 313.

The order here seems to have been *nato bono generis humani*, and this was preceded by the name of the emperor, with which *imperante* agrees forming an ablative absolute. The name of the LEG·AVG·PR·PR· in the third and fourth lines was in the nominative case being the subject of *dedicavit*. C. A. in the last line stand for *C[VRAM] A[GENTE] or C[VRANTE] A[VLO], and ACIL are the first two syllables of ACILIO, which was followed by the cognomen now obliterated.

§ 67. In the year 1726 an altar was found at *Corbridge which bore the following inscription, as given in the Appendix to Gordon's *Iter Septentrionale*, and in Horsley's *Britannia Romana*, Northumberland, n. cviii. :---

> LEG·A..... Q·CALPVRNIVS CONCESSINI VS·PRAF·EQ CAESA·CORI ONOTOTAR VM·MANV PR AESENTISSIMI NVMINIS DEI VS.

The chief difficulty in the inscription is in the words CAESA. CORIONOTOTARVM. The author of the letter in Gordon's

^{*} See Henzen, n. 6737.

[†] This, or rather Colcester in its neighbourhood, seems to have been the Corstopitum of Antoninus.

Appendix thinks that we have here a new body of horse, called equites Cæsarienses (or Casariani) Corionototæ. The latter designation he supposes to be "a corruption of the Roman name of a people in these parts, perhaps Curia or Coria Otadenorum, and that Corbridge was the place." Horsley rejects the explanation, and proposes three other names, of which the word in the text may have been a corruption : Coritani, a people of one of the Provinciæ Cæsarienses; Coriotiotar in the anonymous Ravennas; and Crotoniata, which last he seems to have preferred. As to the explanation of the rest of the inscription, he adopts the view, that præsentissimum numen Dei signifies the emperor, and that manu intimates that Q. Calpurnius was advanced to his post, by the immediate hand of the emperor, supposed to be Commodus or Caracalla.

The first doubt which presents itself as to the correctness of this interpretation, arises from the terms equites Cæsarienses. So far as I am aware (and I have made a careful search on the subject), there is no example of any equites having been denominated Cæsarienses. As to the reference, which is made in Gordon's Appendix to Gruter, p. 445, it proves nothing to the point, for in that inscription there is no mention of equites. Nor is the well known form equites singulares applicable here.

Another doubt is suggested by the meaning given to manu præsentissimi numinis dei, as here, too, I have been unable to find any authority for the interpretation, "the immediate hand of the emperor."

Under such circumstances I am inclined to regard Casa as the participle of cado, and agreeing with manu, which I interpret as band or body. Of the suggestions relative to Corionototarum I prefer that which considers it a corruption of Coriotiotar. As to præsentissimi numinis dei, I understand the phrase as referring to the god to whom the altar was dedicated, and whose name, along with that of the legate, doubtless appeared on that part of the stone which has been broken off. In construction, numinis is governed by cultor understood : an ellipsis, which is confirmed by an inscription found in Portugal, and given by Gruter and Orelli :—

DEO ENDOVELICO PRAESTANTISS IMI ET PRAESEN TISSIMI NVMINIS SEXTVS COCCEIVS CRATERVS HONOR INVS EQVES ROMA NVS EX VOTO.

De Wal also gives this inscription in his Mythologiæ Septentrionalis Monumenta (p. 73), and in his interpretation correctly supplies cultor after numinis.

I read the inscription thus : Legato Augusti Proprætore, Q. Calpurnius Concessinius, Præfectus Equitum, cæsâ Corionototarum manu, præsentissimi numinis dei [cultor] votum solvit.

According to this view, the circumstances under which the altar was erected were these :—Calpurnius Concessinius before going into action with a band of Coriotiotares vowed to some god, that, if successful, he would erect an altar to him. Having cut them to pieces he performed his vow in grateful acknowledgment of the aid of that deity, who had manifested on this occasion his characteristic of giving most timely and effectual assistance. The only objection which I see to the interpretation which I propose arises from the use of *præfectus equitum*, without giving the designation of those *cquites*; but we are not without example of this omission.

If my interpretation be correct this stone possesses unique interest, as the inscription is, so far as I am aware, the only one extant which records an engagement between the Romans and the Britons.

§ 68. Dr. Bruce, *Roman Wall*, p. 290, 2nd ed., figures a lettered stone found at Tynemouth. The following parts of the inscription are distinctly legible :---

>PVMCVMBAS ET TEMPLVM FECIT CIV MAXIMINVS LEG VI VI EX VOTO.

Dr. Bruce's remarks are :---

"About the reading of the first line of this inscription there is some doubt. That active antiquary, Pegge, read it CIPPVM CVM BAS[1], 'a column with a base,' and conceived that an upper line, which has now almost entirely disappeared, contained the name of a deity, probably Mars; Brand read GYRVM CVMBAS, and translated it 'a circular harbour for the shipping.' He conceived that there was a reference here to the adjoining bay, called Prior's Haven, which he says 'has every appearance of having been one of the artificial harbours of that people.'

No Roman hand, however, made that harbour; it is manifestly natural; CYMBAS he conceived to be an equivalent for *cymbas*, boats. But there is no doubt about the other lines, which import that—

> Caius Julius Maximinus, of the Sixth Legion Victorious, in the performance of a vow, erected *this* temple.

The mere circumstance of its selection as the site of a temple proves this to have been a place of some importance in the Roman age.

The name of the builder of the temple fixes, with a near approach to precision, the date of its dedication. Caius Julius Verus Maximinus was a Thracian shepherd of great personal strength; he attracted, at an early period of his life, the notice of Septimus Severus, and, under Caracalla, attained to the rank of centurion. On the assassination of Alexander Severus, in 235, he assumed the purple, and was himself assassinated in 238. He probably accompanied Septimus Severus into Britain, and on this occasion erected the temple commemorated by the inscription."

Mr. Wright, Celt, Roman, and Saxon, p. 175 (p. 177, 2nd ed.), strangely regards this inscription as indicating that "some other buildings (the name is partly obliterated) with a basilica [!] and temple, were built on the site of the modern Tynemouth." As to the true reading he observes that after examination of the stone, he agrees with Mr. Roach Smith that "it seems to be CVPVM (for *cippum*) CVM BASI ET, &c."

The reading *cum basi* is plainly to be preferred, but *cippum* seems to me very improbable. I am inclined to suggest . SCYPVM, *i.e.*, SCYPHVM CVM BAS, as we find in Orelli, n. 2504, CANTHARVM CVM VASE SVA. In nn. 1279, 6140, we have examples of *scyphi* as offerings. In *Monum. Hist. Brit.*, the first two letters are read CV, from which a conjecture may be drawn that the letters before CVM BAS may have been CVRIVM,

the last three syllables of MERCVRIVM, the first being in the upper line, which has been obliterated. This may be supported by reference to HERCVLEM PVERINVM CVM BASI DEA-NAE D. D in Marini, Iscriz, Alb. p. 49. It was not unusual to present as an offering to a god the image of another deity. See The reading GYRVM suggested to me Morcelli, i., p. 44. TYRVM, the last two syllables of SATYRVM, and this may be supported by Orelli, n. 1482. In inscriptions we find not only basis but hupobasis: the only example of this found in Britain is, I believe, the altar, figured in Bruce's Roman Wall, p. 385. \mathbf{It} is now preserved in the Museum of the Society of Antiquaries, Newcastle. The meaning of the double inscription in this case is that Longinus gave the altar not merely cum basi sua, but also cum hypobasi.

§ 69. Of the relics found at Risingham (the ancient name of which is supposed to have been **Habitancum*), one of the most interesting is an ornamental slab, six feet in length, bearing

P. S .- The following is the inscription, to which I have referred in the foregoing note :-

^{*} This supposition originated with Camden, who formed it on the authority of an altar which was found there, with HABITANCI on it. His conjecture derives support from Mr. Ward's reading of the words that follow HABITANCI, as PRIMA STA[TIONE], which accord with the position of Risingham, north of the wall on Watling Street. It must be borne in mind, however, that there is no notice in any ancient author of any place in Britain called Habitancum. Mr McLauchlan, in his very carefully prepared "Memoir of a Survey of the Watling Street," p. 37, is mistaken in calling "the Risingham Station," "the Habitancum of the Itineraries." No such name of a place is found in any Itinerary. But Horsley, Britannia Romana, p. 354, remarks: - "It may sometimes so happen, that the name of a place may be in an inscription which we meet with no where else. And of this there is in fact an instance or two in Britain; namely, Bracchium at Brugh, in Richmondshire, and Habitancum, at Risingham, in Northumberland. To these perhaps may be added Apiatorium, in the inscription now in the library at Durham, which is probably Newcastle, if the altar was found there, and also Alaterva for Cramond in Scotland." The examples, cited by Horsley, prove the danger of depending on such authority for names otherwise unknown. Bracchio, which occurs in the inscription given by Horsley, p. 313, is plainly not the name of a place, but the designation of " a line of communication," as Mr. Gale correctly explained it. See Camden, ed. Gough, iii., p. 331, and add to the references given there, Livy, iv., 9; xxii ,52; and xxxviii., 5. Apiatorio, in n-Ixxvii., Northumberland, is also not the name of a place, but of a person, for it should be read A.PLATORIO; and the individual named in it is Aulus Platorius Nepos, who was legate under Hadrian. ALATERVIS, in n. xxix, Scolland, is an epithet of the Dea Matres, and seems to me derived from abroad, probably from the neighbourhood of the Meuse or the Rhine, for the altar was erected by a Tungrian cohort. Possibly there was some connection between them and the goddess Alateivia, worshipped amongst the Gugerni. See Henzen, n. 5865. It is scarcely necessary to add, that there is no ground for the conjecture of Sir J-Clarke, Stuart's Caledonia Romana, p. 171, "that Ptolemy probably made a mistake, when translating Alatervum or Alaterva castra into Greek, and that the latter is the true reading of his πτερωτόν στρατόπεδον."

an inscription which it is more than usually difficult to decipher in consequence of the great number of ligulate letters, and the injuries which the stone has sustained. It is figured in Dr. Bruce's Roman Wall, p. 287, and in Dr. Surridge's Notices of Roman Inscriptions in Northumberland, pl. iii.; but the first of these is indistinct from the smallness of the scale : and the second is disfigured by the introduction of absurd conjectures.* The following is the reading given in the Monumenta Historica, p. exvi., 192 a; and adopted by Henzen, n. 6701 :-

* * * ICOMAXI COSIII ET M AVREL ANTONINO PIO COS II AVG * * * PORTAM·CVM·MVRIS VETVSTATE DI LAPSIS IVSSV ALFEN SENECINIS VO COS CVRANTE COL ANITI ADVENTO PRO AVGG NN C*I VANGON OPFS CVM AEMI SALVIAN TRIB SVO A SOLO RESTI.

At first sight it is plain, that the emperors named in this inscription are Severus and Caracalla, and that the defect in the

MOGONT CAD
ET·N·D·N AVG
M ·G ·SECVNDINVS
BF·COS·HABITA
NCI PRIMA STA
PRO SEETSVIS POS

Horsley expands it thus :---

"Deco Mogonti Cadenorum et Numini Domini nostri Augusti Marcus Gaius Secundinus beneficiarius consulis Habitanci prima statione pro se et suis posuit' Camden had read PRIMASTA as primas tam, which Horsley justly rejects on the ground of Latinity. De Wal, p. 125, gives the strange expansion—primas tabulariorum, taking primas in the same sense in which Orelli regarded it, viz., princeps, I have no suggestion to propose with which I am entirely satisfied, but in preference to any of those which have yet been offered, I would read HABITANCI-PRIM:ASTAT, i.e., HABITANCI-PRIM[I]{H|ASTATI: Thus the meaning is that Secundinus was of the century of Habitarcus the primus hastatus. It is scarcely necessary to add, that there are examples of the omission of the centurial mark before the name of the centurion and also of astatus for hastatus.

Before leaving this subject I must state my inability to explain the omission of this important station, in the Itine wry of Antoninus. Horsley, p. 397, considers this question but offers nothing satisfactory.

* From Mr. Smith's Collectanca Antiqua, vol. iii., p. 4, I learn that "an engraving of this slab illustrates a paper by Mr. Thomas Hodgson, in the Archaeologia Æliana, vol. iv." I regret that I have not seen it, as I have been unable to procure the work.

line, after COS II AVG, was caused by the intentional obliteration of the name Geta-an erasure common in similar memorials of the period. Accordingly, Henzen restores the commencement with the formula : Impp. Caess. L. Sept. Severo pio Pertinaci Aug. Arabico Adiabenico ParthICO MAXImo p. m. tr. pot. . . . and supplies the defect in the third line with et P. Sept. Geta nob. Caes. As there is no room in the first line for any addition after MAXI, Henzen's suggestions "mo p. m. . . ." must be rejected ; but his reading in the fifth tr. pot. line, VC. for VO, should, in my judgment, be adopted. See For COL in the sixth line, he proposes CL. . i. e., p. 133. Claudio ; and () P F S he regards as initials of the cognomina of the cohort, scil., O (for 8 or 2) miliaria; P, Pia; F, Fidelis; and S, Severiana; but he admits that there is no authority in inscriptions for any cognomen of this corps.

In the Monumenta Historica Britannica, the commencement is restored by the words: Impp. Cass. L. Sever. Pio Pert. P. M. Arab. Parth. Adiaben 1CO,* and the defect in the third line is supplied by Et P. Sept. Geta nob. Cas Cos.+ In the Index Rerum et Nominum, p. cxlvi., viri consularis seems to be suggested as the explanation of VOCOS, and C. Antistio Advento as another reading of COLANITI ADVENTO.

From what has been stated, it is evident that the parts of the inscription as yet not satisfactorily explained, are the names COL ANITI, and the letters O P F S. It appears to me that the difficulties as to the first of these have arisen from mistaking O for C, and *vice versa*, *i. c.*, reading COL for OCL; and from inverting the order of the first three letters in the ligulate group

 $\mathbf{148}$

^{*} Mr. Newton, *Monuon. Hist. Brit.*, p. cxvi., doubtless had authority for the collocation which he suggests of the titles of Severus; but I am not aware of any example of them in that order. They are usually placed as Henzen gives them in his restoration.

[†] The addition of COS seems to be justified by the fact, that in the year A D. 205, Caracalla was Consul for the second time, and Geta for the first. In Dr. Bruce's copy of the inscription, we have, in the third line, COS I for the first. In Dr. Bruce's copy of the mistake. If not we should omit COS from Geta's titles, as the inscription would then be of A. D. 202-204. The addition of I after COS, instead of COS alone which is the recognized form for a first consulship, suggests the conjecture, that this style may have been derived by Caracalla from his father, whose coins of his first consulship present the strange peculiarity of I after COS. Perhaps there was some reference to this in the phrase ter et semel cos by which the year 202 was marked. But I must add, that I have never seen an exampler in the case of Caracalla, of I after COS on either coins or stones.

 \mathbf{N} , *i. e.*, reading NIT for TIN; for I have no doubt that the individual here named is the same *Adventus* who, some years afterwards, in A. D. 218, was Consul with the emperor Macrinus. His nomen gentilitium is variously given as *Coclatinus*, *Oclatinus*, and *Oclatinius*. He is named in the following inscriptions:

VICTORIAE·REDVCIS·DD·NN * * * * * * * PII·FELICIS·AVG·ET* * LIAE * * * * * IVGI·D·N·MILITES·LEG·II PARTH· * * * * AET · Q · M · COCLATINO AD VENTO·COS· &c. &c.

(Fabretti, p. 339, and Relandi Fast. Consul. p. 137.)

DEDIC·PR·ID·MART. IMP * AUG·COS ET OCLATINO ADVENTO

(Masson, Hist. Crit. 6, p. 215, and Orelli, n, 945.)

DIANA CARICIANA M AVRELIVS CARICVS AQVARIVS HVIVS LOC CVM LIBERTIS ET ALVM NIS M·D * * * D·AUG·ET DEDIC·IDIB·AVG· OCLATINO·ADVENTO·COS·

(Muratori, Nov. Thesaur, p. 354, n. 1; Henzen, n. 6058, and Marini, Atti di Frat. Arvali, pp. 6 48-9.)

Muratori, in a note on the last inscription, enquires whether the name should be read COCLATINVS or OCLATINVS, and decides in favour of the latter; but from the second inscription, compared with that on the Risingham tablet, I am inclined to prefer OCLATINIVS. For other notices of this individual,

compare Herodian, Ilist. iv. 12 and 14; and Dio Cassius, Hist., lxxviii., 14,* who was probably personally acquainted with him, as they were at the same time members of the senate. Oclatinius Adventus was one of the most remarkable men of his time. He entered the army as a common soldier, serving amongst the Speculatores and Exploratores, who were held in very low estimation, especially as they had occasionally to discharge the duty of executioners. Then he became successively a tabularius and cubicularius, from which he was raised to the office of procurator. Subsequently to his serving in England, he accompanied Caracalla in his Parthian expedition as colleague of Macrinus, the prafectus prætorio, and was, I suspect, privy to the murder of the emperor. After that, he was despatched by Macrinus to Rome, ad funus Caracalli ducendum as Reimar states in his note, but in reality to get rid of his pretensions as a rival aspirant to the imperial throne, for Adventus did not scruple to tell the soldiers, after the death of Caracalla, that the sovereignty properly devolved on him as the senior of Macrinus, but that in consideration of his advanced age he would give place to his junior. After his return to Rome he was in great favor with Macrinus, who elevated him to the rank of Schator, and to the office of Prefectus Urbi, a remarkable elevation, not only with a view to his antecedents, but also because at the time he was not of consular rank. Then he became consul with Macrinus, and, after the death of that emperor in June, 208, finished his year as colleague of Elagabalus.

Dio Cassius speaks of him very contemptuously, and derides his want of qualifications for the high positions to which he had attained, but his career proves that he must have been a man of very uncommon ability.

This inscription confirms the accuracy of the historian as to his having held the office of *procurator*, and disproves the conjecture of Reimar, that he had been *procurator rei privatæ*. I have already mentioned Henzen's conjecture as to O P F S; it is very ingenious, but must, I think, be rejected on the ground, that there is no authority for the application of any one of the

^{*} Ed. Reimar, Hamburgh, 1752, p. 1322.

designations, miliaria, pia, fidelis, or Severiana to the first cohort of the Vangiones. I interpret the letters O P F S as the abbreviation of operibus perfectis, or factis,*—*i. e.*, having executed or completed the works. We have a similar form of expression in Gruter. cxc. n. 4; OPERIBVS AMPLIATIS RESTITVIT; and also in Morcelli, ii., pp. 129 and 134. I am inclined to venture on the following restoration:

IMPP.CAESS L·SEPT·SEVERO·PIO PERTINACI AVG·ARABICO ADIABENICO PARTHICO MAXI COS III ET M·AVREL·ANTONINO PIO COS II AVG·ET P·SEPT·GETAE N·CAES COS· PORTAM CUM MVRIS VETVSTATE DI LAPSIS IVSSV ALFEN SENECINIS V·C· COS CVRANTE OCLATINI ADVENTO PRO AVGG NN COH I VANGON OPFS CVM AEMI SALVIAN TRIB SVO A SOLO RESTI

Imp[eratoribus] Cæs[aribus] L[ucio] Sept[imio] Severo Pio Pertinaci Aug[usto] Arabico Adiabenico Parthico Maxi[mo] Consuli tertium et M[arco] Aurel[io] Antonino Pio Consuli secundum Aug[ust]o et P[ublio] Sept[imio] Getæ N[obilissimo] Cæ[sari] consulit portam cum muris vetustate di lapsis jussu Alfen[i] Seneci[o]nis V[iri] C[larissimi] Consularis curante Oclatini[o] Advento pro[curatore] Aug[ustorum] n[ostrorum] coh[ors] prima Vang[i]on[um] o[peribus] p[er] f[ecti]s cum Æmi[lio] Salvian[o] trib[uno]‡ suo a solo restituit.

^{*} It is scarcely necessary to add that there are examples of 0 and 0P for opus, and of P F and P for perfect and fect respectively.

⁺ Henzen, *Index*, p. 72, gives "A.D. 202, seqq.," as the date of this inscription; but this is impossible, according to his reading, for Caracalla was not COS II until 205. The latter year I regard as the date, although COS III of Severus and COS II of Caracalla extended over

P.S.—Since the foregoing article was published, I have had access to the *Archaeologia Ælinna*, and have read the paper by Mr. Hodgson, to which reference is made in my note in page 147. In that paper, after a critical examination in detail of each phrase or passage of the inscription, Mr. H. proposes the following reading of it :--

"IMPP·CAESS. L.SEP.SEVERO PIO PERT.P.M. ARAB.PARTH.ADIABENICO MAXI. COS.III.ET M.AVREL.ANTONINO PIO COS.II.AVG.ET.P.SEPT. GETAE.NOB.CAES.COS. PORTAM CVM MVRIS VETVSTATE DI-LAPSIS JVSSV ALFEN.SENECINIS VO COS.CVRANTE COL.ANITI.ADVENTO AVG.NN.COH.I.VANGION. CVM AEMI.SALVIAN.TRIB. SVO A SOLO RESTI.

Which may thus be explained at length :---

Imperatoribus Cæsaribus Lucio Septimio Severo Pio Pertinaci, Pontifici Maximo, Arabico, Parthico, Adiabenico Maximo, Consuli tertium, et Marco Aurelio Antonino Pio, Consuli secundo, Augustis, et Publio Septimio Getæ, nobilissimo Cæsari, consuli, Portam cum Muris Vetustate dilapsis, Jussu Alfeni Senecinis (Senecionis?) Viri Consularis, curante Antistio (or Anitistio) Advento, pro Augustis Nostris, Cohors prima Vangionum ----Cum Æmilio Salviano, Tribuno Suo, a Solo restituit."

On comparison with the reading which I proposed in p.

^{205-207.} But if the year had been 206 or 207, we should have had, I think, the tribunitian number (TRHE POT) of either Severus (scil., siii, or $x \cdot$) or Caracalla (scil., viii), or s of both. I am not satisfied, however, as to the accuracy of the copies which I have seen, and would suggest a careful re-examination of the stone.

Lucius Æmilius Salvianus was already known as tribune of the 1st Cohort of the Vangiones from an altar found at Risingham, the inscription on which is given by Horsley, Northumberland, n. lxxxi.

151, it will be observed that there are several points of difference; but on re-consideration of the subject, I see no reason for changing the opinions which I have expressed in the article and embodied in the restoration. The only question, about which some doubt is suggested, relates to the date. The notice in the inscription of Caracalla as Cos. II. of course fixes the date within the cancelli-205, the year of his second consulship, and 208, the year of his third consulship. Mr. Hodgson argues for 207, assuming that the emperors were at the time in Britain, and adopting Horsley's opinion that "Severus came into the island in the year 207 at latest." He finds confirmation of his assumption as to the presence of the emperors, in the title of Senecio being in this inscription vir consularis, instead of legalus eorum pr. pr., as it appears on a stone found at Greta bridge.

Although the conjecture, that the change of title indicates "the exercise in person [by the emperors] of both the military and civil powers of the government, rendering the office of legate no longer necessary," seems plausible, yet there can, I think, be no doubt that both Mr. Horsley and Mr. Hodgson are in error in fixing 207 as the year of the arrival of the emperors in Britain. The statement of Xiphiline, that Severus died in the island "three years after he undertook the British expedition," suggests 208 as the date of his arrival, for he died in 211 (on February the 4th; not the 12th, as given by Mr. Hodgson in a note); and this date (208) is confirmed by reference to coins, *e. gr.*, one of Caracalla's bearing the legend :

PROF.AVGG.PONTIF.TR.P.XI COS.III.

from which it appears that the profectio Augustorum took place in the eleventh TRIB. POT. and third COS. of Caracalla, *i. e.*, 208. I am still of opinion, for the reason stated in the note, p-152, that 205 is the most probable date of the inscription, although it is possible that the intention of those who set up the stone may have been to indicate that the work was commenced, carried on, and completed during the time in which Severus was COS.III. Caracalla COS.II., and Geta COS., *i. e.*, 205-207.

§ 70. In the Archaeologia Æliana, new series, i., p. 261, a slab is figured, which bears the following inscription :--

DIISDEABVSQVESE CVNDVMINTERPRE TATIONEMORACV LICLARIAPOLLINIS COH·I·TVNGRORVM

Dr. Bruce reads and translates it thus :---

"DIIS DEABVSQVE SE-CVNDVM INTERPRE-TATIONEM ORACV-LI CLARI APOLLINIS COH[ORS] PRIMA TVNGRORVM.

"The first cohort of the Tungrians (dedicated this structure) to the gods and the goddesses, according to the direction of the oracle of the illustrious Apollo."

I have no doubt that I in CLARI stands, as is common, for II; and that CLARII is the well-known epithet which Apollo derived from *Clarus* (near Colophon, in Ionia), where he had a celebrated temple and oracle. It is scarcely necessary to cite illustrations from ancient authors. Amongst the most obvious are Virgil, *Æn.* iii., 360, "Qui tripodas, *Clarii* lauros, qui sidera sentis;" and Tacitus *Ann.* ii., 54, "Relegit Asiam appellitque Colophona, ut *Clarii Apollinis oraculo* uteretur."

§ 71. In the same work, p. 226, we find the following inscription on another slab :—

IMP·CÆSMAVR SEVE RVSALEXANDERPIE AVG HORREVMVETV STATECONIABSVMM COH IIASTVRVM S·A ASOLORESTITVERVNT PROVINCIA REG * * * MAXIMO LEG * * * * * AIMARTI * * * *

Dr. Bruce reads and translates it thus :---

"The emperor Cæsar Marcus Aurelius Severus Alexander, the pious, happy, and august.—The second cohort of the Astures restored from the ground, in a workmanlike mauner, this granary, which had fallen down through age, in the kalends of March......, Maximus governing the Province as (Augustal) Legate."

Dr. Bruce's expansion and interpretation are in the main correct; but there are some points which require emendation. Ι regard M. at the end of the fourth line, as standing for *MILI-TES, and COH II., of the fifth, for COHORTIS SECVNDÆ. This view is supported by the use of RESTITVERVNT instead of RESTITVIT. The expansion SECVNDVM ARTEM for S·A is, in my judgment, very unsatisfactory. I regard the letters as standing, as they often do, for SEVERIANÆ ALEX-ANDRIANÆ. See Orelli, n. 3359. The reading "PROVIN-CIA REGNANTE, governing the province," is unquestionably erroneous. Whether provincia be regarded as the ablative, or, as is most probable, as used for *provinciam*, there is no authority for the government of either accusative or ablative by regnare, nor for the application of the term to the government of a province by a legate or other Roman officer. I would suggest PRO-VINCIA[M] † REG[ENTE]. Thus Tacitus, Hist. i., c. 48, "Vinius proconsulatu Galliam Narbonensem severe integreque rexit ;" c. 60, rexere [Britanniam] legati legionum.

Dr. Bruce gives as the date "A. D. 222-235, viz., the period during which Alexander Severus was emperor-but the precise

^{*} Mr. Newton, Mon. Hist. Brit. n. 19 a, has anticipated me.

[†] This suggestion is favoured by the reading given by Gough, Camden's Britannia, iii., p. 503-RCENT.

year can be ascertained. The inscription is evidently the *same as that given by Gough, *Camden's Britannia*, iii., p. 503. He gives the last two lines thus :---

MAXIMO LEG·VV·A PRO SAL MARTI MED·LEGATVSCOII·ET TEXT

There can, I think, be but little doubt that this inscription, as given by Gough, closes with the names of the consuls, and that we should read instead of TVSCOII.ET TEXT—FVSCO II ET DEXT[RO], *i. e.*, A.D. 225. It is not easy to decide on any thing relative to MED·LEGA. I suspect that these and the other words before the names of the consuls should be read—

KAL·MARTIIS·DEDICA

i. e., Ka[lendis] Martiis dedica[tum].

It is scarcely necessary to observe that *dedicare*, as thus used, signifies what we mean by "inaugurate," "formally open."

Of the preceding line there can, I think, be no doubt. It is --

MAXIMO·LEG·AVG·PRP

i. e., Maximo leg[ato] Aug[usti] pr[0] p[rætore].

It is strange that we have only the *cognomen* of the *legate*: his other names might have been expected in the preceding line.

It may also be of importance to add, that Dr. Bruce's translation "happy" does not express the sense of *felix* as an epithet of the emperors. It signifies what we mean by "fortunate,"

^{*} The only doubt which I have as to their identity arises from the circumstance that the words in the last line of the inscription, as given by Gongh, seem, from Dr. Bruce's wood-cut, to be in two lines on the stone in the Newcastle Museum. The remains of the last three lines as there represented are—

MAXIMO LEG AI MARTI TVS

Gough's copy of the inscription is disfigured by so many mistakes that I have but little doubt that he has erred even as to the arrangement of the words in lines. Dr. Bruce remarks that the stone "is figured in Brand's Newcastle, vol. i., p. 611; Hodgson, lxxxvii. (See also p. 292)." I am unabl to consult either of these authorities.

"lucky," and is expressed in Greek by $\epsilon \dot{\upsilon}\tau \upsilon \chi \dot{\eta}s$. It was first applied, as is well known, to Commodus, to mark his good fortune in being rid of Perennis, whose treasonable designs were abruptly terminated by his murder by the soldiers.

§ 72. In p. 227, we have the following inscription on another slab:

IMP·CAES·M AVRELIO SEVERO·ANTONINO PIO·FELICI AVG·PARTHIC MAX·BRIT.MAX GERM MAX·PONTIFICI MAXIM TRIB·POTEST XVIIII IMP·II COS IIII PRO COS PP COHI FIDA VARDVL CR EQ∞ANTO NINIANAFECIT SVBCVRA LEGAVGPRP

Dr. Bruce expands it thus :--

"IMPERATORES CÆSARI MARCO AVRELIO SEVERO ANTONINO PIO FELICI AVGVSTO PARTHICO MAXIMO BRITANNICO MAXIMO GERMANICO MAXIMO PONTIFICI MAXIMO TRIBUNITLÆ POTESTATIS UNDEVIGESIMUM IMPERATORIÆ SE-[CUNDUM CONSULARIS QUARTUM, PROCONSULI, PATRI PATRIÆ COHORS [PRIMA FIDA VARDULORUM, CIVIUM ROMANORUM EQUITATA [*MILI-[ARIA] ANTO NINIANA FECIT SUB CURA......

. LEGATI AUGUSTALIS PROPRÆTORIS."

"To the emperor Marcus Aurelius Severus Antoninus, pious, happy, august, styled Parthicus Maximus, Britannicus Maximus, Germanicus Maximus, chief priest, possessed of the tribunitian power for the nineteenth time, of the imperial for the second time, the consular for the fourth time, the father of his country; the First Cohort of the Varduli, surnamed the faithful, composed of Roman citizens, a miliary cohort, with its due proportion of cavalry attached, and honourel with the name of Antonine, erected this under the superintendence of or augustal legate and proprætor.

* I have inserted miliaria which was inadvertently omitted.

"The Antonine here referred to is the eldest son of Severus, commonly known as Caracalla; he was consul for the fourth time A.D. 213."

This is a very unsatisfactory explanation. In the expansion, imperatoriæ secundum is a mistake for imperatori secundum, and consularis quartum for consuli quartum. The remark that "Caracalla was consul for the fourth time, A.D. 213," although correct, is likely to mislead, as if that year were the date of the inscription, which it certainly is not. The reading of the 6th line of the inscription must be erroneous. If TRIB POTEST XVIII be correct, the numerals after 1MP must be III not II, and thus we have A.D. *216 for the date. See Henzen, n. 6700 and Index, p. 74.

§ 73. In the same work (vol. i., p. 251) a stone bearing a funereal inscription is figured :

C·VALERIVS·C·VOL· IVLLVS·VIAN*MIL LEG·XX·V·V

Dr. Bruce explains it thus :---

"This inscription may probably be read thus: Caius Valerius Caii (filius) Voltinia (tribu) Tullus vixit annos quinquaginta miles Legionis Vicesimæ Valentis Victricis. (In memory of) Caius Valerius Tullus, the son of Caius, of the Voltinian tribe, a soldier of the Twentieth Legion (styled) Valiant and Victorious (who) lived fifty years. Hodgson's reading is: Caius Valerius Caius Voltinius Julius vixit annos, &c. * * The age of the soldier has been cut upon a nodule of ferruginous matter, which has fallen out: there is not space for two letters, so that there is little doubt that the inscription originally had L."

Dr. Bruce's expansion is a great improvement on Mr. Hodgson's, but I am not satisfied with it. The position of MIL·LEG, &c., and the absence of any distinguishing mark between VI and AN, \dagger lead me to believe that VIAN [N or A] stands for *Vienna*, his birth-place, especially as it is in the right position, according

^{*}Mr. Newton, Mon. Hist. Brit., assigns A.D. 215 as the date, although the numerals, as given by him, are XVIII and 11.

[†] In the original, as figured by Dr. Bruce, there are leaf points after Valerius, C, Vol, and Tullus.

to the normal collocation. This conjecture is confirmed by the circumstance, that all the natives of Vienna (*scil., Allobrogum*), mentioned in inscriptions, belonged to the Voltinian tribe;^{*} e. gr., Orelli, n. 445:

C·VALERI VS·C·F·VOL CAMPANVS VIENNA MIL L·XI·C·P·F· &c. &c. &c.

See also Horsley, Brit. Rom. Yorkshire, n. 8; Orelli, n. 453; Letronne, Inscr. de l'Egypte, Pl. xxxi. 3, &c.

The form VIANNA for VIENNA is found in the following, given by Steiner, Cod. In. Rom. Rhen. nn. 325 and 397 :---

P·SOLIVS P·F·VOL·SV AVIS·VIANNA &c. &c. &c.

C·DANNIVS·C·F· VOL·SECVNDVS VIANNA

I would read the inscription thus : Caius Valerius, Caii [filius], Voltinia [tribu], Tullus, Vianna, miles Legionis xx, Valeriæ Victricis. It is possible that VIANNA, a town of Rhætia or Noricum may be intended, as Reinesius interprets the inscription, which he gives in Class viii., n. 38 (the same as Steiner's n. 325), but as the person named in it was of the Voltinian tribe, I prefer regarding *Vianna* as another form of VIENNA.

§ 74. In p. 261 of the same work, an altar is figured, which bears the following inscription :---

^{*} I do not mean to say that all the natives of Vienna were of the same tribe. There are examples which prove that some who had the same town as their birth-place were of different tribes. See Orelli, n. 3104; and Henzen, n. 6426.

SOLI APOLLINI ANICERO.

Dr. Bruce offers no explanation, but remarks :---

"It was found together with three others of Mithraic character. The third line is somewhat obscure, and the subsequent lines are nearly obliterated by the action of the weather. Mr. Thos. Hodgson has described this and the other altars found on the same occasion in the Arch. Æliana, vol. iv., p. 6."

On reference to Mr. Hodgson's description, I find that the only letters of the doubtful word, which he attempts to explain, are the first four—ANIO. These he regards as "the dative case of ANIVS, who was the son of Apollo and Rhea," and he cites in illustration (apparently with approval !) one of Mr. Faber's wild speculations, that "Rheo" [thus Mr. F. calls the mother of Anius] "is the same as Rhea, a mere personification of the Ark; Apollo is the solar Noah; and Anius is also the great patriarch, under the title of Aniun, the naval dcity."

It appears, from a comparison of the representations of the altar, as figured by Dr. Bruce and Mr. Hodgson, that it is doubtful whether the fourth letter is C or O; and that the last two, read by Dr. Bruce as RO, are not distinct.

I am of opinion that the true reading is ANICETO, and that the word is nothing more than the Greek ANIKHT Ω [I] in Latin characters, *i. e., dvikyto, invicto*, the epithet so frequently applied to Mithras, Sol, and Apollo.

§ 75. Amongst the valuable results of the exploration of the station of *Bremenium*, which was made through the liberality of the Duke of Northumberland, in 1852, was the discovery of several inscribed stones. On one of these, as figured in Bruce's *Roman Wall*, p. 458, is the following imperfect inscription :

Dr. Bruce remarks :---

" The inscription may be read :----

IMP[ERATORI] CAE[SARI] P[IO] F[ELICI] C[O]H[ORS] I F[IDA] VARD[VLORVM] BALLIS A SOLO REST[ITVIT] SVB C[AIO] CL[AVDIO] APELLINI[O] LEG[ATO] AVG[VSTALI] INSTANTE AVR[ELIO] QVINTO TRIB[VNO].

In honour of the Emperor Cæsar, Pious, happy. The first cohort of the Varduli, *styled* the faithful, ______from the ground restored, Under Caius Claudius Apellinius, imperial legate; Aurelius Quintus, the Tribune, superintending the work.

"The word ballis being peculiar, it would be rash to hazard a hasty explanation of it. It does not occur in Gruter. Is it the termination of some word? Is it a contraction for balneis? or has b been substituted for v, and should it be vallis? These are the most plausible suggestions which have occurred to me, but I am not satisfied with any of them. I have written the cognomen of the legate, as I think the inscription requires; it is necessary, however, to state that this name does not occur in Gruter."

In the year 1855, excavations were carried on at the same place, and a slab was discovered bearing the following inscription, as given by Dr. Bruce, in the interesting account published in the *Archæologia Æliana* (new series), vol. i., p. 78:—

> IMP·CAES·M·AV * * * * * * * * PIO F * * * TRIB·POT X COS * * * P·P·BALLIST·A SO * VARDVL * * * * * * * TIB·CL·PAVL * * * * PR·PR·FEC. * * * * P·AEL * * * * * * *

This inscription, as Dr. Bruce observes, solves the question as to BALLIS in that found in 1852, for BALLIST suggests BAL LISTARIVM, and we are also enabled to correct the reading of x

the name of the imperial legate, by substituting *Paulinus* for *Apellinius*. So far every thing seems satisfactory; but Dr. Bruce adds in a note :—

"A comparison of the two inscriptions does not remove all the difficulties attending the reading of the name of the Proprætor on the slab found in 1852; but if the name of this dignitary be not (Tiberius) Claudius Paulinus it is difficult to say what it is."

I am unable to understand the grounds of this remark. The name of the legate on the second slab seems to be, beyond doubt, Tiberius Claudius Paulinus, and from this we have to correct the reading on the first slab—Caius Claudius Apellinius. The substitution of *Paulinus* for *Apellinius* seems certain. Claudius remains in both, the only difference being that in the first we have the abbreviation CLA, in the second only CL-and all that remains to be done is to get rid of Caius, the prænomen in the first. Can there be any doubt that the C preceding CLA in that inscription stands not for Caio but for cura, i. e., that we should read sub c[ura]? Paulini, in the genitive, confirms the expansion. Thus no difficulty regarding the names of this Proprætor remains. In one his prænomen is given ; in the other it is omitted, as is frequently the case. In the Vieux inscription, given in Mr. C. R. Smith's Collectanea Antiqua, iii., p. 95, the names of the same Proprætor also appear without the prænomen. Compare the inscriptions 16a, 98, and 102a in Monum. Hist. Brit.

But another enquiry remains as to the age of the slabs. Dr. Bruce remarks on this point :---

"The Emperor here referred to is no doubt Heliogabalus. He assumed the same titles as Caracalla; but the *character of the letters and the evidently intentional erasure of the distinctive part of his name, indicate the latter rather than the earlier monarch. Fortunately the erasure in the second line has not been so effectually performed as to prevent the word ANTONINO being discernible."

[•] This affords a remarkable illustration of the extent to which the professed power of discriminating the age of an inscription by the character of its letters has been assumed by some palæographists. There is no doubt that there are clearly defined distinctions between the ancient and the later Latin inscriptions, one of which, and perhaps the most marked, is the absence or rarity of ligatures in those of older date, but the attempt to assign a definite

Neither of the reasons given by Dr. Bruce seems to me conclusive evidence as to the emperor here referred to being Heliogabalus. Moreover, the examination of the date of the Vieux monument by Mr. Roach Smith, *Collect. Antiq.*, iii. p. 98, does not favour this opinion. He observes :--

"This monument was erected in the first year of the reign of the third Gordian. [In the inscription on the principal face the date is given—AN· PIO ET PROCVL·COS—which corresponds to A.D. 238.] The events mentioned in the inscriptions probably occurred a considerable time anterior to the setting up of the monument. M. Huet and the Abbé le Neuf believe that the Ædinius Julianus, præfect of the prætorium, whom Solennis went to Rome to see, and from whom he received this letter of recommendation [inscribed on the monument], is the Julianus mentioned by Herodian and Capitolinus, who held this high post in the time of Macrinus [*i.e.*, before the commencement of the reign of Heliogabalus]. This was twenty years prior to the reign of Gordian, and as Julianus speaks of Paulinus as his predecessor in Gaul, Paulinus, in this case, must have been in Britain in the reign of Caracalla, possibly of Severus, when the sixth legion was in active service in the north of the island, repelling the Mæatæ and the Caledonians."

In the opinion of M. Huet and the Abbé le Neuf I concur. It seems very improbable that the *Julianus*, who was prefect of the prætorium under Commodus, was the individual named on the monument. I regard the *Ædinius Julianus* of the monument as most probably the same who is mentioned as *M. Ædinius Julianus* amongst the *patroni* of Canusium, in the well-known inscription (of the date A.D. 223) given by Mommsen, *Inscript. Neapol.*, n. 635.

§ 76. Dr. Bruce, Roman Wall, 2nd edit., p. 48, figures a slab

reign by the special peculiarities of the letters is almost wholly speculative. No more forcible illustration of this can be given than Dr. Bruce's remark, as quoted above, that "the character of the letters indicates the latter rather than the earlier monarch," *i. c.*, Elagabalus rather than Caracalla. This remark is based on the assumption that there was so marked a change in the character of the Latin letters, between April, A.D. 217, and June A.D. 218, that antiquarians can now determine whether an inscription was cut in the reign of Caracalla or of Elagabalus!

The only other ground, which I can conjecture for Dr. Bruce's remark, is his belief that the memorials of Caracalla and Elagabalus, which have been found in Britain, were distinguished by their difference of character; but this cannot be admitted, for no *undoubled* record, so far as I am aware, of the time of Elagabalus has been discovered in the island, except that given in the *Roman Wall*, pp. 155, 156.

found at *Chesters, on the North Tyne. It bears an inscription, of which a great part is illegible. Dr. B. remarks that "it is a sepulchral stone, and bears at the end of the third and the beginning of the fourth lines the words—

II ASTVR[VM]. "

The word before ALAE seems to be CVRATORI, designating the office held by the deceased in the *ala*. The notice of this office is so rare that I do not recollect having seen it noticed except in one instance—Renier, *Inscriptions de l'Algérie*, n. 4043:

D M VLPIVS·TERTI VS CVRATOR ALAEICONTARI

&c.

§ 77. In Mr. Wright's Celt, Roman and Saxon, p. 317 (p. 322, 2nd ed.), we have the following inscription, found at Great Chesters :--

"ЪМ	To the gods of the shades,
AEL·MERCV	To Ælius Mercurialis,
RIALI CORNICVL	a trumpeter,
VACIA·SOROR	his sister Vacia
FECIT	made this."

It is not easy to understand how Mr. Wright could have made such a mistake as to translate *corniculario* "trumpeter," especially as in p. 350 (p. 357, 2nd ed.) he remarks relative to this same inscription—"a cornicularius is commemorated, but whether he belonged to the departmental court or not is uncertain." Horsley, p. 229, had correctly explained the term as it occurs here, for he remarks : "The name of this officer is upon several monuments in Gruter, and occurs frequently in the *Notitia*. He was a kind of clerk or secretary." In the army, there was a *cornicularius tribuni*, the step above which was the *beneficiarius præfecti*, and the step above that the *cornicularius præfecti*.

* The Cilurnum of the Notitia.

§ 78. Many centurial inscriptions have been found in this country. On these see my notes on inscriptions found in Monmouthshire, § 45.

§ 79. *At Corbridge two altars were found bearing Greek inscriptions. One of them is figured in Dr. Bruce's *Roman Wall*, p. 313, and the inscription is thus translated :---

" Ахтартнх	Of Astarte,
βΩΜΟΝ Μ'	The altar
εΣΟΡΑΣ	You see
потахер м'	Pulcher
ANEOHKEN	replaced."

This translation omits that pleasing characteristic, which is often found in Greek inscriptions, whereby the object is regarded as addressing the reader; and not only is ME overlooked in the second and in the fourth line, but the sense of ANEOHKEN is not correctly expressed. It does not mean "replaced," but "set up," "erected," "dedicated." Mr. Wright, p. 269, correctly renders it :--

"Of Astarte the altar me you see, Pulcher me dedicated."

i. e., you see me the altar of Astarte : Pulcher dedicated me. He also notices the circumstance, that the inscription "forms a line in Greek hexameter verse." It is strange, that, being aware of this, he did not observe that a slight and sure emendation will give the same structure in the inscription on the other altar. Following Horsley he reads :—

" НРАКЛЕІ	To Hercules	
τιρρία	the Tyrian	
ΔΙΟΔΩΡΑ	Diodora	
APXIEPEIA	the high priestess."	

It is plain that TIPPI Ω destroys the metre, and that the verse should stand thus :—

,

^{*} As the number of Greek inscriptions found in Britain is very small, I have thought it letter to incorporate any remarks, which I have to offer on them, with my Notes on Latin Inscriptions.

ΗΡΑΚΛΈΙ ΤΥΡΙΩ ΔΙΟΔΩΡΑ ΑΡΧΙΕΡΕΙΑ. ε. ε., Ἡρακλεῖ Τυρίφ Διοδώρα ἀρχιέρεια.

In another Greek inscription, found at Chester, in, I believe, 1856, we have also an Hexameter, which has escaped the notice of Dr. J. Y. Simpson, in his paper on the subject in the *Proceedings of the Soc. of Antiq. of Scotland*, vol. ii., p. i., p. 80. He reads the words, which form the verse,* thus :---

ΈΡΜΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΙΑΤΡΟΣ ΒΩΜΟΝ ΤΟΝΑΑΝΕΘΗΚΑ

i. e., ΕΡΜΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΙΑΤΡΟΣ ΒΩΜΟΝ ΤΟΝΑ ΑΝΕΘΗΚΑ.

It is evident that the fourth letter in the third line is not A but Δ and that the E, which follows it in TON Δ E, is here elided. Accordingly the verse should be :—

ΕΡΜΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΙΑΤΡΟΣ ΒΩΜΟΝ ΤΟΝΔ' ΑΝΕΘΗΚΑ

i. e., I, Hermogenes, a physician, dedicated this altar.

• The preceding words [ZΩT] HPZIN [YII]EPMENEXIN seem to be a portion of an irregular pentameter.

SHROPSHIRE.

§ 79. In the year 1752, some *grave-stones were dug up near Wroxeter, the ancient *Viroconium*, † on one of which were three panels, two bearing inscriptions and the third left vacant. According to the copy in Gough's Camden, ‡ vol. iii., pl. 1, fig. 5, these inscriptions stand thus :--

D M PLACIDA AN LV CVR AG CONIA XXX	D M DEVCCV S ANXV CVR ⁴ G RATRE	
---	--	--

The following notice of this slab is given by Mr. Wright, Celt, Roman, and Saxon, p. §321:---

"A monument found at Wroxeter (*Uriconium*) mentions an office, the exact character of which seems to be doubtful, though the *curator agrorum* or *agrarius* may have been the overseer, or bailiff, of the town lands. The monument consists of a tablet in three columns or compartments; that in the middle contains an inscription to the officer; the one on the left has an inscription to the wife; the other is blank, and it has either been left so for a son, or has become erased. The central inscription is :---

¿ In the 2nd ed., p. 326, the inscriptions, translations and observations are wholly omitted.

^{*} They are now preserved in the library of Shrewsbury Grammar School.

[†] In the MSS. of the Itinerary of Autoninus (see ed. Parthey and Pinder, Berlin, 1848), the name is given also as Uriconium, Uriconium, Uroconium and Viroconium. The anonymous Ravennas has Uriconion; and in the treatise of Richard of Cirencester, de Situ Britannia, we find the forms Viriconium and Virioconium, besides Uriconium and Urioconium. It is difficult to decide which should be preferred. Mr. Wright adopts Uriconium, and Mr. Scarth Uriconium; whilst the weight of authority seems to me to preponderate in favour of Viroconium, the Ούφοκόνιον of Ptolemy.

[‡] I have omitted points, for I am uncertain whether the marks between certain letters, as they appear in the copy of *Gough's Camden*, which I use, are intended for points or for representations of defects in the stone, or are blemishes in the engraving or printing.

$\mathbf{D} \cdot \mathbf{M}$	To the gods of the shades.
DEVCCV	Deuccus
S·V·AN·XV	lived fifteen (?) years,
CVR·AG	he was overseer of the lands
RA TRE	of Trebonius (?)

"The number of years is perhaps not correctly read from the stone, which seems to be in bad condition. The other inscription is :---

D·M	To the gods of the shades.
PLACIDA	Placida
AN LV	lived fifty-five years,
CVR·AG	of the overseer of the lands
CON·I A	she was the wife
XXX	thirty years."

Independently of the objections, that there is no authority for the office of *curator agrorum*, and that no account is taken of A in the 5th line of the central inscription, I am unable to perceive any grounds for passing over the obvious interpretation of CVR. AG. *scil.*, cur[am] ag[ente]. The form is found in many sepulchral inscriptions; and on p. 315 of Mr. Wright's work we have an example :—

> CVRA[M] AGENTE AMANDA CONIVGE.

RATRE is evidently either FRATRE, the F and R being ligulate, or PATRE, the P having been mistaken for R.

In an able and timely *summary of information relative to Viroconium by the Rev. H. M. Scarth, of Bath, which has recently been published in the Journal of the Archæological Institute, this with other inscriptions found at Wroxeter is given, and PATRE is adopted as the true reading of the word in the fifth line, but the letter which follows A in the 4th line is read C instead of G. In the other inscription on this tablet, the I of the fifth line is read by Mr. Scarth as J, and the A in the same line is omitted, whilst the three marks XXX at the bottom are regarded as "more

^{*}Wroxeter, in consequence of the discoveries which have lately been made there, is at present regarded with much interest by antiquaries, and "a well organized movement has at length been made for the exploration of the site of Uriconium."

probably merely an ornament, like a leaf introduced at the end of the next inscription." Adopting his readings, with the exceptions of C for G and J for I, I would give the inscriptions, *in extenso*, thus :---

D·M	D[iis] M[anibus];
PLACIDA	Placida,
AN·LV	an [norum] LV,
CVR·AG	cur[am] ag[ente]
CONI	conj[uge].
D·M	D[iis] M[anibus] ;
DEVCCV	Deuccu-
S·AN·XV	s, an[norum] XV,
CVR·AG	cur[am] ag[ente]
PATRE	patre.

If A and XXX be retained in the first inscription, I would expand the contractions in the 5th and 6th lines, thus :---

CONI A	conjuge annorum
XXX	triginta.

i. e., her husband for thirty years. We have a similar construction in Maffei, *Museum Veronense*, 152, 6:—

C. CASSIVS. C·F VESPA MANLIA. T·F REPENTINA VXOR·AN·XXX

It only remains to add, that I concur in Mr. Scarth's opinion, that the vacant panel was left by the father of Deuccus and the husband of Placida "for his own name and age at his decease."*

^{*} Since the above was written, I observe that the author of a very interesting article on Uriconium, in The Gentleman's Magazine for May, 1859, has adopted Mr. Wright's views, but I am still of opinion that his interpretation cannot be received.

P.S.—In the Journal of the Archaeological Association, 1859, p. 313, Mr. Wright courteously calls the attention of English Antiquarians to my papers in the Canadian Journal, and adopts my suggestions, relative to these inscriptions and that in §80. He prefers, however, CONIA XXX in the first inscription and FRATRE in the second.

§ 80. On another of these grave-stones is the following inscription :---

C MANNIVS	C[aius] Mannius,
CF POL SECV	C[aii] f[ilius], Pol[lia] <i>tribu</i> , Secu-
NDVS POLLEN	ndus, Pollen[tia],
MIL LEG XX	mil[es] leg[ionis] XX,
ANORVLII	an[n]oru[m] LII,
STIP XXXI	stip [endiorum] XXXI,
BEN LEG PR	ben[eficiarius] leg[ati] pr[incipalis],
HSE	[hic] [situs] e[st].

Mr. Scarth remarks that this inscription "may be thus rendered :-- Caius Mannius Secundus,* son of Caius, of Pollentum, a soldier of the twentieth legion, aged 52 years; having served 31 years in the legion and being the beneficiary of the principal legate. He rests here."

Of this rendering I would suggest the following emendations: —the insertion of the words "of the Pollian tribe" after "son of Caius," "Pollentia" for "Pollentum," and t"principal beneficiary of the legate" for "beneficiary of the principal legate." As to the first of these, it is plain that the words proposed to be inserted were inadvertently omitted. The substitution of *Pollentia* for *Pollentum* [is recommended by the consideration, that there were three ancient towns so called,—one in Liguria, another in Picenum, and a third in the Balearic isles; whilst there is no authority, so far as I am aware, for *Pollentum*. In the following inscription found at Zurzach in Switzerland, Orelli, n. 455, we have the name almost complete :—

[•]The writer in *The Gentleman's Magazine*, already referred to, gives the name of this soldier as *Caius Marinius Secundus Pollentius*; and adds that he "was also a pensioner of the first legion (*i. e.*, beneficiarius legionis prime), but both these readings are manifestly erroneous.

[†] The word "principal," as ordinarily used in English, does not convey the meaning of *principalis* as applied to a Roman soldier. The Latin term means that the person so styled was one of the *principales*, a designation given to sub-officers or officials, in contra-distinction to munifices or gregarii, which denoted the common soldiers or privates. See Veget. de rs Militari, in, c. 7.

....GIACVS ...POLIASVPER PO .. ENTIA MILES LEX·XI·C.P.F7SALNI MAXIMI ANNORV XXXV·STIP...

The third emendation is confirmed by reference to Orelli, n. 3461, where we have PRINCIPALIS BENEFICIARIVS TRIBVNI, and Henzen, n. 6791, where we find PBP for *principalis beneficiarius præfecti*; but the collocation of the abbreviations in this inscription is peculiar.

§ 81. A third stone bore the following inscription :---

M PETRONIVS	M[arcus] Petronius,*
L F MEN	L[ucii f[ilius], Men[enia] tribu,
VIC ANN	vic[sit] [annos]
XXXVIII	XXXVIII,
MIL LEG	mil[es] leg[ionis]
XIIII GEM	XIV gem[inæ],
MILITAVIT	militavit
ANN XVIII	ann[is] XVIII,
- SIGN FVIT	Sign[ifer] fuit,
HSE	h[ic] s[itus] e[st]

Mr. Scarth notices the ingenious conjecture of a friend :---

"That Petronius was a bearer of one of the Signa of the fourteenth legion in the famous victory over Boadicea, A.D. 61. This legion arrived in Britain in A.D. 43, when Petronius being only twenty years old was a Miles gregarius, and subsequently for his valour, perhaps under Ostorius Scapula, raised to the rank of Signifer. It could not have been much later, for in A.D. 68 the fourteenth legion was quartered in Dalmatia, (Tacitus). He may have died in consequence of his wounds in the year 61."

It is manifestly impossible to prove the truth of this conjecture, for the fourteenth legion, after their recal from the island under Nero, were sent back in the year 69, and Petronius may have come with them then and died before they were again re-called in

^{*} It is not unworthy of notice, that in an inscription found in Fritzheim, Orelli, n. 501, we have the same name of another soldier of this legion, a native of Claudia Celeia in Noricum. He, however, was the son of Caius, and had a brother, whose *prenomen* was Caius.

the year 70. The conjecture, however, is countenanced by the coincidence, that his period of service, viz. : 18 years, is the same as the interval between the first arrival of the legion in A.D. 43, and the battle in A.D. 61. But how shall we account for his burial at Viroconium ? We have no evidence that the fourteenth legion was ever stationed there, and it is far distant from the scene of the battle, which probably took place not far from Can it have been that the fourteenth legion was with London. Suctorius when he crossed over to Mona (Anglesey), and that on his hurried march back from Wales, Petronius was killed, or died of fatigue, at or near Viroconium, by which route it is probable that Suetonius proceeded to London ? But it is scarcely worth while to dwell on conjectures formed on such slight foundations; it is more important to observe that this inscription is the only extant British memorial of the "domitores Britanniæ."*

§ 82. Blocks of lead, bearing the inscription :---

IMP · HADRIANI · AVG

have been found in this county, about ten miles from Shrewsbury, seven miles north of Bishop's Castle, and four and a half miles from Montgomery. See my notes on inscriptions found in *Derbyshire*.

§ 83. In the Gentleman's Magazine, April, 1862, p. 401, a wood-cut is given of an inscribed stone, which was found at Wroxeter, in September, 1861. The inscription which it bears is evidently funereal, but as some of the letters have been lost by fracture or decay, and the majority are very indistinct, it is extremely difficult to offer any satisfactory reading. The following are the lines as they appear in the wood-cut :—

> MINIVS T POLIA ORVMXXXXVSTHXXHMH·HO· HGEMMHHAVIAQNVNCHI S LEOITEEFFHICE VHAHVSHN OVAHOHH A ADHISVIVHED M DATI IPVS·HONES

^{*} This stone escaped the notice of Mr. Wellbeloved, for he states, *Eburacum*, p. 33, with reference to the fourteenth legion, that "it is not mentioned in any tile or in any inscription found in Britain." P.S.—Since the foregoing article and note were published a stone has been found in Lincoln, which also mentions this legion. See 5, 94.

From such fragments as these it is plain that but little can be made out : but as I have the advantage of comparing the woodcut with a carefully executed *photograph of the stone, I am able to offer some probable suggestions relative to those portions which are at all legible. The first line is—

-AMINIVS T.POLIA.

After the L is a mark which looks like a point. I would read the line-

[T. or C. FL]AMINIVS • T[RIBV or ITI• filius] POL-[LIA] tribu IA[S or SON or SVS] or POLIA for POLLIA tribu.

i.e., Titus, or Caius, Flaminius, tribu Pollia, or Titi filius Pollia tribu, Ias or Iason, or Iasus; or Titus or Caius Flaminius, Titi filius, Pollia tribu. I prefer Titus Flaminius, Titi filius, Pollia tribu, filius and tribu being understood, and Polia being used for Pollia. The second line is clearly,

ORVMXXXXVSTIPXXIIMIL·LEG

i. e, [ANN]ORVM·XXXXV·STIP[ENDIORVM]·XXII· MIL[ES] LEG[IONIS], annorum xxxxv., stipendiorum xxii. miles legionis.

Of the third line the beginning and the ending are doubtful, especially the latter : the rest stands thus :

II GEM MILITAVI AQ NVNC-S-

I would read it—

XIIII · GEM[INAE] · MILITAVI · AQ[VILIFER].NVNC · [HIC] S[VM]

i. e., xiiii. geminæ, militavi aquilifer, nunc hic sum.

I prefer the 14th gemina, as another example of this legion was found here. See § 81. The use of the first person in funereal inscriptions is common. On aquilifer, see Orelli, n. 3389, and on hic sum, Orelli, n. 4738, and Henzen, n. 7411.

^{*} For this I am indebted to the Rev. H. M. Scarth, of Bath, who also kindly communicated his views on the subject.

The remains of the fourth line are-

LEGITE · ET · FELICES · VITA VS ·

I would read it—

[PER]LEGITE·ET·FELICES·VITA·PLVS

There can, I think, be no reasonable doubt as to our having here the first four feet of an hexameter, and the long syllable of the last dactyl : the difficulty is as to the two short syllables of the dactyl and the final spondee. The portion of the dactyl was certainly in this line, but I suspect that the spondee was in the next. It opens with letters like IV.A, whence I am disposed to conjecture that the hexameter was—

Perlegite et felices vità plus minus jutà,

but I am not satisfied with it, chiefly on account of the last two The use of *perlegite* and *felices* in funereal inscriptions is words. common. See Orelli, n. 4848, Henzen, nn., 6843, 7402, 7412, and Reinesius, xvi., 65. The remaining letters of the 5th line are so indistinct that it is almost impossible to make any thing of them. In the 6th, however, the letters A · DITIS are plain, from which we may infer that the preceding portion of the hexameter, of which IANV[A] or TARTAR[A] or TAENAR[A] (or some such word with final a) DITIS formed the ending, was in the 5th line. Here a difficulty presents itself as to the letter or letters in that 5th line, following the letter which stands eighth. To me this ninth character looks like an inverted B, i. e., S, which it is impossible to read so as to obtain a word fit for verse, unless, indeed, we take it as standing for BVS. The six letters after this character look like *AQVATI, but all after this to ADITIS. in the 6th line, are so indistinct that scarcely one of them can be identified with probability. In an attempt to meet the requirements of the case I constructed an hexameter, which I subjoin. It contains many of the apparent letters in order, but I do not at all suggest it even as a feasible reading of the verse :

^{*} The AQ recall aquilifer of the 3rd line, but if this view be adopted, the idea of verse must be given up, at least in this line. There are then various readings which suggest themselves, but there is not one which appears probable.

OMNIB·ÆQVA·LEGE·ITER·EST·AD·TAENARA· DITIS

i. e., omnibus æquå lege iter est ad Tænara Ditis.

The remainder of the inscription is fortunately involved in less obscurity. VIVITE DVM are plainly the beginning of an hexameter, which ends with TEMPVS HONESTE in the 7th line, and the letters before TEMPVS resemble DAT as given in the wood-cut. From these *data* then and the appearances of the fragments of letters in the *lacunæ*, I venture to suggest the following verse :

Vivite, dum Stygius vitæ dat tempus, honeste.

On the use of *vivere* and *honeste* in such inscriptions, see Orelli, n. 4807, and Henzen, nn. 6843, 7402, 7407, 7347.*

^{*} The examination of the inscription shows that there are no grounds for the statements of Mr. Wright, in his letter to the London Evening Mail, October 7-9, 1861, that the man commemorated in the tablet was "named apparently Flaminius Titus Polea or Poleas," and that "he seems to have been in more than one legion." It also proves that Mr. Roach Smith's conjecture that "the concluding words of the inscription may be HONESTA MIS-SIONE MISSVS" is erroneous.

§ 84. Of the Roman remains, which are scattered over different parts of Europe, there are probably none which presented so great difficulties to the antiquary as certain small greenish stones of a quadrilateral form, with intagliated inscriptions in Latin on their edges. Schmidt, in "Antiquitates Neomagenses," "the Antiquities of Nimiguen," seems to have been the first who directed attention to them, but he was himself unable to decipher them, or to determine their use. Since his time, however, the subject has been explained and illustrated by Spon, Chishull, Caylus, Saxe, Walche, Gough, Tochon, Sichet, Duchalais, Way, and Simpson,* so that there now remains no doubt that they were medicine stamps used by the Roman physicians or empirics for marking their drugs or preparations, especially for diseases of the eyes.

One of the most interesting of these stones, inasmuch as it presents very great difficulties in interpretation, is that which was found at Bath, in a cellar in the Abbey yard, in 1731. "It was shewn to the Society of Antiquaries in London, at that time and twice afterwards. Mr. Lethiecullier gave them a cast of it in plaster, and in 1757, the stone itself was the property of Mr. Mitchell. It is square, of a greenish cast and perforated." Dr. J. Y. Simpson, *Edinburgh Medical Journal, March*, 1851, informs us that he "had attempted to trace out the present proprietor of the stamp, with a view of ascertaining, more correctly, the exact nature of the inscriptions; but that these efforts were quite unsuccessful." Fortunately, however, "some manuscript notices of this Bath stamp exist in the minute books of the Antiquarian Society, with an impression taken with ink from the

^{*} Dr. Simpson's articles in the *Edinburgh Medical Journal*, January and March, 1851, afford ample and satisfactory information, relative to the stamps found in the United Kingdom.

inscriptions." From a comparison of these notices with the copies of the inscriptions given by Gough, Arch cologia, ix, p. 228, Dr. Simpson has determined the reading and interpretation of two of the legends with certainty, and of the third with some probability, whilst he states that the fourth side "offers the most puzzling of all the inscriptions hitherto found upon the Roman medicine stamps discovered in Britain." It is to this inscription that I now desire to direct attention. Mr. Gough, Arch cologia, ix., p. 228, reads it :--

T. IVNIANI HOFSVMAD ρ V EC VMODELICTA A MEDICIS.

and Dr. Simpson offers the following explanatory remarks :---

"The fourth legend on the Bath stone offers the most puzzling of all the inscriptions hitherto found upon the Roman medicine stamps discovered in Britain. As Mr. Gough gives it, the last words of the inscription (DELICTA A MEDICIS-esteemed by physicians), are alone intelligible. The plaster cast of this side of the seal, contained in the Museum of the Antiquarian Society of London, contains an extremely imperfect copy of the second line, and not an over perfect one of the first; but we see enough of it to be quite aware of the great carelessness with which Mr. Gough had originally copied the whole inscription. The second last letter in the line is not the Greek e, but the Latin Q; and the name of the collyrium is not HOFSVM, as he gives it, but apparently PHOEBVM. At all events there is a P, which he has omitted, before the H; and the two medial letters, which he read FS, are seemingly EB. Such is the conclusion to which the examination of the lettering of the cast itself forces me; and what is much more important, because affording far stronger evidence than mine, Mr. Akerman reads this inscription in the same way. I may add that (as I am informed by the same gentleman) the word is copied and written as PHOEBVM, in the several notices contained in the minute-books of the Antiquarian Society, and to which I have already referred; and Gough's p always given as Q.

Still, with all these emendations, I confess myself quite at a loss to decipher, satisfactorily, the inscription. The spelling of all the inscriptions on this stamp is executed very carelessly,—as in *crsomaelinum* for *crysomelinum*; *thalaser* for *thalasser*; and possibly the term QVECVMO may be a mis-spelling, by the engraver, for LEVCOMA. If so, the inscription would stand as :—

T JVNIANI PHOEBVM AD LV ECOMA DELICTA A MEDICIS.

The Phoebum of T. Junianus for Leucoma, esteemed by physicians. Z

I am not aware that any of the old authors have described a collyrium under the name of PHOEBVM. But it looks like one of those high-sounding titles which the oculists were so fond of selecting and assuming, and we find described in their works collyria with such semi-astronomical appellations, as Sol. Aster, Lumen, Phos, &c.

I shall venture only one more remark, viz., the possibility of the term being PHORBIVM and not PHOEBVM. 'The Phorbium,' observes Galen, 'possesses attenuating, attractive, and discutient powers. They apply its seeds mixed with honey to Leucoma, and it is believed to have the power of extracting spicula of wood.'"

The obvious objections to Dr. Simpson's interpretations are :---

1st. That we should have had *delictum* and not *delicta*.

2nd. That the participles dilccta or delecta are confused with delicta.

3rd. That his interpretation requires us to regard quecumo as a mis-spelling for *leucoma*.

As the circumstances seem to warrant a resort to conjecture, I venture to suggest QVECVMQ for QVECVMO:—

i. e., AD QVECVMQ DELICTA A MEDICIS.

If PHOEBVM be the true reading, the designation may have been selected with a view to the supposed superiority of Apollo to his son Æsculapius, and of course to the *medici* the sons of Æsculapius. But perhaps the word may be PHOEDVM, the Latinized form of $\Phi OI\Delta ON$ or $\Phi \Omega I\Delta ON$, derived from $\phi \omega \zeta \omega$, whence $\phi o \partial \delta \epsilon_s$ or $\phi \omega \partial \epsilon_s$, used by Aristotle, *Probl.*, 38, 7, Aristophanes, *Plut.*, 535, and Hippocrates, *Econ.*, p. 494, ed. Foes., already cited by Liddell and Scott, and $\phi \omega \partial \delta \omega$, given by Suidas.

QVECVMQ I regard as a contracted form of quaccumque, the E being used for AE, and the final Q for QVE, both of which uses are familiar to those conversant with Latin epigraphy. DELICTA is the participle of *delinquere*; or is used for *derelicta* from *derelinquere*, as in Ennius "delicto Coclite" (if that be the true reading) for "derelicto Coclite;" or it may be that

the correct reading is RELICTA. In Orelli, n. 1518, we have derelictus a medicis, in the sense "given up by the physicians." The word thus admits of two interpretations, either "badly treated" or "given up." The meaning of the inscription, if we adopt PHOEDVM, may be expressed thus : "The blistering (collyrium) of Titus Junianus for such (hopeless) cases as have been given up by the physicians." I prefer PHOEBVM in the sense "radiant" or "Apollinarian."

Another panacea is noticed on the stamp found near Cirencester (the ancient *Corinium*) in 1818, and described by Buckman and Newmarch :

MINERVALIS MELINV [m] AD OMNEM DOLOREM.

It may, I think, be safely inferred from the Bath inscription, if my interpretation be correct, that the stamp did not belong to a regular *medicus*, but to an empiric, possibly one of the *iatrolipta*.

The difficulty in interpreting another legend on this stamp arises from the impossibility of determining the true reading of one of the words. In the books of the Society of Antiquaries the legend is given thus :

T.IVNIANI DIEXVM AD VETeRES CICATRICES.

Dr. Simpson conjectures DIAMYSVM (the name of a well known collyrium) for the inexplicable DIEXVM; but from the copy by Gough it appears that the letters between D and M are in a rude Britanno-Roman character, and that "the disputed word may be more corectly read DRYCVM or DRYXVM," which Dr. S. interprets as a preparation from the bark, acorn, or galls of the *Drys*, *i. e.*, oak. Can it be that the word is formed from *Druidæ* or *Dryidæ*, and that both the appellation and the characters were adopted with a view to securing its sale among the native population ?

§ 85. Horsley's n. ii. is an imperfect inscription on a gravestone found near Bath :---

```
C·MVRRIVS
C·F·ARNIENSIS
FORO·IVLI·MO
DESTVS·MIL·
EG·II·AD·P·F
IVLI·SECVNDI
ANNXXVSTI
H
```

The following are his expansion and remarks :---

"Caius Murrius Caii filius Arniensis (tribus) Foro Julii Modestus miles legionis secundæ adjutricis piæ fidelis Julii Secundi annorum viginti quinque stipendiorum—hic situs est."

"The legio secunda adjutrix which seems to be mentioned in this monument never was in Britain, or at least there is no proof of it from any other inscriptions or Roman historian. Perhaps this soldier came hither for his health, though the legion was at a distance. The letters A.D. P. F. are so distinct in the original as to leave no room for any suspicion of error. As it does not appear that the legio secunda adjutrix was ever in Britain, the letters A. D. P. F. in the fifth line may be read adoptivus filius. There seems to be no objection to this, but the point between D. and P., for Manutius gives us both ADOP and ADP, for adoptivus, from ancient inscriptions; but that point may be either the remains of an O defaced, or put there through inadvertency. This will make the reading of the sixth line evidently Julii Secundi, two names of the person who adopted him.

It is not easy to know what else to make of the sixth line. Some think that the first visible letter may have been a P., and that it has been manipuli secundi, the former part of the word manipuli being effaced. But the appearance of the original did not in my opinion favour this conjecture; for there were no traces of any more letters in the fifth line after P. F., and the first letter in the sixth line did not seem any way deficient. Besides, it is not usual in such monuments to describe a soldier from the manipulus to which he belonged."

There can be no reasonable doubt as to the correctness of the expansion—AD[IVTRICIS] P[IAE] F[IDELIS]. Another soldier of this legion is named on a grave-stone found in Lincoln. See p. 92. IVLI SECVNDI are in the genitive after centuria either understood or obliterated, scil., >, and are the names of the centurion under whom he served.

Foro Juli is his birth-place, scil., Friuli, or Frejus, and there is this

peculiarity in its position in the inscription, that it is not in the normal place. The birth-place, according to usage, follows the *cognomen*; here it precedes it. See other examples in *Fabretti*, pp. 340, 341.

§ 86. Horsley's n. iii. is also an inscription on a grave-stone found at the same place :---

DIS MANIBVS M.VALERIVS·M FILLATINVS (·EQ MILES LEG·XX·AN XXXV STIPENXX. H.S.E

The following are his expansion and remarks :---

"Dis Manibus Marcus Valerius Marci filius Latinus centurio eques miles legionis vicesimæ annorum triginta quinque stipendiorum viginti hic situs est."

"As I read it, this Valerius had served in the capacities of a soldier, an horseman, and a centurion or *decurio equitum* in the same legion."

Orelli's expansion C[olonia] Eq[uestri], the name of the birthplace of the deceased, is much to be preferred.

§ 87. Horsley's n. iv. is on a stone with a figure on either side. He was of opinion that there were three distinct stones, and that they did not appear to have been ever united. "One of these figures," he remarks, "is a Victory with a palm branch in her left hand, and a corona in her right; the other, as Dr. Stukely thinks, has a cornucopia in her left hand; but I am persuaded they have no reference to the inscription near which they are now placed." I am inclined to think that the stones, though distinct, were intended to be placed together, and venture to suggest that the inscription was, or was reputed to be Christian. The palm branch and the corona are well known symbols of Christianity; and I even suspect that the rudely drawn figure with an object on the shoulders (mistaken for a cornucopia) may have been a

a rough representation of "the good shepherd," carrying a lamb. See Maffei, *Museum Veronense*, p. clxxviii., for a remarkable illustration of this suspicion. The following is the inscription on the stone in the middle :

D M SVCC·PETRONIAE VIX ANN·III·M·IIII·D·IX·VЭ́PO MVLVS·ET^VICTSAPINA FIL·KAR·FEC

Mr. Ward's remarks on it are :---

"I am inclined to think the daughter's names here are Succia Petronia; the father's Valerius Petronius . . . mulus or nuclus : and the mother's. Tuctia or Tuccia Sabina. Of these, Petronius is the family name, and therefore given to the daughter. The character at the beginning of it contains four letters, PETR, of which there are other instances. The names Tuccia and Sabina are both found more than once in Gruter. The T at the beginning of the word Tuictia is to be twice read as L in the Middlesex inscription ; the I has been added after the V to accommodate the spelling to the pronunciation in prolonging the sound, and nothing was more common than the promiscuous use of C and T in the same word. I cannot but fancy, therefore, that the daughter's name was taken from the mother's, a little softened by substituting S for T, a thing not uncommon, as we learn from Quintilian; and in this case suited to that natural fondness in parents for their children which the Greeks seem to have happily expressed by the word brokopiopubs. The V in Succia is larger than the following letters, very probably to give it the same force as VI in Tuictia by lengthening the sound, which was a thing very usual."

Horsley gives the following expansion : "Dis Manibus Succiæ Petroniæ vixit annos tres menses quatuor dies novem Valerius Petronius et Tuictia Sabina filiæ carissimæ fecerunt."

I am by no means satisfied with this rendering. Instead of Valerius Petronius I would read Vettius Romulus, and instead of Tuictia Subina, Victoria Sabina. It is remarkable that all the names which occur in this inscription are applied to Christians either in the catacombs of Rome or elsewhere.

§ 88. In the year 1736, a fragment of a grave-stone was found in Bath, which, according to Dr. Stukeley, *Phil. Trans.*, 1748, bore the inscription :---

L·VITELLIVS·MA NIAI·F·TANCINVS CIVES·HISP·CAVRIESIS EQ·ALAE·VETTONUM·CR ANN·XXXXVI·STIP·XXVI H·S·E

i.e. "Lucius Vitsllius Maximiani filius Titus Ancinus, civis Hispanus Cauriensis equitum alæ Vettonum Curator anno 46 Stipendiorum 26 hic sepultus est."

Mr. Warner, History of Bath, Append., p. 118, reads Mantani for Maximiani, Tancinus for Titus Ancinus, Hispaniæ for Hispanus, centurio for curator, and hic situs est for hic sepultus est. He translates the whole inscription thus: "Lucius Vitellius Tancinus, the son of Mantanus, a citizen of Caurium, in Spain, centurion of the Vettonensian auxiliary horse; who died in the forty-sixth year of his age, and the twenty-sixth year of his military service."

The term centurion is explained on the supposition that the ala "here spoken of was probably attached to the twentieth legion; in this Tancinus bore the office of centurion; a command somewhat analogous to the captaincy of a troop in our service." Mr. Scarth, Proceedings of Somersetshire Archeolog. and Nat. Hist. Society, 1852, p. 102, remarks, that "the stone was erected on the place of interment of 'Lucius Vitellius Tancinus, the son of Mantaus or Mantanus,' a citizen of Caurium, in Spain, a centurion of the Vettonensian horse, who died at the age of fortysix years." Both Mr. Warner and Mr. Scarth observe, in illustration, that Caurium was a town in Lusitania, and that the Vettones were a neighbouring people, who supplied the Romans with excellent heavy-armed horse.

There is no doubt that Mr. Warner's expansion is an improvement on that given by Dr. Stukeley, but it is far from being satisfactory. Of the suggestions which have been offered relative to MANIAI.F, I prefer Mr. Scarth's reading MANTAI.F; but perhaps we should substitute E for I, *i. e.*, MANTAE.*

^{*} From MANTA, as SITA in p. 76. Compare also the inscription given in Journ. of Arch. Assoc., 1857, p. 210, fig. 2.

The reading TANCINVS is supported by the inscription in Gruter, p. cmxvii, n. 8, cited by Mr. Warner; but HISPANVS, not HISPANIAE, is conformable to usage. The expansions EQVITVM for EQ· and CVRATOR or CENTVRIO for C·R are unquestionably erroneous. EQ· stands for EQVES, and C·R for CIVIVM ROMANORVM. As to Mr. Warner's suggestion, that the deceased may have been a centurion in an *ala Vettonum* attached to the 20th legion, it is sufficient to observe that there is no authority for a centurion in an *ala*, nor for an *ala* being attached to a legion.

§ 89. In the year 1754 an altar was found in Upper Stall Street, Bath, bearing the following inscription :---

> PEREGRINVS SECVNDI FIL CIVIS·TREVER IOVCETIO MARTI ET NEMETONA V·S·L·M.

Mr. Gough, *Camden's Britannia*, i. p. 118, observes, that the altar "was erected by Peregrinus to two new local deities. Jupiter *Cetius* may be the *Ceaicus* or *Ceatius* on an inscription given by Mr. Horsley, 278, in Cumberland, and takes his name from Mount *Cetius* in Noricum, under which was the town of *Cetium*, and Nemetona, one of the many local deities mentioned only in these inscriptions."

Mr. Warner, *Hist. of Bath*, p. 120, *Append.*, remarks : "It is dedicated to three deities, the Cetian Jupiter, Mars, and Nemetona, a local deity. The name of the person who erected it does not appear; for the word *Peregrinus* is merely an appellative, implying that he was a stranger or traveller. We find, however, by the second and third lines, the name of his father *Secundus*: and the city of his residence, Treves in Germany. The last of the deities mentioned in the inscription seems to have been a British one, and known only in the south-western parts of England. The name Nememotacio (which Baxter considers as

synonymous with Nemetomagus) seems in the chorography of Anonymus Ravennas, and is conjectured by Baxter, to be the present Launceston. If this be allowed, the near approach of Nemetona to the town Nemetomagus, will justify the opinion of the former being the local divinity of the latter."

Mr. Scarth, Somersetshire Archaeolog. and Nat. His. Soc.'s Proceedings, 1852, p. 99, mentions the opinions (which have been above stated) relative to Jupiter Cetius and Nemetona, without, however, expressing approval of them, or offering any other explanation.

There can, I think, be but little doubt in the mind of those who have noticed *Marti Leucetio* in Gruter, lviii. 3, that I, the initial letter of the 4th line of the inscription, is a *mistake for L, and that we should read the names of the deities :--

*LOVCETIO MARTI ET NEMETONA[E]

In Steiner, 1 Dan. et Rh. 1, n. 472, (cited by Henzen, n. 5899, who also proposes this emendation) we have :---

CVRTELIA · PREPVSA MARTI LOVCETIO V·S·L·L·M

and

MARTI·LEVCETIO T·TACITVS CENSORINVS V·S·L·L·M

The deities are joined in the following inscription, found at Altripp, *prope Nemetas*, and given by Henzen, n. 5904 :---

MARTI·ET·NEMETO NAE SILVIN IVSTVS ET·DVBITATVS •V·S·L·L·P

^{*} Mr. Scarth, on reading this conjecture, examined the stone, which is in the possession of the Bath Institution, and ascertained its correctness. See a paper by him in the *Journal* of the Arch. Assoc., 1861, p. 9.

Leucetius seems to be derived from Leuci, and Nemetona from Nemetes, both being names of peoples in the neighbourhood of the Treviri.* It is scarcely necessary to add, that there is no foundation for Mr. Warner's assertion, that "Peregrinus is merely an appellative." The name often occurs in inscriptions; and it must be borne in mind that the use of but one name was not uncommon among the Gauls. The meaning of CIVIS TREVER, also, is not "a citizen of Treves," but a Trever citizen, *i. e.*, a citizen of the people called Treveri, or Treviri.

§ 90. Restorations of imperfect inscriptions, although subjects of agreeable speculation, are generally very hazardous, excepting those cases in which the extant words or letters are parts of formulæ, and then a perfectly reliable reading may be supplied from known examples. It is very different, however, when the attempt is made to complete a fragment by supplying facts supposed to have been stated in the missing or mutilated portions. In such cases the restoration, although sometimes ingenious, is scarcely ever more than plausible. A notable example is presented by Governor Pownall's well-known restoration of the imperfect inscription on stones found in Bath, and believed to to have formed part of the frieze of the †temple of Minerva in that city. The fragments are figured in Warner's History of Bath, pl. 1, fig. 7, and the words on them are thus read by the Rev. H. M. Scarth, Journal of the British Archeological Association, 1857, p. 266 :

(1.) (2.) LAVDIVS·LIGVR OLEGIO·LONGA·SERIA E·NIMIA·VETVST VNIA·REFICI·ET·REPINGI·CVR

^{*} Of these derivations, the latter appears to be certain, but the former doubtful, as we have evidence that Jupiter was called *Leucelius*, as the giver of light. See A. Gell. Nocl. Att. v. 12; Festus, x. i., and Serv. on Virgil, *Zn.* ix. 570. Another derivation, which has been proposed, from *Leuce*, an island in the Euxine, is very improbable.

[†] The only ancient authority for this temple is the following passage in Solinus:—"fonles calid opiparo exculti apparatu ad usus mortalium; quibus fontibus præsul est Minervæ numen, in cujus æde perpetui ignes nunquam canescunt in favillas sed ubi ignis tabuit, vertit in globos sazeos." The identity of the second syllable of præsul with the Celtic name of the goddess suggests that Solinus may have referred to it when he used the word, but the suspicion is groundless, as he says in another place, of Angerona:—diva præsul silentii. Mr. Whitaker seems to have attached great importance to this passage in Solinus, and has built up some theories on it. In his estimate of its value I cannot concur; the facts and the Latinity of Solinus seem to me equally worthless. I am not disposed, however, to question the existence of a temple of Minerva in Bath, as it is otherwise probable.

From these fragments Governor Pownall invented the following restoration :---

[AVLVS·C]LAVDIVS·LIGVR[IVS·SODALIS·ASCITVS FABRORVM·C]OLEGIO·LONGA·SERIA·[DEFOSSA HANC·AEDEM·]E·NIMIA·VETVST[ATE·LABENTEM DE·INVENTA·ILLIC·PEC]VNIA·RFFICI·ET·REPIN-GI·CVR[AVIT·]

The supplied words and letters I have placed between brackets [].

The idea of *Claudius Ligurius* being a member of the college or company of smiths, was evidently suggested, as Mr. Scarth observes, by the inscription to *Julius Vitalis*, in which it is stated that he (*Vitalis*) was ex *colegio fabrice elatus. The objections to the use of the words—tsodalis ascitus fabrorum colegio—in the connection in which they appear, are, if the word be intended to mean on the occasion of his election or appointment, the money for the repairing and repainting, should, according to usage, have been provided from his own funds; and if the words be intended merely as an honorary designation, there is no authority, so far as I am aware, for their use in this sense under such circumstances.

Tacitus Ann. i., 8. Conclamant patres corpus ad rogum humeris senatorum ferendum.

^{*} It has been inferred from these words, that there was a *fabrica*, *i. e.*, a public factory of arms, in or near Bath, although the *Noidia*, whilst noticing similar establishments in different parts of the empire, does not mention it. This possibly may have been the fact, but it cannot be inferred from this inscription. As *Vitalis* was one of the *fubri* or *fabricenses* attached to the 20th legion, the collegium, who manifested their regard for him by a funeral at their expense, was most probably the association of smiths or armourers in that legions. Thus in Orelli, n. 4922, we find mention of the collegia frumentariorum in the 8th and 13th legions. Eduas (Orelli, n. 4715, 4716) denotes that the corpse was borne to the place of interment on the shoulders—thus Horace, Sat. ii. 5:--

Ex testamento sic est elata : cadaver

Unclum oleo largo nudis humeris tulit hæres.

We may also infer that this was a walking functal, the procession being formed of the members of collegium who followed the body on foot. FABRICE may stand either for FABRICE[N31VM]; or for FABRIC[A]E. Orelli, n. 4079, adopts the latter, referring it, however, to the *fubrica* of the legion.

[†] Governor Pownall seems to have attached undue importance to membership in a collegium fabrum. There were handreds of such collegia or organizations of tradesmen, mechanics, and labourers of every class throughout the Roman Empire. The collegia fabrum alone may be counted by dozens; and we are not without examples of collegia dendrophororum, multionum et asinariorum, suariorum et confectuariorum, whose members respectively occupied positions in society about the same as English porters, waggoners, and pork-butchers.

The words seria and pecunia suggested the invention of the story about the money having been found in a vessel. The objections to this application of longa seria defossa are—the word longa seems inappropriate when applied to seria, even though its shape is said to have been oblonga; and defossa does not signify dug up, which seems to have been the meaning intended, but buried, so that the translation of the words, as they stand, would be, a long earthen vessel having been buried, not having been dug up, and moreover, that Aulus Claudius Ligurius had himself buried it. If seria be the correct reading the most probable prima facie reference would be to the seria which was kept in temples. Thus :—

Lamprid. *Heliogab. c.* 6. "Penetrale sacrum [Vestæ] est auferre conatus : cumque *seriam*, quasi veram, rapuisset, atque in ea nihil reperisset, applosam fregit."

But it seems not unlikely that either the true reading of the word on the stone is serie, or that the final a is a mistake in orthography for e. We have thus longu serie, and if we supply annorum, this phrase and nimia velustate will agree well with refici et repingi. Thus in Orelli, n. 3300, we have PERMVLTO TEMPORE VETVSTATE CONLAPSVS; and in Renier, Inscriptions d l'Algérie, n. 109, MVLTORVM INCVRIA DILAPSVM ET PER LONGAM ANNORVM SERIEM As to the age of the inscription, a surmise NEGLECTVM. may perhaps be formed with some reason from the use of the word repingi, a verb, which I do not recollect having seen in any Latin writer earlier than the 6th century, A.D. On the restoration as a whole, it is unnecessary to say more than that I am persuaded that no one familiar with Latin Epigraphy would mistake it for a genuine inscription : indeed it is not as plausible as many of the Ligorian forgeries.

§ 91. That there was a goddess worshipped at Bath under the name *Sul, there can be no doubt. She is named in inscriptions on four altars, and on a tombstone found in that city. Of the inscriptions on these altars, two of them prove that she was

^{*} Henzen regards the nominative as Sulis.

identified with Minerva. The similarity of the name suggests that she may have been the same as Sulivia Idennica Minerva, in n. 2051, of Orelli's Inscriptions; and also leads to the belief, that there was some connection between her, and the Sulevæ, Sulevia, Sulvia, or Silvana, mentioned in Orelli's nn. 2099, 2101, 2103. The terms Suleris et Campestribus in 2101, and Silvanab. et Quadribis, (i. e., Silvanubus et Quadriviis) in 2103, favour the opinion, that the Sulevæ should be classed amongst the Matres, traces of whose worship have been commonly found, especially in Germany, Belgium, and Britain. Mr. Scarth. Journal of the Archaeological Association, 1861, p. 16, regards them as "probably attendant nymphs" of Sul; and to Mr. Roach Smith, Roman London, p. 38, "they appear to have been Sylphs, the tutelary divinities of rivers, fountains, hills, roads, villages, and other localities, against whom were especially directed, in the fifth and subsequent centuries, the anathemas of Christian councils, missionaries, and princes."

Dr. Thurnam, in the very able dissertation on the "Historical Ethnology of Britain," in *Crania Britannica*, Dec. iv. p. 130, observes :---

"Under that of Sul, a Welsh name of the sun, he (Apollo) was worshipped in Brittany, where, under Christianity, he was represented by a pretended St. Sul. There are traces of this name in that of various hills—Solsbury, Salisbury, Silbury—at Bath, Ribchester, Edinburgh, and Abury, which are so many high places of the Sun-god, or Celtic Apollo." * *

"The Celts had not only a great male divinity representing the Sun, but likewise a female one symbolising the passive powers of nature, and by whom the Moon (as by the Syrian Astarte or Venus-Urania) was originally intended."

* * * * * * * * *

"The goddess worshipped conjointly with Apollo at Aquæ Solis [or, as others prefer, Aquæ Sulis] was clearly the Celtic Minerva, as appears from the epithet SVL, by which she was there known, and which, like that of Baalsemen [Lord of Heaven], had both a feminine and masculine application. The Solimara, [Oreki, n. 2050], worshipped by the Bituriges may have been the same as the British Sul."

§ 91. The following is a copy of the inscription on the Bath altar, in which the Sulevæ are named:

SVLEVIS SVLINVS SCVLTOR BRV[C]ETI·F SACRVM·F·L·M

Mr. Scarth remarks :—"In the name of the dedicator we have an instance of the name of an individual derived from the presiding deity of the waters [*i. e.*, *Sul.*]; this is also to be remarked on another altar—*Sulinus Maturi fil.*" This account of the etymology of the name seems probable, especially when we call to mind the Greek and Roman usage of forming names of persons from the names of their deities, such as *Hermogenes, Jovinus, §c.*

The prima facie interpretation of the three middle lines. scil., "Sulinus Scultor, the son of Brucetus," is liable to the objections, that the Sulinus of the other altar has but one name; and that "the last three lines of this inscription are in letters much smaller, and not so deeply cut as the first two lines," whence "Mr. Hunter thinks that the first two lines are the original inscription and that the others were added afterwards." This peculiarity suggests the the conjecture that the first inscription was left imperfect, and that a different person, 'Scultor, the son of Brucetus' took the vacant space for his inscription consisting of the last three But the Greek and Roman stone cutters seem to have been lines. so capricious as to the size of the letters and the depth of the cutting in the same inscription, that we are scarcely warranted in inferring in this case two inscriptions. I am inclined to think that Scultor is not a name of a person, but the designation of an occupation, scil., sculptor, the carver or stone-cutter, i. e., "Sulinus the carver."

This conjecture is supported by the use of the rare formula $\mathbf{F}\cdot\mathbf{L}\cdot\mathbf{M}\cdot$, which I read *fecit libens merito*. If the representation of the altar, as given by Mr. Warner in pl. 2, fig. 6, be accurate, there is reason to suspect the reading BRV[C]ETI·F., as in that representation it seems to be more probably BRVCI·FIL·, or rather BRVSCI·FIL., as in one of the Lincoln inscriptions, noticed in Art. 32 of these notes.

§ 93. The opinion, which I have expressed in the last article, relative to *Sulinus* and *Scultor* is favoured by an examination of the inscription on another altar, *scil.*:

DEAE SVLIMI NERVAE SVLINVS MATV RIFIL VSLM.

i. e., Deze Suli Minervæ, Sulinus, Maturi filius, votum solvit libens merito.

It may, I think, be reasonably inferred, from the apparent etymology of the name *Sulinus*, and from the circumstance, that the individual had but one name, that the dedicator was a barbarian, *i. e.*, a native Briton, or Gaul. This inference derives support from the order of the words SVLI MINERVAE. If the dedicator had been a Roman, or a Romanized provincial, he would probably have conformed to the usage of placing the designation of the Roman deity first, and that of the identified barbarian deity second. There are many examples of this usage. Amongst the most obvious are *Marti Camulo*, *Apollini Toutiorigi*, *Dianæ Abnobæ*.

§ 94. The tomb-stone, to which reference was made in art. 91, bears the following inscription :---

D. M. C.CALPVRNVS [R]ECEPTVS SACER DOS DEAE SV LIS VIX AN LXXV CA[LP]VRNIA TRIFO SA[THR]EPTE CONIVNX F. C.

Mr. Scarth's remarks on it are :---

"This is expanded thus by Mr. Lysons :— Diis Manibus Caius Calpurnius Receptus Sacerdos Deæ Sulis, vixit annos septuaginta quinque, Calpurnia

Trifosa Threpte conjunx faciendum curavit.' Mr. Hunter, in the Bath Institution Catalogue, observes that *Receptus* may be an appellation of Calpurnius, or it may signify that he was an 'admitted' priest of the goddess Sul."

Of the two interpretations mentioned by Mr. Hunter, I prefer the former, *scil.*, *Receptus* as a *cognomen*. The omission of the *cognomen* belongs to an age much anterior to the date of the grave-stone; and besides if the latter had been intended, the order would probably have been *Sacerdos receptus*.

The strangeness of the names of his wife might, perhaps, lead some to question the correctness of the reading, but on examination they will, I think, be found to be free from objection. According to my view of them, they afford evidence that the priest married a Greek slave, that was born and brought up in TRIFOSA and THREPTE suggests that she his own house. was Greek, and CALPVRNIA and THREPTE that she had TRIFOSA, TRYFOSA, TRIPHOSA and been his slave. TRYPHOSA are all Latinized forms of a Greek female name, taken, as Sympherusa, Prepusa, Terpusa and many others, from the nominative singular feminine of the present participle active, i. e., TRTP $\Omega\Sigma A$ or $\tau \rho \upsilon \phi \hat{\omega} \sigma a$, from the verb $\tau \rho \upsilon \phi \dot{a} \omega$, the same name that is found in St. Paul's Epist. ad Rom. xvi. 12. THREPTE, or TREPTE as it is otherwise written, is used as a cognomen, but as the female mentioned here already has one, scil., Tryphosa—I regard the word as standing for $\theta \rho \epsilon \pi \tau \eta$, the Greek term corresponding to the Latin verna.

It is scarcely necessary to add, that, according to usage, she took her first name *Calpurnia* from the *nomen gentilitium* of her master.

It is worthy of observation, that two of the altars, dedicated Deæ Suli, were erected, probably, by Greek slaves who had been manumitted, viz., Aufidius Lemnus,* (Lemnius?) and Aufidius Eutuches (Eutyches?). These liberti took their names Aufidius from their master, Marcus Aufidius Maximus, who is mentioned

^{*} In Mommsen's Inscript. Neapol. n. 4333, we have LEMNIVS LIBERTVS.

in each of the inscriptions, retaining, according to usage, as cognomina, their servile appellations-Lemnus (or Lemnius?), probably from his birth-place Lemnos in the Ægean, and Eutyches, from $\epsilon v \tau v \chi \eta \varsigma$ lucky. It is well known that some slaves were called after their birth-place, e. gr., Syrus, Geta, Cappadox, &c.; and others, from reputed or real characteristics. Mr. Warner's supposition (as noticed by Mr. Scarth) that "the name EVTVCHES is EIVS ADOPTATVS HERES" is unintelligible. If his meaning be that the name implies that he was "the adopted heir of his master," there is not the slightest foundation for the supposition, either in the name or in the inscription. Mr. Warner with equally little reason supposes the altars to have been erected by the same freedman. Mr. Hunter and Mr. Scarth infer from the name CALPVRNIVS the rank of this priest as "a member of the noble Calpurnian family." To me there seems to be no ground for this inference; indeed, so far as we know, we may have derived this name, as a libertus, from the nomen gentilitium of his master. As to his connection with Quintus Calpurnius Concessinius, "legate in Britain under Caracalla," it is sufficient to observe, that there was no person of that name who is known to have held the office of legate. Mr. Wright, Celt, Roman, and Saxon, p. 358, mentions an individual with the first two of these names as a governor of Britain, "believed to be of the age of Commodus," but this statement is erroneous. The only Quintus Calpurnius Concessinius, known in inscriptions found in Britain, was a præfectus equitum. See Horsley, Brit. Rom., Northumberland, cviii., and art. 67 of my notes.

§ 95. In December, 1854, two coffins, evidently of the Roman period, were found at Combe Down, near Bath. One of these was partly covered by a stone bearing the following inscriptions :

> PRO-SALVTE IMP-CES-M-AVR ANTONINI PII FELICIS INVIC TI AVG. NAEVIVS AVG LIB ADIVT PROCC PR. I PIA RVINA OPRESS-A SOLO RES TITVIT.

Mr. Hunter, Archaelogical Journal, March, 1855, supplies M after I in the 4th line, and gives the following explanation :

"For the safety,—or whatever salus in this connection, where we for ever find it, may mean,—of the emperor Cæsar Marcus Aurelius Antoninus Pius, happy, invincible, (or unconquered) Augustus, (supply a prenomen where the stone is damaged, probably one represented by two letters, as CN). Nævius, a freedman of Augustus, the adjutor of the procurators, (then comes the doubtful word, which perhaps may be PROVINCIE), restored from its foundations, (this building, temple, or whatever it was, for the edifice was there to speak for itself), when it had been thrown down by an impions act of ruination.

Another reading of the doubtful word may be PRIMARIVS, and I think some one suggested PRETORIVM. I fear the word is too far gone for any one to venture to pronounce conclusively what the reading of it is.

A question arising upon this inscription is, which of the emperors, calling themselves Antoninus, it commemorates. It is a question of about fifty years, A. D. 180-230. On a first view one would refer it to Marcus Aurelius, the immediate successor of Antoninus Pius, the first of the Antonines, and I see not why it should not belong to his reign, unless it can be shown (a point I have not examined) that his name is never found in inscriptions with the additions Felix and Invictus. If it shall appear that his name does not occur with these additions, then undoubtedly it may be assigned to the three years' reign of Heliogabalus, or to any intermediate emperor who called himself Antoninus, and who is known to have used those additions. But at present I see no improbability in assigning it to the emperor so well known by his name of Marcus Aurelius."

Mr. Hunter here offers a conjecture that *impia* may refer to "some religious or political ferment," and cites in illustration the words *locum religiosum per insolentiam erutum*, found in another of the Bath inscriptions.

"Nævius the Adjutor, a Roman officer, to whose dutics sufficient attention seems hardly to have been paid by the writers on Roman antiquities, may seem to have been the proper officer to superintend this re-edification.

His name, I believe, is not found in any other inscription discovered in England. But in Gruter, civ., No. 9, we have—P. Nævius, Adjutor, in an inscription found at Tarracona. We find also, in Gruter, ccclxxi., No. 8, Adjutore Procc. Civitatis Senonum Tricassinorum Meldorum, &c., which shows that the Adjutor to the Procurators is not an officer unknown to inscriptions."

In the same number of the *Journal*, we have also Dr. Bruce's observations :---

"As far as my present knowledge goes, I am disposed to expand the inscription thus :---

Pro salute Imperatoris Cæsaris Marci Aurelii Antonini Pii Felicis Invicti Augusti Nævius Augusti libertus adjutor Procuratorum principia ruina oppressa a solo restituit.

It may be translated in something like this form :—For the safety of the emperor Cæsar Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, the pious, fortunate and invincible Augustus ... Nævius, the freedman of Augustus and the assistant of the Procurators restored these chief military quarters, which had fallen to ruin.

The first question that arises here is respecting the emperor, specially addressed. I find that the names and epithets used in this inscription are in others applied both to Caracalla and Heliogabalus, with the exception of the word invictus; and in no other instance that I can find is this applied to either of these emperors. I incline to Mr. Franks' opinion, that Heliogabalus is the person here intended, for the following reasons :--- 1. On the murder of Heliogabalus his name seems to have been erased from inscriptions, or the slabs themselves thrown down. This stone having been used to cover a tomb must have previously been removed from its original position. 2. From the indistinctness of some of the letters, I take it for granted that the inscription is not deeply carved; this, together with the omission of the A in Cæsaris, and the occurrence of tied letters, seems to indicate the *later rather than earlier period. 3. Had Caracalla been the person intended one of his well known epithets, such as Parthicus, Britannicus or Germanicus. would probably have occupied the place of invictus; so far as I have noticed, Heliogabalus had earned no such distinctions; his flatterers, therefore, on his assuming the purple, would have no resource but to bestow upon him the indefinite title of invictus.

The next thing which occurs in it is the name of the dedicator. Mr. Hunter remarked that the name NAEVIVS occurred in Gruter. It is not without interest to observe, that one of the examples furnished by that author (P. civ., No. 9,) contains that name with the epithet *adjutor* appended.

TVTELÆ V. S. P. NAEVIVS ADIVTOR.

The Nævius of the slab found at Bath was a freedman of Augustus, and an assistant or secretary of the procurators of the province. We are not without an authority for the reading *Adjutor Procuratorum*. In Gruter (P., ccclxxvi, No. 8), the following occurs :--

* See my note, p. 162.

.....MEMORLÆ AVRELI DEMETRI ADIVTORI PROCC

The word which I conceive to be *principia* presents the greatest difficulty. It appears that the stone is damaged in this part. We are necessarily driven to conjecture in order to supply the vacuity between the N and the I at the end of the fourth line. The inscription speaks of the restoration of something which had become ruinous. If I correctly read the other parts of the inscription which seem to be quite plain, this is the only word left to reveal to us the precise object of the dedicator's exertions. In the station at Lanchester, a slab has been found (Horsley, Durham. No. xii.), containing on its third and fourth lines the following words:—

PRINCIPIA ET ARMAMEN TARIA CONLAPSA RESTITVIT.

Here we have evidence that there was a class of buildings called *principia*, which, like other buildings, would fall into ruin and require restoration. This word seems best to suit the damaged part of the inscription before us. The only letters that we require to draw upon the imagination for are the first I in the word, which has probably been attached to the top of the left limb of the N, and the C, for which there is sufficient room on that injured part of the stone between the N and the I. Perhaps the word *principia* might be translated officers' barracks. The remainder of the inscription require no remarks."

In the number for June, 1855, Mr. Franks states the grounds of his conviction that the tablet should be assigned to the reign of Elagabalus :---

"The inscription can only apply to Caracalla or Elagabalus, but it does not appear that the epithet *Invictus* was given to the former. There are, however, coins of Elagabalus on which he is thus styled. The inscription may have suffered mutilation in a slight degree, and the popular indignation, which defaced or destroyed the memorials of the Emperor, may possibly account for the occurrence of this tablet used as a part of the cover of a sepulchral cist."

The Rev. H. M. Scarth, by whom the stone was purchased and presented to the Bath Institution, communicated a very interesting paper on the subject to the Somersetshire Archæological and Natural History Society, in which he gives full particulars of the discovery of the coffins, and expresses his assent to Dr. Bruce's interpretation of the inscription.

The only difficulties in the text of the inscription relate to the prænomen of Navius, and the word or words between PROCC and RVINA. As to the first it is of but little moment and can never be determined with certainty or probability. It may have been *Publius*, as in Gruter, civ. 9, but it must be borne in mind that in that inscription ADIVTOR is more probably a cognomen and not the designation of an office.

With reference to the word or words between PROCC and RVINA, Dr. Bruce's citation of the inscription given by Horsley, (Durham, n. xii.) seems to remove all doubts on the point. I do not, however, feel quite satisfied with the interpretation of the word *principia, as "chief military quarters" or "officers' barracks;" or of ruina oppressa, as "which had fallen into ruin."

The latter expression, which is so rare that I have been unable to find any tother example in inscriptions, seems to me to indicate that the *principia*, whatever they were, were destroyed by the falling of something else,—either the building of which they formed a part, or some adjacent edifice. It is certainly in this sense that the words are used by Cicero, de Oratore, ii., 86, "ca ruina *ipsum* oppressum cum suis periisse.

The ordinary form of expression, which is found in inscriptions, relating to the falling of buildings, is *vctustate collapsum*. In Steiner, *Cod. Inscrip. Rom. Rhen.* n. 852, we find the following variety, approaching that in the text :---

DIS·CONSER VATORIBVS·Q·TAR QVITIVS·CATVL VS·LEG·AVG· CVIVS·CVRA·PRAETOR IVM·IN·RVINAM CONLAPSVM·AD·NO VAM·FACIEM· RESTITVTVM·

But the principal and most interesting question relates to the emperor, whose names and titles are given.

* See	p. (59.
-------	------	-----

† In Henzen's n. 7392 we have RVINA PARIETIS OPPRESSVS applied to a person.

As there were three emperors, each of whom was commonly known as *Marcus Aurelius Antoninus Pius*, our only hope of determining to which of them we should refer the inscription, is in the other epithets *Fclix* and *Invictus*. Now there is satisfactory evidence that Commodus was the first Roman Emperor to whom the epithet *fclix* was given, and consequently the question is limited to Caracalla and Elagabalus.* That the epithet *invictus* was applied to the first of these cannot be questioned, as the following examples leave no doubt on the subject.

١III•

IMP · CAESAR M.AVRELIVS ANTONINVS INVICTVS.PIVS.FELIX.AVG. PART·MAX·BRIT·MAX·GERM MAX · PONT · MAX · TRIB · POTES[T] XVIIII · IMP · III · COS · IIII · PROCOS VIAM·ANTE·HAC·LAPIDE[I]AM **INVTILITER·STRATAM·ET** CORRVPTAM·SILICE·NOVO QVO.FIRMIOR.COMMEANTIBVS ESSET · PER · MILIA · [PAS] SVM·XXI·SVA·PECVNIA FECIT LXXI. (Monmsen, Inscrip. Neapol., p. 354.) IMP · CAES · M · AVRELIO ANTONINO · PIO · FELICI INVICTO · AVG · PARTH MAX · BRITANN · MAX PONT·MAX·TRIB·POT·XVI IMP·II·COS·IV·P·P·PROCOS DOMINO INDVLGENTISSIMO NEGOTIANTES VASCVLARI **CONSERVATORI-SVO** NVMINI · EIVS DEVOTI (Henzen, Inscrip. Lat., n. 7262.)

^{*} There are one or two inscriptions, in which Commodus is styled M. Aurelius Antoninus Fius Aug. Filix, and Invictus, but, however, the question in the present case seems to be properly limited to Caracalla and Elagabalus.

From Eckhel, VII., 179, we learn that the epithet was also given to him on coins.

The use of this term in the case of Elagabalus, although probable in consequence of his assumption of other titles of Caracalla,* cannot, so far as I am aware, be established by any inscription clearly belonging to him. But Mr. Franks, *Archeological Journal*, June, states, that "there are coins of Elagabalus in which he is thus styled." I am not aware of any such, excepting those noticed by Eckhel, VII., p. 249, and Rasche II., ii., p. 792, as bearing the legend INVICTVS SACERDOS AVG, where *invictus* seems to be applied to him as priest of Sol, of whom that term is a *perpetuum epitheton*.

If we assign the inscription to Caracalla, a question still remains as to the date of it. As there is no mention of either Severus or Geta, it is most probable that it was after the death of both. Now Severus died at York in February, A. D. 211; and Caracalla and Geta left England in the same year, for Rome, where Geta was murdered in February, A.D. 212. The limits the nare February, 212, and April, 217, when Caracalla himself was murdered. The statement, by Eckhel, that *Felix* did not appear on the coins of Caracalla until A. D. 213, suggested to me that year as one of the *cancelli*, but there is unquestionable evidence that *Felix* was amongst his epithets on stones before that date, not only in conjunction with his father, (of which there are well known examples,) but also separately after his accession.

§ 96. The following inscriptions are on pigs of lead found in different parts of this county :

BRITANNIC * * AVG II

TI·CLAVDIVS·CAESAR.AVG·P·M·TRIB·P·VIIII· IMP•XVI·DE·BRITAN·

^{*} Dio Cassius, lxxix., 2, states that he assumed the titles Casar, Augustus, Imperator, Proconsul, Trib. Pot., Ant. Fil. and Severi Nep. From coins, however, we learn that this is not a complete enumeration, as he is styled on some of these Pater Patria.

IMP•HADRIANI•AVG

IMP•DVOR AVG ANTONINI ET VERI ARMENIACORVM

For remarks on these and other similar relics, see § 16.

STAFFORDSHIRE.

§ 97. At Hints, in this county, a block of lead was found bearing the inscription

 $IMP \cdot VESP \cdot \overline{VII} \cdot T \cdot IMP \cdot \overline{V} \cdot COS$

On this see § 16.

SUSSEX.

§ 98. At Pulborough, in this county, four blocks of lead were found bearing the inscription

_

TI·CL·TR·LVT·BR·EX·ARG

On this see §16.

WILTSHIRE.

§ 99. About 200 years ago, a cup made of brass, or bronze, with an inscription round the outer rim, was found in a well at Rudge in Wiltshire. It is figured in Horsley's *Britannia Ro*mana, and the inscription may be thus represented on a plane surface :



He reads it:—ABALLAVA UXELODUM CAMBOGLANS BANNA A MAIS; and adopts the explanation offered by Mr. Gale, who supposed "it may have been a *patera*, used in libations by the people of those towns that are mentioned on it." In confirmation of this supposition, it is remarked :

"Sacrifices were generally offered by the ancients, when they met together upon any solemn occasions sometimes only when they were assembled for mirth and feasting, as is evident from many passages, which mention this custom among them. Why then might there not be an alliance or society formed among these five neighbouring places, and perhaps a feast annually or more frequently observed by them when they jointly made their libations out of one comfion *patera*, inscribed with all their names, as a token of their friendship and unanimity ?

> Post iidem inter se, posito certamine, reges Armati, Jovis ante aras, paterasque tenentes Stabant, et cæsa jungebant fædera porca.

Here indeed each king appears to have had his own patera, whereas in the other case it is supposed that one and the same patera was common to several places. The gentleman [Mr. Gale], however, would therefore have the inscription read, A Mais, Aballava, Uxelodumo, Amboglanis, Banna; supposing all the names to be in the ablative, governed by the preposition a, and that the C before Amboglans has been designed for an O, and is to be joined to Uxelodum which therefore makes it Uxelodumo."

To this Horsley adds-

"These five places were near to each other, and all of them upon that part of the wall, where probably the inroads were most frequently made; and consequently where the greater danger might make it more necessary for the several garrisons to enter into a stricter confederacy for their mutual strength and relief."

He also notices a conjecture, which he had at one time entertained : --

"This object might have been some way fixed to the top of an *hasta* or military ensign. Somewhat like this does sometimes appear (if I am not mistaken) on the *Roman vexilla*. If this could be admitted, we need only suppose, that the cohort to which this ensign belonged had been in garrison and perhaps behaved themselves well at the several places, whose names are inscribed round this ornament; such a matter of fact would be sufficient ground for this inscription."

In answer to the question, "what brought it from Cumberland to Wiltshire"? he remarks :---

"So small a vessel might easily be transported from one part of the kingdom to another, even the most distant, and that on a thousand occasions which it is needless to mention. The learned Baron Clerk supposes that this *patera* may have been thrown into the well, where it was found, after some solemn libation. In those days wells were esteemed sacred, and sacrificing to them was common."

As to the age of the object, he makes the following observations :---

"It is a little surprising that the name Banna on this cup should be exactly the same with what is in the anonymous Ravennas; though that name occurs no where else, and the place intended by it be most probably the same that is called Petriana in the Notilia, as I have shewn in another place. This, and the omission of Congavata (or Stanwicks) upon the cup, though that when built stood between Aballaba and Axelodunum, and is mentioned

in the Notitia, among the stations per linear valli, looks as if the cup was more ancient than the Notitia, and prior to the building of the station at Stanwicks, near Carlisle. This, I think, is also more agreeable to the historical account of the Roman affairs in Britain; for I see no evidence of their having any garrisons or settlements in the west of England, so late as the Notitia, and it is more probable that this vase, of whatsoever kind it be, has been left at the place, where it was discovered, by the Romans themselves, rather than any other."

Dr. Bruce, Roman Wall, 2nd ed., p. 252, remarks :---

"The inscription manifestly contains a reference to five places in the neighbourhood [of the station of Amboglanna]. It has been read, A MAIS, ABALLAVA, VXELODVMO, AMBOGLANIS, BANNA. Except MAIS be the MAGNA of the Notitia, AMBOGLANNA is the only place named whose position can be said to have been ascertained with any tolerable degree of accuracy. As, however, ABALLABA and AXELODVNVM follow shortly after AMBOGLANNA in the Notitia list, though not continuously, all of these were no doubt camps situated on the western limit of the wall. BANNA is not mentioned in the Notitia; Hodgson hazards the conjecture that it was Bewcastle."

Mr. MacLaughlan, Memoir written during a Survey of the Roman Wall, p. 74, expresses the opinion that Stanwiz represents the Axelodunum of the Notitia:—

"The situation seems to agree, together with the nature of the ground, that it should have been so called [from *azel* or *achel*, *high*, *lofty*, and *denum*, a *fortress*]; and equally so with the Rudge cup: for supposing the cup to have been consecrated to a party of hunters, no country could, in those days, have afforded more wild animals than the district between Stanwix and Burdoswald [Azelodunum and Amboglanna]."

To these observations he subjoins the note :---

"The words on the Rudge cup, in the Duke of Northumberland's possession, are: A. Mais Aballava Uxelodum Camboglans Banna. It will be observed that there is a stop placed on each side the letter A. which precedes the word Mais; hence we should be disposed to take Maia, Watchcross, first; Aballava Brampton, second; Uxelodum, Stanwix, third; Camboglans, Petriana, Walton House, fourth; and Banna, Burdoswald, fifth. The A. preceding Mais is doubtless the preposition as at the commencement of each iter of Antonine. The difficulty in identifying Banna has been stated. See page 54, note ante. It occurs in the Ravenna list, and on the altar to Silvanus, found at Burdoswald. Bruce, R. W., p. 395."

In the note, p. 54, Mr. M. remarks :---

"Amboglanna has been supposed by some to be the Banna of the Rudge cup; and there seems no reason why it should not be known by two equally descriptive denominations." * * * * * * Banna is mentioned as a station by Ravennas, in the description of Britain, written, as is supposed, about A.D. 650. The order in which the name there occurs would lead to the idea that it may be the same as Amboglanna or Petriana; whilst the former, being found on the Rudge cup, preceding Banna, seems to identify Banna with Petriana."

The first difficulty which presents itself, in treating this inscription, is as to the beginning. In my judgment, the commencement should be with Banna, as the words seem to have been intended for an Hexameter, *scil*.

Banna Camboglans Uxelodum Aballava Mais a.

As it seems doubtful whether it was intended that A should be taken into account, it may be that *Mais* should be read *Ma-is* for *Maiis*, the proper dative and ablative of *Maia*, orum. The doubt regarding A is suggested by the full point on either side of it, which may denote either that it is not to be connected with *Banna* or *Mais*, or that it may be joined with either.

There is no difficulty as to the metre, if A be regarded as the preposition governing *Banna*, or both *Banna* and *Mais*; nor even, without this, if we take *Banna* as the nominative, is the lengthening of the last syllable a sufficient reason for rejecting the intended Hexameter. Some of the verses found in epigraphy are very poor specimens of accuracy in syntax or prosody—*e. gr.*, Bruce, *Roman Wall*, p. 396.

Somnio præmonitus miles hanc ponere jussit Aram quæ Fabio nupta est nymphis venerandis.

But with what object have the names of these places been inscribed on the cup? The first thought, and that chiefly suggested by A regarded as a preposition, would be that the inscription recorded the route between two places, as in an Itinerary. This suspicion may be supported by the discovery noticed

206

by Dr. Bruce, "of * three silver cups, bearing outside an inscription, containing the itinerary of the road from Rome If this view be taken, and A be regarded as to Cadiz." governing only Mais, the meaning will be that a person starting from Maia for Banna must pass through Aballava, Uxelodum, and Camboglans. If A be regarded as governing both Banna and Mais, the meaning will be-a person starting from Banna for Aballava must pass though Camboglans and Uxelodum, and a person starting from Maia for Camboglans must pass through Aballava and Uxelodum; or a person starting from Banna for Uxelodum must pass through Camboglans, and a person starting from Maia for Uxelodum must pass through Aballava. But what possible difficulty can there have been, such as to render it necessary or expedient to have any one of these routes recorded on a cup? Besides, a serious difficulty presents itself as to the order of these places, when compared with the statement in the Notitia. The latter authority-on the supposition that the stations per lineam valli are given in due order from east to west-would lead us to place Aballava between Camboglans (whether it stand for Amboglanna or Petriana) and Axelodunum, whilst on the cup Uxelodum, the presumed representative of Axelodunum, comes between Camboglans and Aballava. In support, however, of the arrangement on the cup it has been stated that the order on it is similar to that given in the chorography of the Anonymus Ravennas, scil., Banna, Uxeludiano, Avalaria, Maia. Here, although Camboqlans is omitted, Axelodunum and Aballava may be regarded as represented respectively by Uxeludianum and Avalaria.

In my judgment, it is labour thrown away to endeavour to reconcile the order of the places on the cup with their geographical positions, as I believe that they are arranged as they stand, simply because this arrangement of them gives an hexameter, *i. e.*,

Banna | Cambo | glans Ux | elodum A | ballava | Mais a.

^{*} See Marchi, La stipa tributata alle divinità delle Acque Apollinari, 1862; and Henzen, n. 5210, where the inscriptions are given. An examination of these inscriptions does not at all favour the suspicion.

The meaning of the two points, one before and the other after A, may be to indicate that the hexameter may be formed with or without it, and may begin with either *Mais* or *Banna*.

Of the various Hexameters, which thus result, I prefer either Banna Camboglans Uxelodum Aballava Mais a

or

Banna Camboglans Uxelodum Aballava Ma-is;

and regard A not as a preposition, but as *standing for amicitiæ, scil., causå, or amicitiam, as we have commonly salutem, with Mais in the dative. In this I am influenced by the conjecture that the cup was a token of the friendship subsisting between the four towns and Maia, either presented by them to the latter or made in commemoration of this amity on some special occasion. I prefer this conjecture, which resembles that adopted by Horsley, to the suggestion that it may have been a cup made for a party of hunters. Horsley's idea that it was "fixed on the top of an hasta or military ensign," seems to me highly improbable; nor can I accept his view as to its antiquity. The shape of the letters and the style of the ornamental pattern seem to indicate a later date than any assigned to the Notitia.

208

[•] There are examples of A standing for Amicus, a sense in which it may perhaps have been used here.

§ 100. In Horsley's Britannia Romana, n. 15, we have the following inscription :---

DMS CADIEDI * IAE FO * TVNA * PIA·V·AX *

He expands it thus : Dis Manibus sacrum Cadiedinice Fortuna Pia vixit annos decem. Mr. Ward had previously read it: "Cadillae Jeriae Piae Fortunata Pia, all which names are in Gruter." It is obvious that Mr. Ward's reading should be at According to the process which he adopted, once rejected. almost any thing could be made out of any thing with the help of the Index to Gruter. I am not satisfied, however, with Horsley's The chief objection, which I have to it, arises from expansion. the singularity of the names Cadiedinia, and Fortuna Pia. There can, I think, be no doubt that pia is not a name, but an adjective expressing the character of the deceased female. There are many examples of this use of pius and pia, e. gr., Renier's Inscriptions de l' Algérie, n. 2814 :---

DMS SITTIA MENOPHI LA·PIA·VIX ANXXV HSE

i. e., Dis Manibus sacrum. Sittia Menophila. Pia vixit annis viginti quinque. Hic sita est.

If this view be adopted, it follows that there are not two persons named in the inscription under consideration, but only D 2

one, whose second name is FORTVNA or FORTVNATA. The question then is as to her first name. Adopting Horsley's conjecture, I would supply N. as the first letter of the third line. but would limit the name to the letters EDINIAE, which I regard as used for the more usual form AEDINIAE by the ordinary substitution of E for AE. The name AEDINIA frequently occurs, e. gr., in Renier's Ins ripions de l'Algérie, Ædinia Julia in n. 1924, Ædinia Lucilla in n. 2598, Ædinia Rogata in n. 3015, and Edinia in n. 2802. In n. 195, we have Ædia Fortunata. From what has been advanced, it may, I think, be reasonably inferred that the correct reading of the inscription, omitting CADI, is Dis Manibus sacrum Ediniæ Fortuna [or Fortunala]. Pia vixit annis X*. But we have yet to examine CADI. I am inclined to suggest that it is a designation of the receptacle for the remains of the deceased. Ι am unable to cite an example from any other inscription, but Virgil, Æn. VI., v. 228, supplies the following authority :--

"Ossaque lecta cado texit Corynæus aheno."

It is well known that *cupa* and *cupula*, both signifying barrels, are used as designations of receptacles of the dead, and to these I think *cadus* should be added, as denoting, perhaps, an earthen vessel of the form of a cask, used for the same purpose. Gutherius, *dejare Manium*, *Græv. Antiq.* xii., p. 1224, figures a *cupa* made of stone. As to the construction, *cadi* may be either in the nominative †plural or in the genitive singular. It is not easy to decide on the construction on the latter supposition; but there seems to be no doubt that it was used—*e. gr.*, Orelli, n. 4477:—

> D·M LOCI IN QVO CORPVS T·LV * * SABINIAN LV CIANI CREMA TVM EST.

As it is not probable that the genitive is after dis manibus,

^{*} Henzen thinks differently : see his Index, p. 196.

[†] It may also be the singular, if we read CAD'I., as we have OLL'I.

we must suppose the omission of some such word as *signum* or *titulus*, indicating that the stone was the mark of the place or receptacle.

P. S. In n. xvii. of the very interesting series of "Letters from Rome," by the Rev. J. W. Burgon, M.A., there is a copy of an inscription "scratched rather than engraved on a small tablet in the Museum Kircherianum."

> " EGOSECUNDAFECICUPELLABONE MIMORIEFILIEMMEEMSECUN DINEM QERECESSIT'IN'FIDEM CUMFRATREMSUMLAUREN TIUMINPACERECESERUND

1 Secunda have made a grave to the virtuous memory of my daughter Secundina, who departed in faith; with her brother Laurentius. They departed in peace.

Even De Rossi, the great patron of those who sleep in the Catacombs, will not approve of *cupella*, for the accusative; nor of *filiem meem*, in place of the genitive; though *cum fratrem sum* may admit of defence; and *receserund* may only reflect the popular pronunciation. But in truth, look at the original of this inscription; and you understand the history of the inaccuracies at once. It belongs, in a word, to persons in humble life.

The chief point of interest, however in the preceding epitaph, is the word CUPELLA,—which (I humbly suspect) is new. At least it was unknown (in any such sense) to Du Cange. But he gives "cupa," and quotes for it a heathen inscription (to be seen in Gruter, p 845) which ends,—"In hâc cupâ mater et filius positi sunt." On this authority, Du Cange explains "cupa" to mean *urna*, arca sepulchralis. But he refers his reader to "Cuba," of which he says,—"forte pro Cumba, locus subterraneus;" and he quotes a monkish writer, who employs the word as follows:—"Ad pedes B. Sabini est altare S. Martini . . . *in alia Cuba, juzta orientem,* sepulchrum S. S. Victoris, Domnini," &c.—"Cuba" and "cupa" are therefore probably one word, of which "cupella" will have been the diminutive. Whether allied to "cumba" or not, I have very serious doubts.

I suspect that "cupa," (the same word as "cup,") and its diminutive "cupella," originally meant a sepulchral vase which held the burnt bones of the dead. This kind of sense the word preserves to this hour,—"cupel" being, I am told, the established appellation of a little vessel used by refiners. But in early Christian times, the word will have readily sustained a change of signification, in connection with the remains of the departed. It will have indicated generally the grave where those remains were deposited. How closely connected from a very early period were places of sepulture

and places of prayer, —what need to state before one learned in Christian Antiquities? Already then will you have anticipated the suggestion for the sake of which I am troubling you with this letter, namely, that we have here the etymology of the word CHAPEL, which has so long perplexed philologists, —yourself, I believe, among the rest. "Capella," (Anglice "Chapel") is derived, I suspect, from "Cupella," which in the fourth or fifth century denoted a place of Christian burial, —as the humble inscription under consideration shows. Perhaps Voult would be the nearest English equivalent for the word."

Mr. B. adds that "he is afraid to suggest further that 'Cupola' may be only another form of the same word."

There can be little doubt that *cupella* of this inscription is only another form of *cupula*, which I have above noticed. I have seen the word more than once in the African inscriptions, but am unable to recall any other example than that in Renier, *Inscrip.* de l' Algéric, n. 3939 :---

> " OBMEMORIAM MARITISVIVALSI LVANITRIIRARCHI CELIAMONNATA CVPVLMASVPER STIFENROGVSEIVS VIXITANXLIMVDX

Ob memoriam mariti sui Val[erii] Silvani, tri[e]rarchi Celia Monnata *cupulma (*sic*) superstite[m] rogus ejus, vixit an[nis] quadraginta uno, m[ensibus] quinque, d[iebus] decem."

The proposed etymology for *chapel* seems doubtful, but I regard the suggestion relative to *cupola* as certain. *Cupula* is at present the Spanish form of our *cupola*.

§ 101. The following is the inscription, found at Ilkley, to which I referred in p. 59 :---

RVM CAES AVG* ANTONINI ET VERI IOVI DILECTI CAECILIVS LVCAN * S PRAEF COH

* i. e., cupulam.

Horsley expands it thus : "*Pro salute* Imperatorum Caesarum Augustorum Antonini et Veri Jovi dilecti Cæcilius Lucanus præfectus cohortis."

The point, which at once attracts attention, is the use of the unique phrase-Jovi dilecti-especially as applied to but one of Horsley compares the the Emperors named on the stone. Homeric $\delta_{i\sigma\tau\rho\epsilon\phi\dot{\epsilon}\epsilon\gamma}\beta_{a\sigma\imath\lambda\hat{\eta}\epsilon\gamma}$, but the illustration throws but little light on this remarkable compliment, so strangely limited to one of the emperors. It is possible that IOVI may refer to Antoninus, and the phrase is certainly classic, as the Horatian-Dilectam penitus Jovi, but I am persuaded that the reading is erroneous. There is a singular omission of the deity to whom the altar This should, in my judgment, be supplied from the was erected. fifth line; and I venture to suggest that the true reading is IOVI. DOLIC.TI., i. e., IOVI DOLIC[HENO] TI[BERIVS], Tiberius being the prænomen of Cacilius Lucanus, or TI may be a misreading for H, scil., DOLICH. The epithet appears in various forms, such as Dolicenus, Dolcenus, Dolc, and D.

§ 102. The following inscription is on a sarcophagus, or stone coffin, which was found at York several years ago, and is now preserved in the Museum of the Yorkshire Philosophical Society:—

> MEI....AL·THEODORI ANI..OMEN·VIXIT·ANN XXX.V·M·VI·EMI·THEO DO.A·MATER·E·C·

In removing it when found, it was unfortunately broken, and the inscription is consequently imperfect. The fracture extends between I and A in the first line, I and O in the second, X and V in the third, and O and A in the fourth.

Mr. Wellbeloved, Eburacum, p. 110, remarks :--

"The difficulty is confined to two words. The first word no doubt, when perfect, was MEMORIAL for MEMORIALE, but the author has not met with that word in any other inscription. If L, which is undoubtedly the present reading, be an error for E, the difficulty is removed. EMI in the third line presents the next difficulty; it might, though unusual, be a con-

traction for EMERITI; but that would be very strangely introduced, after the mention of the age, and without any notice of the legion to which Theodorianus had belonged. OMEN was most probably NOMEN, and that the abridged form of NOMENTANI."

Dr. Thurnam, Crania Britannica, Decade I., observes :---

"The principal difficulty is confined to two words; the first of the inscription, and the EMI in the third line. It seems most probable that both these are prænomina, the first that of Theodorianus, the other of Theodora; though what these names have been it is perhaps not possible to say." * * "The inscription is probably to be thus read: Diis Manibus [conjectured to have been on the operculum or lid, which has not been preserved] Mei...al. Theodoriani Nomentani vixit annis xxxiv., mensibus vi. Emi. Theodora mater efficiendum curavit." * * * "Altogether the external evidence is in favour of the remains found in this coffin being those of a Roman citizen and soldier, a native of Italy, and of the ancient Latin territory in the immediate neighbourhood of Rome itself."

There is no doubt that the only difficulties in the inscription are from M to L in the first line, and EMI in the third. Mr. Wellbeloved's conjecture of NOMENT is confirmed, so far as the last letter is concerned, by *" an accurate rubbing," procured by Dr. Thurnam, "which shows distinctly the ligulate letter T in the word OMENT." It also seems to me evident that Mr. Wellbeloved's readings, MEMORIAL and EMERITI, must be at once rejected, and for the reasons which he himself states. Nor can I concur with Dr. Thurnam in the view which he has taken of "the external evidence being in favour of the remains being those of a Roman citizen and soldier." The absence of the usual notice of the legion or cohort suggests the presumption, that Theodorianus had not been a soldier.

1 am inclined to read from M to L thus: MEM·C·VAL; *i. e.*, Memoria Caii Valerii. MEM may stand for either MEMORIA or MEMORIÆ; if for the former, I regard it as meaning "The

^{*} Since the publication of this article I have had the opportunity, through the kindness of Dr. Thurnam, of examining this rubbing, and now doubt the truth of my reading MEM, which I suggested in reliance on the accuracy of Mr. Wellbelowd's statement that the first word was "no doubt MEMORIAL" From this I inferred that he was certain as to the third letter being M.

monument;" if for the latter, "To the memory." I prefer the first interpretation, which is confirmed by the words MEMO-RIAM-POSSVIT (*sic*) on another stone coffin also found at York. The abbreviation MEM may be justified by the inscription given by Gruter, 894, 2, and the construction in the nominative by that given by Morcelli, cc.

As to EMI, I regard it as the perfect tense of the verb emo, *i.e.*, as meaning, "I Theodora his mother bought." It is scarcely necessary to point out to any one familiar with Latin sepulchral epigraphy the frequency of such a notice of the mode in which the sepulchre was obtained. Fabretti, p. 153, gives many examples of such purchases. Nor is the use of the first person rare. See Fabretti, pp. 236 and 252. The only doubt which remains is as to the meaning of $E \cdot C$. Various expansions may be proposed, such as *ei carissimo*, *ejus carissimi*, *ejus causâ*, *ex communi*, *scil.*, sumptu, or according to the received interpretation of these notæ on other stones, *erigendum* (*i. e.*, memoriam) *curavi*, for such sarcophagi stood above ground.

According to my views, the whole inscription may be read thus:--Memoria Caii Valerii Theodoriani Nomento. Vixit annos (or annis) xxxiv., menses (or mensibus) vi. Emi Theodora mater [et] erigendam curavi.

I have no grounds for the selection of *Caii* as the prænomen; it is wholly conjectural. If there had been room for the *Nomen* gentilitium and the *Nomen patris*, I should have supplied G or P before AL, thus taking it for either GAL or PAL, the abbreviations of the Galerian or Palatine tribes. After emi I understand *locum* as is usual, (or *memoriam*,) and supply et, the omission of which is not rare, e. gr., Fabretti, p. 307 :--

VALERIA·A·A·L·RVFA EMIT·AEDIFICAVIT.

§ 103. In Wellbeloved's *Eburacum*, p. 90, we have an account of an altar then (1842) recently found, "in excavating the ground for the station [at York] of the York and North Midland Railway." It was standing on a large brick and a square sheet of lead, and bore the following inscription :—

```
DEAE
FORTVNAE
SOSIA
IVNCINA
Q•ANTONI
ISAVRICI
LEG•AVG
```

"It appears, from this inscription, to have been dedicated to the goddess Fortune by Sosia Juncina, the daughter of Quintus Antonius Isauricus, of the legion Augusta. Three legions were distinguished by this appellation the second, the third, and the eighth. The third and the eighth are not known to have been ever in Britain. The second came into Britain in the reign of Claudius, and from inscriptions on the wall of Hadrian, we learn that during his reign this legion was in the north. In the time of Antoninus Pius it was employed in building the wall at the upper isthmus. Afterwards it was at Isca Silurum (Caerleon, or perhaps Usk), which was probably from that period its chief quarters. The form and character of the letters [?] concur with these circumstances to fix the date of this altar to the latter part of the reign of Antoninus, or the beginning of that of M. Aurelius, when the legion probably passed through Eburacum, and rested there on its way to the south."

Mr. Wright, Celt, Roman, and Saxon, p. 279 (p. 282, 2nd ed.), explains and reads it thus :--

"A lady whose father belonged to the second legion, dedicated an altar to Fortune at the head quarters of the sixth legion at Eburacum (York.) This monument, which may still be seen in the York museum, has the inscription :—

DEAE	To the goddess
FORTVNAE	Fortune,
SOSIA	Sosia
IVNCINA	Juncina,
F ANTONI	daughter of Antonius
ISAVRICI	Isauricus,
LEG AVG	of the Augustan legion.

If Mr. Wellbeloved's representation of the altar in pl. x., fig. 4, be correct, there is no authority for Mr. Wright's F before ANTONI in the fifth line. Nor would I, with Mr. Wellbeloved, supply *filia*: I prefer *conjux*, which is sometimes omitted.

Where $AVG \cdot is$ applied to a legion in Britain, it is a just inference that the 2nd is intended: nor are we without examples of the omission of the rank of a member of a legion, whether he was an officer or a private, *e. gr.*,

FELICIVS·SIMPLEX·PATER·FECIT LEG·VI·V

I prefer, however, regarding LEG·AVG here as standing for *LEG-[ATI] AVG[VSTI]; and believe Q. Antonius Isauricus to have been legatus Augusti of the 6th legion.

§ 104. At the Mount, near York, there has been recently discovered "a slab, upwards of six feet long, with four incised figures in the upper part, and below them an inscription of six lines, of which nearly the whole is legible." The inscription, as far as it can be deciphered, reads as follows:

D·M· FLAVIAE·AVGVSTINAE VIXIT·AN·XXXVIIII·M·VII·D·XI·FILIVS NVS·AVGVSTINVS·VXT·AN·I·D.III AN·I·M·VIIII·D·V·CAERESIVS I·LEG·VI·VIC·CONIVGI·CARI ET·SIBI·F·C."

[i.e., D[iis] M[anibus] Flaviæ Augustinæ;
Vixit an[nis] xxxviiii, m[ensibus] vii, d[iebus xi.]Filius nus Augustinus v[i] x[i]t an[no] i, d[iebus] iii, an[no] i, m[ensibus] viiii, d[iebus] v, Cæresius i leg[ionis] vi vic[tricis] conjugi cariet sibi f[aciendum] c[uravit.]

The Rev. J. Kenrick lately read a paper on the subject before the Yorkshire Philosophical Society, from the report of which, in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for January, 1860, I have taken the foregoing particulars. On the interpretation of the inscription, Mr. Kenrick offered the following remarks:---

The monument appears to have been raised by Cæresius, a soldier of the sixth conquering legion, to the manes of his wife, Flavia Augustina, and two children, who died in their infancy, and prospectively for himself. Only the termination, NVS, of the son's name remains; there is room on

^{*} He may have been governor of the province; but if he had, PR PR would most probably have followed LEG AVG.

the stone for the letters necessary to form FLAVINVS, which is not unlikely to have been the name. But the space before the term of life, in the fourth line, is so small, that there is only room for a single name, and we must suppose an ellipsis of VIXIT to be supplied from the preceding clause. CAERESIVS is a name which, in the forms CAERETIVS and CAERECIVS. occurs in Gruter. The beginning of the fifth line may have contained the second name of Cæresius, which one might have expected to be followed by some designation of his military character or office, as CENT, MIL. or TRIB. MIL. It is difficult to find any word ending in I, which could grammatically have stood in this position. The number of the cohort is often prefixed in the names of auxiliaries, prætorians, &c., but not of legionaries; and though the number of stipendia and years of service is often noted in inscriptions to deceased soldiers, it could hardly be looked for on a monument which a soldier had prepared for himself. It is natural to conjecture that the I is a remnant of an L, in which case MIL may have preceded the title of the legion, but the appearance of the stone does not favour the conjecture. The space at the beginning of the sixth line is, no doubt, to be filled up with the remaining letters of CARISSIMAE."

The only difficulty in the inscription is, as Mr. Kenrick points out, in the I before LEG. He justly rejects the suppositions that the number either of the cohort or of the *stipendia* is denoted by I as a numeral. The natural conjecture is cortainly that it should be read L, as the last letter of MIL; but that is not favoured by the appearance of the stone. Under the circumstances, I am inclined to propose PRI, as in §1, for PR1[NCEPS]. There is little use in speculating on the second name of *Caresius*; but there seems to be sufficient space before PRI for one such as FVSCVS, the cognomen of the *Carecius* mentioned in p. ccclxxix, n. 6, of Gruter.

P. S.-In the Gentleman's Magazine for November, 1860, an account is given of the proceedings of the Yorkshire Philosophical Society, at their monthly meeting in October. Mr. Kenrick, Curator of Antiquities, "called the attention of the members to the inscription on the monument of Flavia Augustina, discovered at the Mount, near York," and to my suggestion that the letter I before LEG was part of the abbreviation PRI. "This may have stood," the report proceeds, "either for Princeps or Primipilaris, examples of both occurring in inscriptions. The latter is perhaps the more probable. * * * * * * * * * ¥ * The monument in question, though coarse in exe-

cution, must have been costly, and we may conclude that Caeresius, who dedicated it to the memory of his wife and children,

218

was a person of higher military rank than a common soldier." I have *already expressed a preference for princeps as the reading of PRI :; and on reconsideration of the subject I see no reason for altering my opinion. It seems to me very improbable that the same contraction was used for the designations of two high officers of different rank; and the enquiry as to the meaning of PRI · appears to be no more than a search for a case in which the abbreviation certainly denotes either of them. If such be found, then it may, I think be reasonably concluded that it was not used for the other. Now there is no example, so far as I am aware, which proves that PRI was ever used for primipilus; whilst PRI · PRI · in Orelli, n. 3451, (if that inscription be genuine) establishes the use of it for princeps. Moreover, in my notes on the subject, I had no reference to princeps, as "a common soldier," one of the principes, but to princeps as the designation of the chief centurion of the principes, and the second in rank of the centurions in a legion, for, as Vegetius, ii. 8, informs us, Vetus autem consuetudo tenuit, ut ex primo principe legionis promoveretur centurio primi pili. This use of princeps, as "the" princeps, not "a" princeps, is not uncommon. Livy, xxv., 14, calls the first centurion of the principes in one place, "princeps primus," in another, "princeps tertia legionis." See pp. 17, 121, of my notes, and Henzen, nn. 6747 and 6779.

The ordinary abbreviations for *primipilus* (otherwise *primopilus*, or *primipilaris*, or *primopilariis*) are PRIM. and P. P. There is no example of the former in the inscriptions found in Britain, but there are, as I think, of the latter.

OMNIVM
GENTIVM
TEMPLVM
OLIMVETVS
TATECONIAB
• SVMG·IVL·
PITANVS
P •P•RESITVIT

* See p. 5.

† Scil., MATRIBVS.

Horsley notices the expansions propria pecunia, publica pecunia, præfectus prætorio, præfectus provinciæ, but prefers provinciæ præses.

I regard the letters as standing for * primipilus. Again, we have the same nota in an inscription on a slab found at Chesterholme, which is given by Bruce, Roman Wall, 2nd ed., p. 411:—

D M CORNVICTOR·S·C MIL·ANN·XXVICIV PANN·FIL SATVRNI NI·PP·VIX·AN·LV·D·XI CONIVX·PROCVRAVI

He expands and translates it thus :---

" DIIS MANIBVS CORN[ELIVS] VICTOR S. C. (Sibi constituit.) MIL[ES] ANN[OS] XXVI CIV[IS] PANN[ONIAE] FIL[IVS] SATVRNI-NI P. P. VIX[IT] ANN[OS] LV. D[IES] XI CONIVX PROCVRAVI

To the Divine Manes; Cornclius Victor ordered this to be erected to himself. He was a soldier twenty-six years, a citizen of Pannonia, and very dutiful (P. P. *pientissime*) son of Saturninus. He lived fifty-five years and eleven days. I, his wife, saw his order executed."

This inscription has peculiarities, which are worthy of notice. It is not usual for the years of service to be stated before the birth-place or the years of life, or the parentage, nor for FIL. to precede the name of the father. Mr. Hedley, who first published this inscription, Archaeologia Æliana, i., p. 211, expands it thus :—

DIS MANIBVS CORNELIVS VICTOR, SIGNIFER COHORTIS MILITAVIT ANNOS VIGINTI SEX, CIVIS PANNON[1]CVS, FILIVS SATVRNI NI PIENTISSIME VIXIT ANNOS QVINQVAGINTA [QVINQVE DIES VNDECIM CONIVX PROCVRAVI

* There are examples of the use of primipilus without mention of the legion.

220

I prefer Mr. Hedley's militavit and Pannonicus (or, rather, Pannonius) to Dr. Bruce's miles and Pannonia, but I do not approve of signifer cohortis, or pientissime: nor would I accept Dr. Bruce's sibi constituit. I am inclined to read S. C. singularis consulis, and would certainly take P. P. as standing for primipili. If the expansion pientissime be adopted, it should unquestionably be joined as an adverb to vixit.

§ 105. A block of lead, bearing the inscription,

```
IMP·CAES·DOMITIANO·AVG·COS.VII.
```

was found in this county about eight miles from Ripley. On this see § 16.

§ 106. In the year 1752, a small altar was found, in Micklegate, bearing a very perplexing inscription, which, so far as the letters are clearly legible, may be represented *thus :---

> MAT·A+? ? IA·? A M ? I ? ? ? ? DE MIL·LEG·VIVIC GVBER·LEG·VI V·S·L·LM

Mr. Wellbeloved figures it in his *Eburacum*, pl. x., and offers the following observations on it :---

"A writer in the Gentleman's Magazine of the year 1752, signing himself Lasenbiensis, conjectured the age of the altar to be about the reign of Antoninus Pius, and read the inscription thus :---

> MATribvs AFricis ITAlicis G ALlicis Marcvs MINVtivs MVDE MILes LEGionis VI (sextæ) VICtricis GVBERnatori LEGionis VI (sextæ) Votum Solvit L L (libentissime) Merito

According to which, Marcus Minutius Mude, a soldier of the sixth legion victorious, in performance of a vow, dedicated the altar to the African,

^{*} This reading is formed after a comparison of the sketches in Gough's edition of Camden and in Wellbeloved's Eburacum with a lithograph made from a rubbing of the stone, as given in the Annual Report of the Yorkshire Philosophical Society for 1861.

[†] The marks of interrogation indicate doubtful letters.

Italian, Gallican (Goddesses, the) Mothers, to the Gubernator of the Sixth Legion. The writer confessed there was some inconsistency in the dedications to the Matres, &c., and to the Gubernator; he did not presume to think his interpretation the true one; he wished only to excite the attention of more able antiquaries. Mr. Pegge was not tardy in taking up the subject; but in a communication to the *Gentleman's Mogazine*, in the following month, October, 1752, under his usual acrostic signature of Paul Gemsege, agreeing with the preceding writer in the reading of the three last lines, he differed from him in the interpretation of the two first; justly observing, that 'Matribus' never occurs in inscriptions alone without 'Diis or Deabus.' Supposing the first letters of the first line to be not MAT but MÆT, and the cognomen MVDE in the second line to be mutilated at the end, and the true reading of it to be MVRE; he reads the two first lines thus:--

> Marti ÆTolico AFro ITAlico GALlico Marcus MINVTius MVREna.

Having settled the interpretation, he goes on to offer some explanatory remarks. He observes that the altar was erected in consequence of a vow; that the votary had served in all the countries mentioned in his address, and had been particularly preserved, as he thought, by the God of War. He infers from this inscription, that the sixth legion was under the special protection of Mars: and understands Gubernator as put in apposition with Marti in the first line. According to Gough, Drake sent a copy of the inscription to the Society of Antiquaries, reading the first line

MATribus AILTA GeNio,

in the second line, AVDE . . . and in the fourth line GVBERnator, supposing it in apposition with MILES; but he does not appear to give any explanation of the address.

Other interpretations have been proposed, but so manifestly erroneous, that it would be perfectly useless to record them. The author cannot presume to undertake what others, more skilful, have failed to accomplish. Several letters of the first line, in which the greatest difficulty is found, appear to have been originally so peculiarly formed, aud now are so indistinct, that it is next to impossible to decipher them. The word GVBER in the fourth is very perplexing, whether it be read Gubernatori or Gubernator,—whether it be in apposition with MARti, supposed to be in the first line, or with MILes in the line preceding. The proper word in connection with MARti, would be Conservatori, and no such military legionary officer as Gubernator is any other place ever mentioned. One remark only the author would offer, and for that he is indebted to a learned friend, that the last word in the second line is not MVDE, nor an erroneous reading for MVRE, but ANDE, the abbreviation of Andegavanus or Andegavensis, denoting that M. Minutius was of Andes or Andegavensis (Angers) in Gaul."

222

At a meeting of the Yorkshire Philosophical Society in January, 1862, the Rev. John Kenrick offered some observations on* it :---

"Mr. Kenrick remarked, that GVBER, in the fourth line, had created some difficulty, as GVBERNATOR, which the abbreviation must represent, was not the name of any legionary officer. He suggested, however, that as the sixth legion was so long settled at York, on the banks of a navigable river, the word might bear the ordinary sense of pilot or steersman; and that the dedicator of the tablet may have had the charge of the vessels, by means of which the legion communicated with places on the Ouse, or the rivers that fall into it."

Of the opinions, which are stated in the foregoing remarks, Mr. Pegge's and Mr. Drake's must be rejected, except the supposition of the latter that gubernator is in apposition with miles, which seems probable. The reading of the first line by Lasenbiensis is supported by another inscription to the Deve Matres found in England, as given by Mr. Smith, Collect. Antiq., iv., p. 41, who notices the similarity of the two inscriptions :--

> MATRIB ITALIS GER MANIS GAL · BRIT .NTONIVS CRETIANVS .F·COS·REST.

i. e., as Mr. S. expands it :--Matrib[us],Italis Germanis Gal[licis] †Brit[annicis] [A]ntonius Cretianus [Bene]f[iciarius] co[n]s[ulis] rest[ituit.]

The idea of Lasenbiensis as to two dedications—to the Matres and to the Gubernator of the sixth legions—cannot for a moment be entertained. From what has been said it is plain that the difficulties in the inscription are in the first and second lines and in GVBER of the fourth. •I am inclined to read the first :—

MAT · AFLIA · GAV

[•] It is now deposited in the Museum of the Society by the Dean and Chapter.

[#] Brit[tis], as in Henzen's n. 5932, had occurred to me, but I prefer Brit[annicis].

and to expand it Mat[ribus] (or Mat[ronis]) Aflia[bus] Gav[adiis.] See Henzen, nn. 5929, 5937.

This reading, so far as MAT • AFLIA •, seems almost certain, and the appearance of the stone, as represented in the lithograph, favours GAV. There is certainly now no authority for GAL, and I suspect that there never was.

The feasible readings of the second line are $M \cdot MINV \cdot MVDE$, and $M \cdot MINV \cdot ANDE$; but I am not satisfied with either; and yet the only improvement, which I can suggest, is the reading NANDE instead of MVDE or ANDE. Nande was situated in that part of Media, called Atropatene. See Ptolemy, vi. 2, 10. Mr. Kenrick's explanation of GVBER · as gubernator taken in apposition with miles, is more satisfactory than any of which I am aware. See Muratori, mmxxxvi, 1. See also my notes, p. 84.

WALES.

CAERNARVONSHIRE.

§ 107. In Mr. Smith's *Collectanea Antiqua*, vol. iii., p. 201, we find the following notice of "an imperfect inscription found at *Caernarvon."

"It is on two pieces of stone, which, on comparison, appeared to have belonged to one and the same slab;

•	• • EPT.SEVERVS.PIUS.PER	·	•
•	· · VREL.ANTONINV · · ·	•	•
•	AQVAEDVCTIVM VETVS · ·	٠	•
•	· · BS.COH.I.SVNC.RESIT ·	·	•
	$\cdot \cdot \cdot \operatorname{VIPF} \cdot \cdot \cdot$		
	· · · IVI. · · ·		

"The first two lines mention Severus and Caracalla; the second and third [third and fourth] refer to an aqueduct or aqueducts, which, having become decayed through age, had been restored by the first cohort of the Tungri; that is to say, presuming that SVNC of the engraving in the 'Archæologia Cambrensis' for April, 1853, should be TVNG. The remaining lines probably gave the name of the commander of the cohort, and that of the superintendent of the work of restitution."

It is plain that Mr. Smith correctly explains

[S]EPT[IMIVS] SEVERVS.PIVS.PER[TINAX] [A]VREL[IVS] ANTONINV[S]

as standing for the Emperors Severus and Caracalla; and

AQVAEDVCTIVM VETVS[TATE] [COLLA]BS[VM] COH[ORS] I SVNC RESTIT[VIT]

as referring to an aqueduct, or aqueducts, which, having become

* The Segontium of Antoninus.

CAERNARVONSHIRE.

decayed through age, had been restored. Nor is his opinion as to the contents of the fifth and sixth lines improbable; but I have no doubt that the cohort named in the fourth line is not cohors prima Tungrorum, but cohors prima Sunuc[orum], the N and V being ligulate. This cohort is mentioned in Hadrian's tabulæ honestæ missionis, from which it appears that at the time (A. D. 124) it was serving in Britain under the command of Auluntus Clau-This Caernarvon stone is valuable, as it and the diploma dianus. are the only extant memorials of the cohort. The Sunuci, or Sunici, were a Belgic people. They are mentioned by Tacitus and Pliny, but their position has not been exactly defined. It is probable, however, that they lived between Cologne and the Meuse about the eastern part of the modern Belgic province of Limbourg.

Mr. Foster, Archaeologia Cambrensis, iv., p. 72, remarks:

"In reading the upper line, Aquæductium Vetus, and comparing it with the site of Segontium, it is difficult to conjecture how it can apply to any military operations which have been erected on this spot, for nearly the whole of the rising ground on which Segontium stood is at this day literally springs of water."

Aquaductus was applied not merely to an "aqueduct," but also to a "drain." The form aquaductium is peculiar. It may be for the genitive plural governed by some word on the lost portion of the stone; or it may be the accusative of a word, not met with elsewhere, scil., aquaductium.

§ 108. In the Archaeologia Cambrensis, ii., p. 51, we have the following account of "a Roman inscription on a stone discovered at Tycoch, in the parish of Bangor, about the year 1820 :---

"It illustrates an historical fact recorded by Pausanias, the geographer, in his Arcadia. This author, who lived at the time of the event which he briefly relates, mentions that Antoninus Pius ordered an expedition to demand satisfaction from the Brigantes, a powerful tribe in the north of England, for having entered in a hostile manner into the neighbouring district, called Genounia, then in subjection to Rome. This expedition must have been undertaken by Lollius Urbicus, Proprætor under Priscus Licinius, about the year 140. The legions at this time employed in Britain had signalized themselves a few years before under Hadrian, in his Judaic expedition, as may be proved by existing monuments; the title Arabicus occurring on the imperial coins and other memorials of this period.

CAERNARVONSHIRE.

The only nations bordering on the Brigantes were the Otadini on the north, and the Ordovices on the south and west; and it may reasonably be supposed that the Greek geographer intended to express Gwynedd by the Greek term Genounia. This being premised and granted, it appears not improbable that the stone pillar at Tycoch was set up by the ninth or Arabic legion, as a record of the services performed in obedience to the imperial order, in ridding the country of the marauding Brigantes.

Gwynedd was so thoroughly reduced under the Roman yoke by the terrible example which Agricola had previously made of the inhabitants, that the remnant which he left, were glad to avail themselves of the imperial protection against the inroads of the Brigantes aud other warlike tribes, such as the Picts and Belgæ; and hence in that emergency, which was of so important a character as to attract the attention of Pausanias, (probably when on his visit to Rome,) we may conclude that they solicited the aid of the emperor on their behalf. It may also be observed that the ninth legion had been employed in the reign of Claudius in garrisoning Britain ; having at that time Hispania engraven on their standard. The inscription alluded to is as follows :—

The author of this article has made some extraordinary mistakes: of these two or three, as being connected with the inscription, require notice. Lollius Urbicus was not proprætor under Priscus Licinius; there is no evidence that the 9th or any other legion ever bore the title *Arabica*; and the emperor named in the inscription, as is obvious from the name *Aurelius*, was not the "Antoninus Pius," whose legate Lollius Urbicus was in Britain in A.D. 140. It is plain, too, that the emperor cannot be Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, the philosopher, for there is no eyidence, except one inscription, that he was ever styled *pius* in his life time, and Commodus was the first emperor to whom *felix* was applied.

I have but little doubt that the emperor named in the inscription is Caracalla. I would read the second, third, and fourth lines thus :---

> IMP·CAESAR·MARCVS AVREL·ANTONINVS PIVS·FELIX·AVG·ARAB

CAERNARVONSHIRE.

i. e., Imp[erator] Cæsar Marcus Aurel[ius] Antoninus pius felix Aug[ustus] Arab[icus]. The letters read TI.IX • are doubtless FE IX, the L, between E and I, being obliterated.

From the statement of Spartian, which is confirmed by an inscription given by Gruter, cclxvii., 7, it appears that Caracalla used the titles of his father, *Arabicus* and *Adiabenicus*. Any doubt which I have relative to Caracalla being the emperor named in the inscription arises from a suspicion as to the reading ARAB[ICVS]. It seems very strange that of all Caracalla's titles this, which is so rare, should be the only one selected, and that it should occupy so extraordinary a position. Hence I should be inclined to conjecture that the true reading may be A·RAB, as we have on the Leicester *miliarium* A·RATIS, if I could find mention of any place in the neighbourhood beginning with *RAB.

The numerals in the fifth line (if we regard the stone as a mile stone, which "it was said to be by those who saw it") indicate the distance of nine miles.

If Tycoch, which is said to be "near Bangor," be between that town and Caernarvon, it is highly probable that the stone marked nine miles from *Segontium*, for the distance of Bangor from Caernarvon is about nine English miles.

As it may be assumed that both Severus and Geta were dead at the time of the inscription, its date will fall between A.D. 212 and 217.

On the NVMC in the first line I have no satisfactory explanation to offer. I have never seen any thing similar in a miliary inscription.

§ 109. Many years ago a cake of copper was found at Caerhên in this county. It bore the inscription SOCIO ROMAE, crossed obliquely by another—NAT·SOL. On this see "Additions, p. 54."

^{*} Are these letters a misreading of BAR, *i.e.*, BARIS for VARIS? If so, there must have been some numerals lost before the IX, and the miles must have been counted from *Devs* to *Segontium*, not \mathbf{v} . \mathbf{v} , as in the Itinerary.

SCOTLAND.

DUMBARTONSHIRE.

§ 110. Old Kilpatrick in this county was most probably the western *terminus* of the barrier of the upper isthmus known as *"the wall of Antoninus." Amongst the Roman relics, which have been found in its neighbourhood, are some legionary inscriptions of the class referred to in p. 116. Mr. Stuart, *Caledonia Romana*, ed. Prof. Thomson, pl. vii., figures three of them, bearing the following inscriptions :--

(1)		(2)
IMP·C		.MP·C·T·AE
T • AE • HADRIA		.ADRIANO
NO·ANTONINO·AVG·PIO·P·P		.NTONINO
VEX		G·PIO·P·P·
$LEG \cdot XX$.EG·XXVV
VV·F	Е	· · · DXI
PPIIII	CDXI	

^{*} In the Journal of the Archaelogical Institute, 1856, there is an interesting and carefully prepared notice of the present condition of this work by John Buchanan, Esq., to whom Archæologists are indebted for the preservation of many valuable relies. From his statements compared with those in Stuart's Caledonia Romana, it appears that the remains and traces of the northern barrier and its forts are much less perfect than these on the southern isthmus, as described by Dr. Bruce. This difference is mainly due to the less durable character of the work between the Forth and the Clyde, and to its position in the track of ancient violence and of modern improvement. The extant memorials, however, of its builders are more satisfactory than those of the southern wall. There is no doubt as to the emperor, by whose order it was constructed, nor as to the troops employed on the work, whilst it has long been a quastio vexata by whom the Southern barrier was built, and although the claims of Hadrian, put forward by Hodgson, have been zealously urged by Dr. Bruce, the able historian of the Roman wall, more recent enquirers have rejected this opinion, and probably there are now many who prefer Mr. McLauchlan's view, as stated in his Memoir, p. 89, whilst some, perhaps, may be disposed to accept the theory advanced by Mr. Merivale in the Quarterly Review, Jan., 1860.

(3)

IMP·C·T·AELIO HADRIANO·ANTO NINO·AVG·P·P· VEX·LEG· \overline{VI} ·VIC P·F·OPVS·VALLI P.* $\infty \infty \infty \infty \infty$ CXLI

The following are Mr. Stuart's expansions :---

(1)

IMP[ERATORI] C[AESARI] T[ITO] AE[LIO] HADRIANO ANTONINO AUG[USTO] PIO P[ATRI] P[ATRIAE] VEX[ILLATIO] LEG[IONIS] VICESIMAE +V[ALENTIS] V[ICTRICIS] FE[CIT] P[ER] P[ASSUS] QUATUOR MILLE QUADRINGENTOS UNDECIM

(2)

[I]MP[ERATORI] C[AESARI] T[ITO] AE-[LIO] [H]ADRIANO [A]NTONINO [AU]G[USTO] P10 P[ATRI] P[ATRIAE] Vexillatio LEG[IONIS] VICESIMAE †V[ALENTIS] V[ICTRICIS] per passus - - DXI

(3)

IMP[ERATORI] C[AESARI] T[ITO] AELIO HADRIANO ANTONINO AUG[USTO] P[ATRI] P[ATRIAE] VEX[ILLATIO] LEG[IONIS] SEXTAE VIC[TRICIS] P[ER]F[ECIT] OPUS VALLI [PER] P[ASSUS] QUATUOR MILLE CENTUM QUADRAGINTA UNUM

* Here and in pp. 13, 22, &c., 1 have been obliged to use an 8 laid on its side for the symbol of 1000. See fig. 4 of frontispiece. Horsley's idea that it was formed by connecting two D's-scil., $Q \times D$ -is probable.

† Read VALERIAE. See note p. 3.

On examination of these expansions (which are almost exactly the same as those by Horsley), there are some doubtful points which require discussion. With a view to the elucidation of these, and of the subject generally, let us consider similar memorials found in other places :—

* (4)		* (5)
LEG	IMP	ANTON
ĪĪ	AVG	PIO
AVG·F·	Р	P
PIIIICXI	\mathbf{LE}	G
	Î	-
	AV	
	FPIJ	IICCLXX
* (6)		* (7)
IMP·C	IMP·C·T·	AELIO HADR
T·AE·HADRIANO	IANO ANTONINO•AVG	
ANTONINO	P·P·VEX	$\cdot \text{LEG} \cdot \overline{\text{VI}}$
PIO·P·P·VEX·LEG	VICTRICS	•P• F•
$\overline{\mathbf{X}}\overline{\mathbf{X}}$ VV FEC	OPVS·VA	LLI P·
Р.	$\infty \infty \infty \infty CC$	XL•P
+ (8)	4	+ (9)
IMP C	IMP CAES	S TITO AELIO
T AELIO	HADRIAN	NO ANTONINO
HADRIANO	AVG · PIO	PP LEG \overline{II}
ANTONINO	AVG·PER	MP III DC
AVG·PIO P.P	LXVI·S	
$VEX \cdot LEG \cdot XXV$		
P·P III		

^{*} Stuart, plate viii.

[†] Stuart, pl. ix. In the 4th line of n. 9, iii. is given instead of iiii. See Cal. Rom. p. 308, and Brit. Rom., iii.

* (10)

* (11)

IMP·CAESAR·T·AELIO	IMP · CAES · T
HADRIANO ANTONINO	AELIO HADRI
AVG PIO PPVEXILLATIO	ANTONIN·AVG
LEG VI·VICTR·P·F	PIO P·P VEXILLA
PER·M·P IIIDCLXVIS	LEG · VI · VIC · PF
	PER·M P HIDCL

+(12)

IMP CAES TITO AELIO HADRIANO ANTONINO AVG PIO·P·P·LEG II AVG PERMPHIDCLXVIS

+(14)

IMP·CAESARI·T· AELIO · HADRINO ANTONINO · AVG **PIO·P·P·VEXILLA** LEG·VI·VIC·P·F· PERM

§ (16)

VEXILLATIONS LEG II AVG ET LEGXXVVF

ГЕК•М Г ШDCL . . . +(13)LEG XX

V V FEC MPIIIP THCCCIV

‡ (15)

IMP CAES TAE HADRI ANTONINO AVG PIO PP **VEXILATIOVS**

§ (17)

IMP · CAESARI **T**•AELIO HADRI ANO ANTONINO AVG PIO PP VEXILLATIO LEGXXVALVICF PER·MIL·P III

§ (18)

IMP·CAES·TÆLANT AVG·PIO P·P· COH I TVNGRO RVM FECIT ∞

* Stuart, plate xvi. Horsley and Stuart omit I between V & S.

232

[†] Stuart, plate 10.

[‡] Stuart, plate xiii.

[§] Stuart, plate xv.

From nn. (14) and (17) (if the reading of the first lines be correct) it appears that the Emperor's names were in the *dative case, in the sense "to" or "for." If it had been intended to define the time, we should have had the ablative, and the COS and TRIB·POT·, with their numbers, would have been stated.

In such records different constructions seem to have been used. Here we have the dative; on the slab, p. 154, there is the nominative; on another, p. 157, the ablative; and in the inscription, given in p. 203 of Bruce's *Roman Wall*, we find the genitive. This variety of construction in epigraphy appears in other instances. In the numbers of consulships and of years of tribunitian power we have such forms as COS·TERTIO and TERTIVM, and TRIBVNITIAE POTESTATIS, or TRIBVNITIA POTES-TATE followed by the numeral in O or VM. In both cases, however, VM is the usual form. In sepulchral inscriptions we find the name of the deceased in the nominative, the genitive, or the dative; and in the same class of inscriptions time "how long" is expressed by either accusative or ablative, and sometimes by both on the same stone, e. gr., vixit annos LVIV., *M. uno*, *dies* XIV.

From ant inscription, given in *Caledonia Romana*, pl. xv., fig. 7, and *Britannia Romana*, xxv., we may infer that these works were executed in the 3rd Consulship of Antoninus, *i. e.*, A. D. 140–144, probably in the first of these years.

As he was styled *Imp.* ii. at the close of A.D. 139, it may be assumed that the victory of Lollius Urbicus was in the autumn of that year.

From nn. (10), (15), (16), and (17), it appers that VEX. in

^{*} Morcelli, de stilo, ii., p. 127, and Zell, Delectus, p. 415, give the ablative, in expanding n. (3).

[†]Horsley correctly reads the third line cohors prima Cugernorum. This corps is named in Trajan's diploma of A.D. 104. But if the stone is faithfully represented in the Caledonia Romanu, his reading of the last lime—VMOIII MP—is certainly erroneous. There the letters resemble CIT, the ending of FECIT, followed by IMP. I suspect that I may be a relic of P. for per. It is certainly not a numeral: nor can Horsley's III be received, as the numerals should not precede, but follow M. P. I am also inclined to think that, as this stone was probably a mile-stone, the work recorded on it was done not on the valum, but on the via militaris.

nn. (1), (3), (6), (7), (8), and VEXILLA. in nn. (11), and (14), stand for VEXILLATIO, not for* VEXILLARII. It is also plain that there were three vexillations employed on the wall, scil., of the second, sixth, and twentieth legions; and I strongly suspect that these are the same which are mentioned in Henzen's n. 5456 : PRAEPOSITVS VEXILLATIONIBVS MILLIARIIS TRIBVS EXPEDITIONE BRITANNICA. If this was the fact, they must have remained from the time of Hadrian, for the expeditio Britannica was probably his. It appears also that not only vexillations of the second and twentieth legions, but those †legions were employed; there is no evidence, however, relative to more than a vexillation of the 6th legion.

In nn. (7), (10), (11), and (14), $\mathbf{P}\cdot\mathbf{F}\cdot$ stand for PIAE FIDELIS, not ‡ PERFECIT. The term for "executed" is FECIT, given in extenso in n. (18), abbreviated into FEC· in nn. (6), and (13), into FE in n. (1), and into F· in nn. (4), (5), (16), and (17), and understood (*i. e.*, to be supplied,) in nn. (2), (3), (7), (8), (9), (10), (11), (12), and (14). The phrase *in extenso* for executing a portion of the wall seems to have been—opus valli fecit per mille passus—but opus valli are seldom expressed. Where we find P·P·, as in the last lines of nn. (1) and (8), they stand for per passus, but where there is P alone, it is doubtful whether it stands for per or passus. I am inclined to prefer the preposition. The absence of either M·P· or P· before the number of paces is common on mile-stones. See p. 87.

In nn. (9), (10), (12), and (15), the last line ends with S, preceded

^{*} Morcelli, de stilo, ii., p. 127, reads Vexillarii, in n. (3.)

[†] From the number of paces stated in their tablets it is improbable that their full force was engaged on the work.

[‡] Morcelli. de stilo, ii., p. 127, gives perfectrunt, agreeing with Vexillarii. See my notes, p. 95. relative to pria fidelis as titles of the 6th legion. Mr. Stuart also expands PF perfecil, and adds in a note on n. (3.) p. 289, the astonishing remark : "The word perfecilis translated by Gordon, (p. 62), "carried on." Might we not rather say "perfected" or "finished ?" Let this be granted, and no doubt will remain as to the Wall of Antoninus having terminated about Kilpatrick. Independently of the objection that perfect must, of course, apply only to the specified number of paces, Mr. Stoart's interpretation would place the termination of the wall at every place where an incription was found giving P'F. Thus we should have the end of the wall at the points where nn. (7), (10), (11), and (14,) were found. See Cal. Rom., notes, pp. 301, 314.

in nn. (10) and (15) by V. Horsley supplies V in n. (12) before S, and expands them all—V[otum] S[olvit.] I have no doubt that this expansion is erroneous, and am persuaded that Mr. Stuart's suggestion, that the S means "a half," *i. e.*, stands for *Semis*, not *Semissis*, as he erroneously states his own suggestion is the correct explanation. See my notes p. 118, and Orelli, nn. 817, 2844. As to (15) I am inclined to think that the last line is a mis-reading of VEXILATIONS for *vexillationes*. See n. (16).

The occurrence of the numbers 36661 three times is very remarkable. Nn. 10 and 11 were, probably, duplicates, for a tablet seems to have been placed at each end of the work that was executed. See Cal. Rom., p. 310, where it is stated that a pair set up by the 20th legion, have not only inscriptions almost identical, but the boars, the cognizance of the corps, looking in opposite directions towards each other. See also Prof. D. Wilson's Prehist. Annals, p. 376, where these facts were first noticed. The number 3666 being so nearly a multiple of the number of days in the year, and also of the number of days in some months, might suggest the surmise that a certain quantity of work was apportioned for each day; but I am inclined rather to conjecture that the work was laid out for the legions and vexillations in sections, some of three miles, others of four, and that the miles were subdivided into thirds, whence we have 3 and 2 miles.

There is a remarkable agreement, which I have not seen noticed between the work done by the 2nd legion and the vexillation of the 6th. In n. (4) read with Stuart, p. 299, 4111, and in n. (5), with Gordon, 3270, and we have the same sum as 4141 in n. (3) and 3240 in n. (7,) *i. e.*, 7381. There will be a further agreement in their work, if we read $3666\frac{1}{2}$ in (n. 9,) as it is given in the plate, instead of $4666\frac{1}{2}$, and assume that nn. (9) and (12), and nn. (10) and (11,) are duplicates.

As to the other odd numbers following 3000 and 4000, I would suggest that they may indicate the difference between the measured miles in a straight line and the actual distance traversed by the *vallum* in consequence of curves. I was led to

form this conjecture by examining n. (13). The work executed is there stated to be MP*IIIP IIICCCIV—which I would interpret as indicating that they had finished their three miles, which in consequence of the curves extended over 3304 paces.

Horsley, Britannia Romana, p. 160, and Roy, *†Military An*tiquities, p. 165, have deduced from the number of paces on the tablets the length of the barrier, but such calculations seem very hazardous, and those which were made by them are not reliable. It may, however; I think, be inferred from the tablets, that we must either adopt the supposition that they were set up in pairs, or else have a large excess.

§ 111. An altar, bearing the following inscription, was found at Castle Hill, in, I believe, this county :---

> " CAMPES TRIBVSET BRITTANNI Q·PISENTIVS IVSTVS PREF COA IIII GAL V·S·L·L·M "

Mr. Stuart, p. 309, expands and translates it thus :---

To the Eternal Field Deities
of Britain,
Quintus Pisentius Justus,
Præfect of the Fourth Cohort
of the Gaulish Auxiliaries
(dedicates this)
His vow being most willingly performed.

ET in the second line is plainly "and," *i.e.*, Campestribus et Britannicis, scil., Matribus. The nomen gentilitium of the Præfect was more probably PISENIVS; and for libentissime read lætus libens. See p. 247.

236

[•]The III between P and P are doubtful. Mr. Stuart reads them as "three I's," but adds the note: "Could the doubtful marks be converted into an M, the sentence might, perhaps, be read—Murum Perfecit, (Per) Mille Passus (or Millia Passuum) Tria Trecentos-Quatuor." This suggested reading is highly improbable.

[†] In this work there is a well executed plan of the course of the wall and of the vestiges of the stations. An important addition to our knowledge of the southern wall has been made by the publication of of Mr. MacLauchlan's Surveys and Memoir, for which Archæologists are indebted to the munificence of the Duke of Northumberland.

DUMFRIESSHIRE.

§ 112. One of the most remarkable relics of the Roman period is a full length statue, found at *Birrens, in the year 1732: it is described by Mr. Stuart, *Caledonia Romana*, p. 124:---

"This statue stands within a niche, is winged at the shoulders, and armed with a helmet encircled by a mural crown, over which is wreathed an olive branch. In her right hand she holds a spear and a shield, in her left a globe, and on her breast appears the representation of a Gorgon's head. The stone on which she stands is inscribed with the following words:—

> BRIGANTIAE. S. AMANDVS ARCHITECTVS EX IMPERIO IMP I.

According to the learned antiquary, Mr. Gale, the contractions ought to be understood thus:---

BRIGANTIAE SACRUM AMANDUS ARCHITECTUS EK 1MPERIO IMPERATORIS JULIANI.

To Brigantia, Amandus the architect, (crected this statue,) by order of the Emperor Julian.

From its general appearance, many were inclined to believe that this figure represented Minerva, others that it was meant either for a Victory, or a hybrid personification of several deities in one."

Horsley, Britannia Romana, p. 341, remarks :---

"As for the inscription beneath the figure, I cannot but agree with Mr. Gale supposing BRIGANTIA to be the name of the deity here represented; the S I would suppose to stand for sacrum; and AMANDVS is a proper name, not unfrequent in inscriptions. ARCHITECTVS may either be for architectus, as Baron Clerk supposes, observing that architects are often mentioned in the Codex, as necessary persons in the provinces; or it may be to denote some other name or names of the same AMANDVS. If the last single stroke be an I, of which I find Baron Clerk cannot be certain, Mr. Gale's reading, ex imperio imperatoris Juliani, seems highly probable.

^{*} This station, otherwise called Middleby, is the Blatum Bulgium of Antoninus.

DUMFRIESSHIRE.

otherwise IMP. may perhaps stand for *impendit*, or some such word; and EX IMPERIO, that precede, signify the same as *ex jussu* or *jussus*, whether this command was supposed to be received by a divine impulse, or might be given by some superior."

The expansion IMP[ERATORIS] I[VLIANI] is, in my judgment, so highly improbable that it should at once be rejected. Henzen suggests the reading IMP ·S and the expansion IMP ENSA] S[VA], i.e., "at his own cost," but is not satisfied with it. Mommsen also doubtfully proposes IMP.F, IMP[ERATVM I prefer IMP[ERANTE] I[PSA]; but per-FFECIT]. haps the true reading is NIMP., *i.e.*, NIMP[HAE] I[PS-I strongly suspect that this Brigantia is the same IVS]. mentioned as DEAE NYMPAE BRIG, in the inscription noticed by Selden, Prideaux, and Gale, if indeed that inscription be genuine. See Horsley, Brit. Rom., pp. 179 and 315, and Stuart's Caledonia Romana, p. 125. The use of I for Y in this word is not rare. Thus we have in Orelli, nn. 1648, NIMPHIS SALVTIFERIS and NIMPHIS 1633, AVFIDI. The meaning of ex imperio nimphæ ipsius is "by command of the nymph herself," scil., of Brigantia, a Dea Nympha. The use of such phrases as ex monitu, ex imperio, or jussu, indicating that the altar was executed in consequence of some [supposed] order of the deity, to whom it was raised, is See Orelli, nn. 1370, 1443, 1469, 1486, &c. Zell, common. Delectus, nn. 279, 280, and 281, supplies examples of the use of ipse; MATRONIS AFLIABYS * * * EX IMPERIO IPSARVM, MATRONIS HAMAVEHIS * * * EX IM-PERIO IPSARVM, MATRONIS VATRIABVS * * * EX IMPERIO IP.

I also suspect that Brigantia, who, doubtless, was represented by this statue believed by some to be an image of Victory, was a native, or at least Celtic deity, probably specially worshipped amongst the Brigantes. See p. 65. I identify her with the DVICI BRIG of the inscription, given by Horsley, Brit. Rom., Yorkshire, xviii, which he reads DVI CI[VITATIS] BRIG[ANTVM], *i. e.*, "to Dui, the tutelar god of the state of the Brigantes," but which I would read D[EAE] VICT]ORIAE] BRIG[ANTIAE], and interpret as denoting that the Romans identified their goddess

DUMFRIESSHIRE.

*VICTORIA with the British BRIGANTIA. It may be worth while to add that there are examples of *architectus*, or *arcitectus*, as a military office, *e. gr.*, Renier, *Inscriptions de l' Algérie*, n. 547.

D M S MCORNELIVSFESTVS MILLEGIIIAVG ARCHITECTVSVIC SITAN—NISXXX

§ 113. Fig. 1, plate ii, Stuart's *Caledonia Romana*, p. 128, is the representation of an altar, also found at Birrens. It bears the following inscription :---

DEAE HARIMEL LAE·SACGA MIDIAHVS ARCXVSL.

On this Mr. Smith, Collect. Antiq., iii., p. 203, remarks :---

"This, with the exception of the first part, Mr. Stuart considers unintelligible. As it stands it would be 'sacred to the goddess Harimella; Gamidianus Arcx, &c.'; but it is doubtful if the dedicator's name was transcribed correctly. In another inscription found at Birrens, we find Amandus Architectus erecting a statue to Brigantia; and it is not improbable the above uncouth word may be a misreading for Amandus and Arcz an abbreviation of Architectus. The word Harimella seems also an importation from Germany, where dedications to Hariasa and Melia have been found, from which words Harimella may be compounded."

Mr. Smith's reading seems probable, except *arcx* as an abbreviation of *architectus*. It is better with Henzen, n. 5892, to regard X as standing for *ex*, *i. e.*, XV = ex voto, but his GAMIDIANVS is very doubtful. If Mr. S.'s conjecture as to the name be correct, and it is not improbable, it removes the objection to the expansion *architectus*, which may arise from having two *architecti* at the same place. It may be, however, that ARC \cdot stands for ARCARIVS, an officer often mentioned in the African inscriptions. The deriva-

[•] Victoria is also identified with Andraste. See Dr. Thurnam, Cran. Brit. dec., iv., p. 131; and p. 81, of my notes, on different identifications of barbarian duties.

tion which Mr. Smith suggests for the name of the goddess is not probable. The only inscription, in which *Melia* is found, has been proved to be a forgery. See Henzen, n. 5244.

§ 114. In p. 128 we have two inscriptions, also found at this station, which present similar difficulties of interpretation :----

(1.)	(2.)
DEAE VIRADES	DEAE RICAGM
THI PAGVS CON	BEDAE PAGVS
DRVSTIS MILI	VELLAVS MILIT
IN COH II TVN	COH II TVNG
$GR \cdot SVB SIVO$	$\mathbf{V} \cdot \mathbf{S} \cdot \mathbf{L} \cdot \mathbf{M}.$
AVSPICE PR	
AEFE.	

Mr. Stuart's observations on No. (1) are :---

"With some few alterations—and considerable allowance made for the errors that may occur in deciphering those time-worn legends—the [inscription] may be translated somewhat as follows:—"To the goddess (or deified) ----, Thiasus Pagus Condrustus, a soldier of the second Cohort of the Tungrian auxiliaries, commanded by Sivus Auspicius, Prefect, (dedicates this altar.) We are at a loss to discover the meaning of the word VIRA-DES; perhaps it has been erroneously copied [by Pennant,] and ought to be read DRYADES or OREADES; in which case the difficulty vanishes, and we have the German soldier offering up his vows to a particular and perhaps tutelary class of the Dex Nymphx."

On the inscription No. (2) Prof. Thomson offers the following note :---

"The altar appears to be dedicated to some provincial deity, possibly Ricagmena Beda by name, by a soldier of the second cohort of Tungrians, Pacus Vellaus, (vide Preh. Ann. p. 398,) or, to avoid imputing a serious grammatical error to the sculptor, by *two* soldiers, Vellaus and Pagus."

Subjoined is the passage in the *Prehistoric Annals of Scotland*, to which reference is made in the note :

"It appears to be dedicated by Pagus Vellaus to one of those obscure local deities, apparently provincial names with Latin terminations, which are more familiar than intelligible to the antiquary. It belongs to a class of Romano-British relics which is peculiarly interesting, notwithstanding

the obscurity of their dedications, as the transition-link between the Roman and British mythology. These altars of the adopted native deities are generally rule and inferior in design, as if indicative of their having their origin in the piety of some provincial legionary subaltern. In the obscure gods and goddesses, thus commemorated, we most probably recognise the names of favourite local divinities of the Romanised Britons, originating for the most part from the adoption into the tolerant Pantheon of Rome of the older objects of native superstitious reverence."

Henzen, n, 5921, gives the first inscription from the 1st ed. of Stuart's *Caledonia Romana*, and subjoins the brief notes :---

"Nomina barbara, fortasse etiam corrupta." "MILLI (avit)." "TVN-GROr." "Corr. PRAEF, cujus nomen male lectum est."

Mr. Wright, Celt, Roman, and Saxon, p. 296 (p. 299, 2nd ed.) translates (1) thus:-

To the goddess Viradesthi, Pagus Condustris a soldier in the second Cohort of Tungrians under Sivus Auspex the Prefect.

PAGVS, in both inscriptions, seems to me to be not a proper name, but the ordinary term, used by Cæsar and Tacitus, for "a district." See Cæsar, B.G. i., 37; iv., 1; and Tacitus, Germ. 39. CONDRVSTIS (or perhaps CONDRVSTVS—a form used in the middle ages) and VELLAVS are, in my judgment, ethnic adjectives, the former derived from CONDRUSI, the latter from VELLAI. The Condrusi and Vellai are both mentioned by Cæsar, B.G. ii., 4, and vii., 75. The Condrusi were neighbours of the Eburones, who were succeeded by the Tungri. The Vellai, Vellavi, Vellavii, * Vellauni, or Velauni were a people of Gallia Celtica, or Aquitania, as the latter term was extended in signification under Augustus.

They are noticed by Strabo, iv., 2, and Pliny, iv., 19, and their name is found in inscriptions: e. gr.—

ETRVSCILLAE AVG·CONIVGI AVG.N̄ CIVITAS VELLAVOR LIBERA.

The Etruscilla mentioned in this inscription is Herennia Cupressenia Etruscilla, the wife of the emperor Trajanus Decius, which fixes the date to the middle of the '3rd century after Christ.

Libera of course indicates the independence of the Vellavi. They were free, however, in the time of Strabo, although in that of Cæsar, B.G. vii., 75, they were in subjection to the Arverni.

For other inscriptions relative to this people, see Mem. des antiquaries de France, iv., pp. 87 and 528.

MILI (or MILT) and MILIT are abbreviations of *militans* not of *militavit*, as Henzen states, for the verb is in the omitted final formula—and SIVO (or SIVOD, the ancient form of the dative and ablative, as given in the illustration), is an erroneous reading of SILVIO, as appears from the following inscription also found at Birrens :—

> MARTI ET VICTO RIAE·AVG·C·R^{AE} TI MILIT·IN COH II TVNGR·CVI· PRAEEST SILVIVS AVSPEX PRAEF· V S L M.

I regard the names of the goddesses, as they appear in the inscriptions, as VIRADESTHI (or VIRADETHI, as it is given in the lithographic representation in the *Caledonia Romana*,) and RICAGMBEDAE; or perhaps the latter is formed of two words. Nothing is known of these deities. They may possibly have been connected with the towns Virodunum (*Verdun*) and Rigomagus (*Remagen*); and it appears to me more probable, that they were local deities of those who erected the altars, than that

they were adopted from the Britons. See p. 63. If the reference to *Rigomagus* be correct, it may be inferred that the Vellavians, serving in a Tungrian cohort, adopted a Tungrian deity.

According to the views which I have stated above, I should translate the inscriptions thus :---

(1.) "To the goddess Viradesthi (or Viradethi) the Condrusian district, (*i. e.*, the men from that district) serving in the second Cohort of the Tungrians, under the command of Silvius Auspex Præfect."

(2.) "To the goddess Ricagmabeda the Vellavian district, (i. e., the men from that district) serving in the second cohort of the Tungrians," &c., &c.

P.S.—Since the foregoing remarks were written, I have seen the 3rd vol., part iv., of the "Collectanea Antiqua" by Mr. C. Roach Smith, in which that able and ingenious antiquary offers his views relative to the two altars which have been under consideration. From these I find that he has anticipated me as to the interpretation of *pagus*, the reference to *Rigomagus*, and the emendation of the prefect's name. After a careful consideration, however, of his interpretations, I see no reason for changing the opinions which I had previously expressed.

Subjoined are his remarks :---

"I propose reading it [inscription 2,] thus : 'To the Goddess Ricamaga of the district (Pagus) of Beda, Vellaus, serving in the Second Cohort of the Tungri, in discharge of a vow, willingly dedicates.' The Bedæ agus was a tract on the line of the Roman road, from Treves to Cologne, some trace of the original name of which is retained in that of its modern representative Bitburg. In this region was a station or town, called Rigomagus or Ricomagus; and to this place, I suspect, may the goddess of the Birrens altar be referred ; especially as the dedicator was a Tungrian. The word pagus is not unfrequently found, in the sense in which it here appears, Mr, Stuart gives one, copied by Pennant, and in similar inscriptions. also found at Birrens, which was erected also by a Tungrian, to the goddess * * * * Mr. Stuart's reading of of the Viradesthian (?) Pagus. the first part is evidently erroneous; and equally so Sivus Auspicius, as we may be assured by fig. 2 of our plate [giving the inscription already noticed,] where we have the same prefect in the nominative case, Silvius Auspez."

A decisive objection to Mr. Roach Smith's interpretations is that they are inconsistent with *pagus* in the nominative case. His reference to *Bedæ Pagus* seems to confirm the conjecture, that *Ricagmabedæ* was composed of two words, of which the latter *Bedæ* was the name of the goddess. Hence *Beda vicus*, (now Bitburg), in the route a *Treviris Agrippinam*, as given in the Itinerary of Antoninus, derived its appellation; and from it came *Pagus Bedensis*, which is noticed in Wesseling's note. See Vet. Rom. Itiner. Amstel., 1735, p. 373.

§ 115. In the preceding article, I cited an inscription on an altar found at Birrens, with the object of establishing the correct reading of the *nomen* of a præfect of the second cohort of the Tungrians. As doubts, however, exist relative to the interpretation of parts of this inscription, I now propose directing special attention to it.

MARTI ET VICT^o RIAE·AVG.C.R^{AE} TIMILIT·IN COH II TVNGR·CVI· PRAEEST SILVIVS AVSPEX·PRÆF· V S L M

In the Caledonia Romana, 2nd ed., by Prof. Thomson, p. 128, we have the following translation of this rendering :---

"To Mars and Victory, the Companies Augustæ of young soldiers in the second cohort of the Tungrians, commanded by Silvius Auspex, Præfect, most willingly have performed their vow."

As this interpretation is evidently unsatisfactory, Prof. Thomson suggests that "The letters C·RAETI probably refer to 100 Raeti, that is, soldiers drawn from the north of Italy and south east of Germany; if so, the term Augustæ must be taken as an epithet of the Goddess Victory."

Mr. C. Roach Smith, Collect. Antiq. iii. p. 203,—"suggests the following reading, emending that given by Dr. Wilson only as regards the name of the person who erected the altar :— Marti et Victoriæ Augustæ C. Raetius militaris in cohorte secunda Tungrorum cui præst Silvius Auspex Præfectus votum solvit lubens merito."—but this reading of C·RAETI MILIT. seems very improbable.

AVG-for AVGVSTÆ-should unquestionably be joined with VICTORIÆ, as there are numerous similar examples; C, as I think, stands for CIVES, as it is frequently used in inscriptions; Prof. Thomson's suggestion, in my judgment, gives the true reading, RAETI, the ethnic adjective of RAETIA: and MILIT is the abbreviation of MILITANTES. From this and a preceding inscription relative to the Tungrians, we learn that in addition to their own countrymen, Vellavians and citizens of Ractia were serving in their ranks. This is as might be expected, and agrees with the inference which may be drawn from many sepulchral inscriptions, that the soldiers in the alæ or auxiliary cohorts were sometimes of nations different from that which gave name to the ala or cohort. See Henzen, Annall. Inst. Arch. 1850, and n. 5838.

§ 116. The following inscription, mentioning the same Præfect is on an altar, also found at Birrens : -

DEAE MINERVAE COH II TVN GRORVM MIL EQ CL CVI PRAEEST CS L AVSPEX PRAEF.

Prof. D. Wilson, *Preb. Ann.* p. 397, renders it thus :- DE.E MIN-ERVÆ, COHORTIS SECUNDÆ TUNGRORUM MILITIA EQUESTRIS CON-STANTINI LEGIONIS, CUI PREEST CAIUS LUCIUS AUSPEX PRÆFECTUS.

grians of the Constantine legion, commanded by Caius Lucius Auspex Prefect.' The cohort was the tenth part of a legion, and hence the apparent transposition in this translation."

There are many obvious objections to this interpretation, and it is plain that it cannot be received. COH II TVNG-RORVM stand for COHORS [SECVNDA TVNGRORVM and indicate that the altar was erected by the cohort, $V \cdot S \cdot L \cdot M \cdot$ or the verb *posuit*, *dedicavit*, or some similar term being omitted, as is of frequent occurrence. As to MIL EQ CL, we have already, p. 15, met with these abbreviations applied to this cohort in the sense, *Mil[iaria] eq[uitata] c[ivium] L[atinorum]*.

The only other point, which deserves attention, is the name of the Præfect, CS L AVSPEX. Instead of the reading which has been proposed, *Caius Lucius Auspex*, I would suggest that I between S and L has been overlooked, that SIL is an abbreviation of SILVIVS, and that the full names of the officer mentioned in this and the other inscriptions, were *Caius Silvius Auspex*.

According to my views, the inscription may be translated thus :---

"To the goddess Minerva, the second cohort of the Tungrians, a thousand strong, furnished with cavalry, consisting of Latin citizens, under the command of Caius Silvius Auspex, Præfect," have erected this altar.

§ 117. There was also found here a pedestal of a small statue of Fortune, bearing an inscription: Mr. Stuart, p. 129, expands and translates it thus :---

FORTVNAE R	FORTUNAE REDUCI PRO
SALVTE P. CAM.	SALUTE P.CAMMII
ITALICI PRAEF CO	ITALICI, PRAEFECTI COHORTIS-
TVN CELER LIBER	TUNGRORUM, CELER
LLM	LIBERTUS, VOTUM SOLVIT
	LIBENTISSIM*O MERITO

Which may be translated: To returned Fortune, in gratitude for the restored health of Cammius Italicus, Prefect of the . . . cohort of the Tungrians Celer the freedman [didicates this,] most willingly performing his vow.

To these observations is subjoined the note :

The number of the cohort is illegible. This *Celer* was, we may suppose a former slave of *Cammius*, and had most probably erected the altar to Fortune as a grateful expression of his feeling for benefits conferred. [A learned friend has favoured me with a different version of this inscription, taken from a copy in the hand-writing of the well known antiquary, Dr. Robert Clapperton of Lochmaben, whose name repeatedly occurs in the early transactions of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland.

FORTVNAE RECVPERATA	To Fortune, on the recovery of his health,
SALVTE P.CAMPANVS	P. Campanus, Prefect of the First Italic
ITALICAE P.PÆ COH.I	Cohort of Tungrians willingly per-
TVNG FLER. LIBERTVS	bis vow.—ED.] [formed
V. I. L. M.	- •

To Mr. Stuart's expansion I see no objection except the use of *libentissime* for *libens' latus*. The notae L. L. were read by Scaliger and by many since his time, as, *libentissime*, but Orelli, n. 2101, points out that the words votum solvit latus libens, being *in extenso* in that inscription, determine the correct reading. See also Henzen, n. 5875. His translation, also, requires emendation. Fortuna redux does not mean returned fortune, but fortune causing the return, bringing home. See p. 18. Celer's master was most probably absent when he crected the altar. Pro salute, also, does not mean for the restored health. If that had been the meaning we should have had ob salutem. The version of the inscription, noticed by Professor Thomson in the note, has not the semblance of probability to recommend it. It is both unprecedented and unintelligible.

§ 118. "Another stone," Mr. Stuart continues, on the same page, "is said to have been found at or near Birrens, which refers to the same "Tungri;" it bears an epitaph to the memory of Ordinatus, most likely one of their tribunes, who was probably interred at this station, and had been erected by his widow, as we learn from the inscription :--

"DIIS MANIBVS AFVTIANO BASSI ORDINATO Tribuno COHortis II TVNGrorum FLAVIA BAETICA CONIVNX FACiendum CVRAVIT"

The name of this tribune was certainly not Ordinatus. It was contained in the words, which have been misread as AFVTIANO BASSI. ORDINATO is used in the same sense as ORDINATVS > 1N LEG. IIII in Henzen's, n. 6773, *i. e., ordinatus centurio in legione quarta.* Lange, p. 46, thinks that ordinatus is there used in the sense of ordinarius. I question it, but I have not been able to satisfy myself as to the distinction. A similar doubt exists as to ORD. in the inscription given by Bruce, p. 196.

§ 119. In the *Caledonia Romana*, p. 202, we find the following note by Professor Thomson :---

"A Roman inscription found on the right bank of the Rhine, has already been referred to, which is the work of one of the Horesti stationed there as a body of Roman Auxiliaries. Another inscription from the same locality, which supplies the date, (consulship of Presens and Albinus, A.D., 239,) is as follows:—

> I N H D D BAIOLI ET VEXILLARI COL LEGIO VICTORIEN SIVM SIGNIFER ORVM GENIVM D E SVO FECERVNT VIII KAL OCTOBR PRESENTE ET ALBINO COS H.XIII.D.S.R.

"This inscription, for which we are indebted to Mr. C. R. Smith, (*Collect. Antiq., vol. ii., p. 135,) has been thus extended by him :— 'In honorem domus divinæ, Bajuli et Vexillarii collegio Victoriensium signiferorum, genium de suo fecerunt, VIII Kal. Octobris, Presente et Albino Consulibus, Heredes tall de suo restituerunt.' That is, so far as correct translation is possible :— 'In honor of the abode or temple of the gods, the carriers and standard-bearers of the guild of the Victorian standard-bearers, erected this to their tutelary deity at their own expense, on the eighth Kalends of October, Presens and Albinus being consuls. Their thirteen heirs restored it at their own expense.' D D may perhaps more probably be an abbrevia-

^{*} Mr. Smith, in the passage referred to by ,Prof. Thomson, observes :--- "This inscription commemorates the restoration of the monument (by the persons whose names appear on the sides,) which originally had been erected by the porters, (bajuli,) the vexillarii, and the standard-bearers[and the vexillarii in the guild of the standard-bearers] of the Victorienses, in honour of the divine house, during the consulship of Presens and Albinus, (A. D. 239."

tion for Deovum [Deorum]. The Victorienses mentioned in the inscription are supposed by local antiquaries to have been natives of the locality; but Mr. Smith, with greater consistency, refers it to the VICTORIA of North Britain, which Ptolemy names as one of the towns of the Damnii. The Notitia furnishes abundant evidence of the care with which the barbarian auxiliaries were removed to a distance from their native provinces, and enables us to trace those drafted from Britain to Gaul, Spain, and even to the East, as well as, from the evidence furnished by such inscriptions, to the banks of the Rhine."—ED.

There are serious errors in this note, some of which it may be useful to point out. The consulship of Præsens and Albinus was not in A.D. 230, but in A.D. 246. D D do not mean "the abode or temple of the gods," nor are they an abbreviation for *Deorum*. They signify the "imperial family," for which they are very commonly used. See p. 126. The words genium dc suo fecerunt do not mean "erected this to their tutelary deity at their own expense," but "erected this Genius at their own expense," viz., the figure, which stood on the base bearing the inscription. In the expansion of $H \cdot *XIII \cdot D \cdot S \cdot R$ —heredes *XIII de suo restituerunt—Prof. Thomson follows Mr. Smith, who seems to have derived this strange reading from Steiner, Inscript. Rom. Rhen., n. 759.

There cannot, 1 think, be a reasonable doubt that the expansion of H, adopted by Orelli, n. 988, is preferable, *scil.*, *hi*, referring to the persons named on two other sides of the base. I also much prefer the opinion that *Victoria* was the ancient name of *Niederbiber*, where the inscription was found.

Mr. Smith, Collect. Antiq., ii., p. 134, gives another inscrip-

* This is given by both Mr. Smith	and Prof. Thomson	n in mistake fo	r xiiii., as there are
14 names on the sides, scil.,			
			a

PATERNVS	SATVLLVS
	A
PRVDENS	SATTARA
MARIANVS	MACRINVS
DAGOVASSVS	LAETVS
CERIALIS	APOLLINARIS
ATVRO .	SECVNDANVS
VICTOR	VRSVS

In the date also they both give VIII.KAL.OCTOBR, instead of VIIII.KAL.OCTOBR. It is worthy of remark that the day is the same as that mentioned, p. 124, in the inauguration of a building at Caerleon. Was there the same reason for the selection of the day? And was it because it was the birth-day of the first Augustus?

tion found at the same place, in which, following Steiner, n. 756, he finds mention of the Horesti, a tribe of North Britons. Prof. Thomson, *Caledonia Romana*, p. 102, adopts Mr. Smith's views. The inscription is variously read, and is very difficult to interpret. Neither the reading nor the interpretation, given by Steiner and adopted by Mr. Smith and Prof. Thomson, appears to me to be satisfactory. I prefer the reading given by Lersch, C. M., iii., 101, and subsequently adopted by Steiner in *Inscript. Dan. et Rhen.*, n. 949, scil. :---

> IDVS OCTOB GIINIO HOR N BRİTTONVM A·IBKIOMARIVS·OPPI VS POSITTVM QVINTA NIISIS POSIT VII

l also prefer the interpretation suggested by Borghesi, Ann., 1839, p. 138, scil., GENIO HOR[REORVM] N[VMERI] BRITTONVM. There is no ground for the supposition that "the Quintanenses were probably a people of the locality." Henzen's conjecture—quintanensis—a soldier of the fifth legion—is much more plausible. See Henzen, n. 5781.

MID LOTHIAN.

> MATRIBALA TERVIS.ET MATRIBCAM PESTRIBCOHI TVNGRINS VERSCARM OI²- SXXVV

"The altar was erected to the DEAE MATRES, here called ALA-TERVAE, (probably from the ancient name of the place,) as also CAM-PESTRES, by the cohors prima TUNGRORUM. So far I think all the copies agree. Indeed the numeral I does not appear distinctly; but since it is the first cohort of the Tungrians that occurs in other inscriptions, 'tis probable that it has been the same also in this. But what to make of the rest of the inscription I know not. I sometimes imagine the next words might have been *instituerunt sacram aram*. This appears not disagreeable to the remains of the letters; and then the last line may possibly have been thus: CONL·RES·XX·V·V·: conlapsam restituit (legio) vicesima valens victrix."

Gough, Camden's Britannia, iv., p. 55, observes : "Dr. Stukeley read the last lines

VIP·COMIM Q·LEG·XXV."

Stuart, Caledonia Romana, ed. Prof. Thomson, p. 167, adopts Horsley's suggestions as to the interpretation, but, following Gordon, gives as the reading of the last two lines

> VEP·SNM OIRS XXVV.

Of the origin of the epithet ALATERVIS I have already

* See p. 146.

expressed an opinion in p. 146; 1 shall therefore limit my present remarks to the difficulty which exists relative to the last two lines. They are so defective, and the differences of the proposed readings are so great that it is, I fear, hopeless to attempt to restore them. I entertain but little doubt, however, that they contained the name and rank of some officer, probably a centurion or tribune, of the 20th Valeria Victrix, and that INS at the end of the 5th line stands for INSTANTE, denoting that the altar was raised by the Tungrian Cohort, under the superintendence of that officer. See p. 16.

This opinion is supported by the inscription on an altar, found at Rough Castle in 1843, and figured in *plate* xv., Stuart's *Caledonia Romana*. The inscription is read and expanded by him thus :---

Stuart regarded the inscription as "a dedication to victory by the Sixth Cohort of the Nervian auxiliaries, who were commanded, as far as we can ascertain the name, by $A \cdot BELIO$, a Centurion in the Twentieth Legion Valens Victrix." To his remarks he subjoins the note: "We cannot be certain of the letters which ought to be inserted here, they are so indistinct upon the stone; but they are most probably the initials of the words CVI PRAEEST, 'commanded by.'" I have but little doubt that the* indistinct letters (as represented in the plate) in the third line after VIORVM are INS• standing for INSTANTE and that the symbol before LEG in the fourth line is the ordinary > for centurion. It is not easy to form an opinion relative to the name of the individual. Stuart's A• BELIO would suggest Aulus Belius, which I disapprove : perhaps the cognomen was BELLICVS or BELICVS.

 $[\]bullet$ Mr. Stuart reads the first letter C: if this be true, the letters are CVR for CVRANTE.

MID LOTHIAN.

These altars furnish additional illustrations of the usage of placing legionary centurions, detached from their legions, over auxiliary bodies. See Henzen, nn. 6740, 6787. This usage explains the meaning of *suo* in the inscription, given in p. 147. In Horsley's *Yorkshire*, n. 1, we have the very rare case of one auxiliary body executing a work under the direction of the commanding officer of another :—

COH·I·THR ACVM·REST ITVIT·CVRAN TE·VAL· FRON TONE PRAEF EQ·ALAE VETTO

i. e., cohors prima Thracum restituit curante Valerio Frontone præfecto equitum alæ Vettonum.

§ 121. In Stuart's Caledonia Romana, p. 159, ed. Prof. Thomson, we find the following explanation of an inscription on an altar found at Inveresk :—

"APOLLINI
GRANNO
Q LVSIVS
SABINIA
NVS
PROC
AVG
V·SS·L·V·M

Apollini Grannico Quintus Lusius Sabinianus Proconsul Augusti ; votum susceptum solvit lubens volens merito.

To Apollo Granicus, Quintus Lusius Sabinianus the Proconsul of Augustus [dedicates this] a self-imposed vow, cheerfully performed."

GRANNO and PROC. are the only parts of the inscrip-

MID LOTHIAN.

tion which present any doubt worth considering. Stuart seems to have adopted the opinion expressed by Camden, that "Apollo Grannus among the Romans was the same with the Grecian 'A $\pi \delta \lambda \omega \nu \, \dot{a} \kappa \epsilon \rho \sigma \epsilon \kappa \delta \mu \eta \varsigma$, that is, long-locked; for Isidore calls the long hair of the Goths granni." Dr. Thurnam, Hist. Ethnol. Cran. Brit. Dec. iv., more probably traces the name to grian, the Gaelic name of the sun, and observes that the old name of Aix la Chapelle, Aquis granum, shows the same derivation. He also refers to Orelli, nn. 1997-2000, where we have the same 'Apollini Granno.'

As to LVSIVS, it is plain from Stuart's remarks that he mistook the meaning of *prænomen*. Accordingly he makes statements which are erroneous and suggests doubts, where there is no room for one. Horsley, in his expansion, unaccountably reads LVCIVS, for which there is no reason. The LVSIA is a wellknown *gens*, members of which are named in several inscriptions. The expansion of PROC. into *proconsul* is erroneous : it probably stands for *procurator*.

PERTHSHIRE.

§ 122. A funereal tablet, which was found many years ago in the Roman station at Ardoch, is figured in Stuart's *Caledonia Romana*, ed. Prof. Thomson, pl. v., fig. 5, and the following explanation is given of the inscription :—

> DIS MANIBVS AMMONIVS DA MIONIS * COII I HISPANORVM STIPENDIORVM XXVII HEREDES F C

"To the shade of Ammonius Damion, Centurion of the First Cohort of the Spanish Stipendiaries, who served for 27 years, his heirs have erected this monument."

To this translation are subjoined notes to the effect, that others have regarded *Damionis* as governed by *filius* or *servus* understood; and that it would perhaps be more correct to join xxvii to *heredes*, *i. e.*, his twenty-seven heirs.

Horsley, Britannia Romana, p. 205, expresses his preference for considering Damionis as the nominative case, and compares such names as Petilius Cerealis.

It is not easy to discover where Stuart found any authority for the word *Stipendiaries*, which he introduces into his translation, for on the supposition that he mistook the meaning of *Stipendiorum*, we are then at a loss for the Latin denoting "who served for." Nor is it possible to reconcile *Ammonius* in the nominative with his translation—"of Ammonius Damion." Professor Thomson's suggestion to connect xxvii with *heredes* is so obviously unwarrantable, that it is surprising that any one could for a moment have entertained the idea. There is no doubt

PERTHSHIRE.

that the words-COH I HISPANORVM STIPENDIORVM XXVII HEREDES $\mathbf{F} \cdot \mathbf{C} \cdot$ -mean "of the first cohort of Spaniards, of twenty-seven years' service, his heirs have caused [this memorial] to be erected;" and the only questionable point is as to *Damionis*. I am inclined to take it as the genitive case, \mathbf{F} either being omitted as is not rare, or perhapsobliterated by the fracture of the stone between S and C, where there seems to be sufficient space both for it and for >, the symbol of *centurio*.

ROXBURGSHIRE.

§ 123. An altar, probably found at or near Eildon, is figured in Stuart's *Caledonia Romana*, ed. Prof. Thomson, pl. vi., fig. 2. Prof. Thomson reads and translates the inscription thus :---

"CAMPESTR	Campestribus
SACRVM AEL	Sacrum Ælius
MARCVS	Marcus
DEC ⁰ ALAE AVG	Decurio Alæ Augustæ
VOCONTIO	\mathbf{V} ocontio
V·S·L·L·M	Votum solvit libentissime merito.

Dedicated to the field-deities by Aelius Marcus Decurion of the Augustan Wing, a Vocontian^d (who) performs his vow most cheerfully.

"d. The Vocontii inhabited the S. E. of Gaul. We have rendered the above as if it had been Vocontius."

I would read the inscription thus :-

CAMPESTR[IBVS] SACRVM AEL[IVS] MARCVS DEC[VRIO] ALAE AVG[VSTAE] VOCONTIO[RVM] V[OTVM] S[OLVIT]⁻L[AETVS] L[IBENS] M[ERITO].

The deities, to whom the altar was erected, were the matres campestres. Marcus is a rare cognomen, but in Mommsen's Inscript.Neap., n. 3836, we have another example of it as borne by an individual also a member of the Ælia gens. The ala Augusta Vocontiorum is also mentioned in an inscription, given in Monum. Hist. Brit., n. 112 a., as a part exercitus Britannici.

Mr. Wright's reading, in the *Celt, Roman, and Saxon*, p. 253 (p. 257, 2nd ed.), of the name of the dedicator as "Marcus Decius Voconticus" is singularly erroneous.

к 2

ROXBURGHSHIRE.

§ 124. In the year 1830 an altar, in perfect preservation, was found not far from the village of Eildon. It is figured in Stuart's *Caledonia Romana*, p. 152, ed. Prof. Thomson, and bears the following inscription :---

DEO SILVA NO PROSA LVTE·SVA·ET SVORVM CAR RIVS DOMITI ANVS > LEGXX VV·VS·LL·M

Stuart expands it thus : "Deo Silvano, pro salute sua et suorum *Carrius Domitianus centurio legionis vicesimæ valentis victricis votum solvit libentissime merito."

I would emend this expansion by reading C. Arrius (Caius Arrius) for Carrius, Valeriæ for valentis, and lætus libens for libentissime. See pp. 3, 247.

^{*} Mr. Wright, Celt, Roman, and Sazon, p. 268 (p. 272, 2nd ed.) adopts this reading.

§ 125. Many years ago there was found at Kilsyth, near the wall of Antoninus, a grave-stone bearing the following inscription, as given in Gough's Camden, iv., p. 95 :—

D·M C·IVLII MARCELLINI PRAEF COH·I·HAMIOR

i, e., Diis' Manibus Caii Julii Marcellini præfecti cohortis primæ Hamiorum.

Reinesius (Syntag. p. 520) suggests THAMIOR, instead of MAMIOR, which was the reading in his copy, and traces the name to Tamia, a town in Britain mentioned by Ptolemy. Stuart, Caledonia Romana, ed. Prof. Thomson, p. 338, regards the Hamii of the inscription, as "auxiliaries, it is probable, from the neighbourhood of the Elbe." Böcking, Notitia, ii., p. 932, is disposed to regard the reading HAMIOR as a mistake for NERVIOR, *i.e.*, Nerviorum. The name of this people also appears on an altar, found, as Horsley believed, at Little Chesters in Northumberland.

> DEAE SVR1 AESVBCALP VRNIO AGR ICOLALEG·AV(} PR·PR·A·LICINIVS CLEMENS PRAEF III·A·IOR

i. e., Deæ Suriæ, sub Calpurnio Agricola legato Augusti pro prætore, Aulus Licinius Clemens præfectus, * *

Horsley states that some had read the last line I HAMIOR,

i. e., primæ Hamiorum, but that he preferred IV GALLOR, *i.e., quartæ Gallorum*. In 1831 another altar was found at *Caervorran* in Northumberland, which gives further information as to this people, *Archæologia*, xxiv., 352 :--

FORTVNAE·AVG· PRO·SALVTE·L·AELI CAESARIS·EX·VISV T·FLA·SECVNDVS PRAEF·COH·I·HAM IORVM·SAGITTAR V·S·L·M

i. e., Fortunæ Augustæ pro Salute Lucii Ælii Cæsaris ex visu Titus Flavius Secundus præfectus cohortis primæ Hamiorum sagittariorum votum solvit libens merito.

From what has been stated, there can, I think, be no doubt that the first cohort of a people called *Hamii* served in Britain during the Roman occupation; but it has not been ascertained who they were. The conjectures of Reinesius and Stuart are so improbable, that we must look elsewhere for a solution of the difficulty. Mr. Wright, *Celt, Roman and Saxon*, p. 295, remarks :—

"An altar was found at Thirwall, on the wall of Hadrian, dedicated to a *dea Hammia*, who is supposed by Hodgson to have been named from *Hamah* on the Orontes. Perhaps, however, this goddess may have been named from the Hamii, a tribe on the banks of the Elbe, who are found stationed in this part of Britain."

Mr. Wright's suggestion that Dea Hummia, Bruce's Roman Wall, p. 400, was a local goddess of the Hamii seems probable, but Mr. Hodgson, has, in my judgment, pointed out the native place of both the deity and the people, when he refers us to Hamah on the Orontes. The inscription Deæ Suriæ supports this reference, and it is not improbable, that it is the place mentioned in the Notitia, Dux Syriæ, p. 88, ed. Böcking, as Amattha. It was otherwise called by the Syrians, Hemmath, Hamath, and Chamath, and is commonly known by its Greek designation, Epiphania.

§ 126. In Stuart's *Caledonia Romana*, ed. Prof. Thomson, p. 330, we have the following account of one of the altars found at Auchindavy :---

"The second is inscribed, as copied below, to a whole list of the Immortals—Mars, Minerva, the Field Deities, and Victory—besides, apparently, two others, called HERO and EPONA, regarding whom there is much field for conjecture. Professor Anderson imagined the former to be some particular Hero whom Firmus worshipped, and the latter to be the name of a German goddess:—c

"MARTI	MARTI
MINERVAE	MINERVAE
CAMPESTRI	CAMPESTRIBUS
BVS HERO	HEROI EPONAE
EPONA	VICTORIAE
VICTORIAE	MARCUS COCCEIUS
M. COCCEI	FIRMUS
FIRMUS	CENTURIO LEGIONIS
JLEG·II· AUG.	SECUNDAE AUGUSTAE "

"c He also gives another reading, in which the word CAMPESTRI is coupled with MINERVAE—making the dedication to the Rural Minerva and for the word HEROI he supplies RVSHERIO—in his opinion another deity of the Germans. It scems, however, to be HEROI in the original."

There can be no doubt that Stuart's reading is correct, except as to* HERO..., which, I am persuaded, should have been read HERC, *i. e.*, HERCVLI or HERCLI. His remark, however, that there is much field for conjecture regarding EPONA is inaccurate. *Epona* is well known to classical scholars from Juvenal, *Sat.* viii., 157, and Apuleius, *Metam.* iii., (cited by Prof. Thomson in a note,) and to epigraphists from some altars on which she is named. See Bruce, *Roman Wall*, p. 398. P. S. Orelli, p. 1555, has anticipated me in conjecturing *Herculi*.

§ 127. Mr. Stuart, *Caledonia Romana*, ed Prof. Thomson, pl. x., fig. 3, figures the fragment of a tablet, which bears the following imperfect inscription :---

P•LEG• II A Q•LOLLIO VR LEG AVG•PR•PR

Mr. S. expands and translates it thus :---

POSUIT LEGIO SECUNDA AUGUSTA QUINTO LOL-LIO URBICO LEGATO AUGUSTI PROPRAETORI. Placed by the second Legion Augusta to (or in honor of) Quintus Lollius Urbicus, Legate and Proprætor of the Emperor.

Prof. D. Wilson, *Prehist. Annals*, p. 374, taking the same view, remarks :---

"No great error can be committed in thus extending it as a votive tablet in honour of the Legate rather than of the Emperor:—POSUIT LEGIO SECUNDA AUGUSTA QUINTO LOLLIO URBICO LEGATO AUGUSTI PROPRAETORI."

I have no doubt that this reading is erroneous, and that Horsley's is correct. He expands the inscription thus :---

"Imperatori Cæsari Tito Aelio Hadriano Antonino Augusto Pio patri patriae legio secunda Augusta sub Quinto Lollio Urbico legato Augusti proprætore fecit."

If P had been used for POSVIT, it would have followed LEG·II·AVG; and if the tablet had been dedicated to the legate, his name and titles would have preceded LEG·II·AVG. P.

§. 128. In the *Celt*, *Roman*, and *Saxon*, there is an instructive chapter on "The different races in Roman Britain," in which Mr. Wright has collected the scattered notices which bear on the Ethnology of the period. As might be expected in a task of considerable labour, and involving many minute details, some errors have crept in, which require notice, lest they should mislead others. One of these (page 253) is, that *" Caius Antiochus Lysimachus, commemorated in a Greek inscription found in Scotland, was no doubt a Greek."

Mr. Wright has been led into error by a mistake in Stuart's

^{*} In the 2nd ed., Mr. Wright has omitted this passage without remark. For other instances of similar adoption of my corrections, see pp. 5, 7, 8, 62, 167.

Caledonia Romana. In No. 1 of plate VI. of that work,* a stone, preserved in the Museum of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, is figured, in which the name Lysimachus occurs; but the stone was found, not in Scotland, but in Africa, and Prof. Thomson, in his preface, points out Mr. Stuart's mistake, and acknowledges his own oversight.

^{*}The stone is a sepulchral memorial of Antiochis, the daughter of Lysimachus. It is not easy to tell, from the faint copy which I have before me, what the letters are which Mr. Wright read "Caius;" but they unquestionably do not stand for that name. The first letter seems to be L, from which I infer that they most probably are sigla for the year of the Emperor, as is common in the Greek inscriptions of Egypt and Cyrene.

P. S.-Mr. Burgon, Letters from Rome, p. 164, strangely remarks, relative to the use or this letter on a grave-stone, bearing a Greek inscription, in the Museum Kircherianum:-

[&]quot;Would the use of the initials of $\Lambda\nu\kappa\alpha\beta\alpha_s$, instead of the common word $\epsilon\tau\sigma_s$, indicate some connection of the person commemorated with Egypt? It is only on Egyptian coins, I think, that dates are indicated by the initial of that very unusual word for year?" Has he forgotten the numerous examples on stones found, as I have stated above, in Egypt and Cyrene? See Boeckh, Corp. Inscr. Grac., vol. iii. The L was formerly regarded as standing for Λ the first letter of $\Lambda\nu\kappa\alpha\beta\alpha_s$, an ancient Greek term for a year. See Homer, Od., xiv., 161, xix., 306. This opinion is rejected by Franz, Elem. Epig. Grac., p. 372.

A.

A. for Amicitia or Amicus 208
Aballava 203-208
Adventus, Oclatinius 149, 150
Aera for Stipendia
Æsculapius, British
Alæ, Miliariæ, and quinge-
nariæ note 15
Alæ:
I Asturum 133, 134
<i>II Asturum</i> 164
II Gallorum Sebosiana 6, 62
I Hispanorum 6
Indiana
I Pannoniorum Tampiana 6
Petriana,additions to 62
Sabiniana 195
Sacmatarum 81
<i>I Thracum</i>
Hispanorum Vettonum6, 183
Vocontiorun
Alatervanote 146
Amboglanna note 17, 205
Ammianus Marcellinus, ed. Wag-
ner and Erfurdt, Leipsic,
1808 67
Andraste, a goddessnote 239
Anicero
Anio, ' misreading of Anto,' i.e.,
Antoniniana
" misreading of Anic 160
'Annali dell' inst. di corres-
pond. Archæol.' Rome 67
F 96, 250
Anociticus, Antenociticus, a
god additions to 134
L 2

⁴ Antiquaries of Scotland, Pro- ceedings of Society of ² 160 Antoninus, Itinerarium, ed. Par- they and Pinder, Berlin, 1848, note 3, note 18, note 21, note 28, note 56, note 60, note 62, note 56, note 60, note 62, note 77, note 78, 99, note 137, note 142, note 147, note 167, note 228, [note 244, note 263
Apiatoriumnote 146
Apollo, Clarius 154
" Maponus 79
Aquæ 135
Aquæductus
Aquaucius
Aquæ Solis 176—199 Aquilifer 173
Arabicus 227
Arbeia
Arcarius 239
Archæologia, London 40
[note 64, 177, 260
Archæologia Æliana, Newcastle, 29
60, 79, 117, note 147, 152, 154
[155, 157, 158, 159, 161, 220
'Archeological Association,
Journal of,' London 84, 97
[142, note 169, note 183, 186
'Archæological Institute, Jour-
nal of,' London 32, 78, 90, 99
[106, 168, 229
" Proceedings of
Archæologia Cambrensis, Lon-
don
'Archæol. and Nat. Hist. So-
ciety of Somersetshire, Pro-
ceedings of,' Taunton, note37, 183
occuração, fauntos,setter, set

Architectus238, 239
Aristophanes, Oxon. 1851 178
Aristotle, Paris, 1848 178
Armatura, a soldier
Armaturarum cuneus,note 81
Arneth I. 'Zwölf Romische,
Militar-diplome,' Vienna,
1843
Arnobius, Leyden, 1651 66
'Atti della pontif. Accad. d'Ar-
cheol.,' Rome 8
Augustine, Paris, 1685 66
Ascia 93
Auxiliary troops, 'Alæ' and
"Cohories" note 15
Axelodunum note 21, 204, 205
В.
Ballistarium 161
Bangor 226
Banna
Bateman, Mr. T., 'Vestiges of
the Antiquities of Derby-
shire,' London, 1850
Bath 176–199
Dallisianus Delisianus Deli
Bellicianus, Belicianus, Feli-
cianus
Benwell 134 and additions.
Bewcastle 64
Biagi, Clemens, Monum. Græc.
et Lat. ex Museo Naniano,Rome,
1787note 127
Binchester 60
Birdoswald17, 205
Birrens12, 21, 237-248
Birth-place, name of, pro-
perly after cognomen 4
" rarely before 181
" in ablative or genitive, note 20
" without domo note 111
Blatum Bulgium, note 237
Böcking, Dr. E., Notitia Dig-
nitatum utriusque imperii,
Bonn, 1839-1853, 12, note
14, note 56, 58, note 81, 84,
note 133, note 134, note 136,
[137, 164, 259, 260

Boeckh, A., Corpus inscrip.
Græcarum.'-Berlin note 263
Bono generis humani 141
Borghesi, B. Count, 8, 53, 67, 250
Bracchium, note 146
Brampton 205
Bremenium note 137, 160
Bremetenracum, Bremetenacum,
Bremetonacum, Bremetonacæ,
Brementoracum, Brementura-
cum note 78
Brigantia, a goddess, 65, 237, 238
Brittones and Britanni, distinc-
tion between 136
Brough 146
Bruce, Rev. J. C., LL.D. 'The
Roman Wall,' 2nd ed., Lon-
don, 1853—18, 20, note 57,
58, 61, note 65, 105, 134
and additions, 136, 137,
138, 144, 146, 147, note 148,
163, 164, 165, 205, 206, 220,
[233, 261
" " Archæologia
Æliana, 116, 154, 155, 156,
157 and additions, 158, 160, 161
" " Journal of
Archaelogical Institute 30, 78
[194
Buchanan, Mr. Jnote 229
Buckman, Prof 179
Burgon, Rev. J.W., M.A., 'Let-
ters from Rome,' London,
1862 note 132, 211, 212,
[note 263

c.

C. A. curam agente
Caerleon 99-132
" Roman name of, as
colonia (?) 126
Caesa manu, 'having cut to
pieces a body' (?) 144
Caesar, Bell. Gall., ed. Long,
London, 1853note 15, 241, 242
Cambeck note 14

Camden, ' Britannia, 'ed. Gough,
London, 1806 5, 36, 67,
75, 79, 92, 123,236, note 146,
[156, 167, 184, 250, 259
Canat, M
Cangi or Ceangi 36, 50
Canganorum promontorium 36
Cardinali, C. 'Diplomi Impe-
riali,' Velletri, 1835 9
Carlisle, Rev. D 15
Carlisle 30
Castle Steads 12
Castra exploratorum note 21
Cellarius, C. 'Notitia Orbis An-
tiqui,' Leipsic, 1731 91
Centuria, to which a soldier be-
longed, put in the ablative 92
Centuriæ, peculiar sense of 104
Centurial mark, for century, 89, 115
[180
" stones 9, 85, 112, 121
Centuriæ pedatura 117
C. EQ., Colonia Equestris 181
Chester
Chesterfield 38
Chesterholm 136
Chesters 164
" Halton 134
" Little
Cicero, ed. Ernesti, London,
1810, 29, note 75, note 82, 105
Γ120, 197
Cilurnum note 164
Cirencester 62
Civitas, ' for birthplace,' 31
C. L., civium Latinorum15, 246
Clayton, Mr. J note 81
fand additions to 134
Cocidius or Cocideus, a god, note 64
Coccium note 78
Cognomen, ' want of,'
" 'masculine of fe-
males,' 129
Con· I· L· GOR·, Cohortis pri-
mæ Lingonum Gordianæ 57

Cohorts, Auxiliary :
I Alpinorum 6
II Asturun 154
I Bætasiorum 6
III Bracar. Augustanorum 6
Brittonum 136
I Cornaviorun 137
I Cugernorum 6, note 233
I .Elia Dacorum
IIII Delmatarum 6
I Frisianonum, note 65, 85,
[note 119
IIII Gallorum note 95
I Hamiorum23, 259, 260
I Hispanorum 6, note 59, 255
I Lingonum
<i>IIII</i> " 6, note 58
I Morinorum 6
I Nervana Germanorum, note 16
21 et seqq.
Nerviorum 23
VI " 252
I Sunucorum 215
<i>II Thracum</i> 6
I Tungrorum, 6, 14, note 15, 17
[154, 232, 251
II Tungrorum, 12 et seqq., 240
[247
I Vangionum6, 147, 152
I Vardulorum139, 167, 160
Cohors miliaria equitata note 15
" peditum or peditata note 15
Colcesternote 137
Collocation of words, errors
from not noticing, 5, 27, 57, 262
Condercum note 133
Congavatanote 21, 204, 205
Conjux, 'meaning of,' 110 Constructions mistaken,8, 155, 158
Constructions mistaken,8, 155, 158
" varied 233
Consuls, names of, restored, 124
[125, 156
Consuls:
Neronis IIII., A. D.60 52
Vespasiano V., Tito III., A.D. 749, 35
74

$\mathbf{267}$

Vespasiano VII., Tito V., A.
D. 76 9, 35
Domitiano VII., A.D. 81 85
Trajanus V., trib. pot. VII.,
A.D. 104 5
M. Laberio Maximo II, Q. Gli-
tio Atiluo Agricola II., A.
D. 104 6
Madriano III., trib. pot. IV.,
A. D. 120–121 86
Antonino Fio III., A. D. 140-
144 233
Commodo et Laterano, A. D.
154
Aproniano et Bradua, A. D.
191 additions to 20
Severo III., et Antonino II., A.
D. 205-7 147
M. Aurel. Antonino [Cara-
callo] IIII., trib. pot.
XVIIII., imp. III. (?) A.
D. 216 158
Fusco II. et Dextro, A.D. 225 156
Maximo II. et Urbano, A. D.
234124
Gordiano III., (?) et Pompei-
ano, A.D. 241 13
Attico et Prætextato, A. D.
242 additions to 20
Æmiliano et Peregrino, A D.
244 125
Contubernales, meaning of, 169,110
Сов 139
Corbridge, note 137, note 142
Corinium note 62
Corionototarum 142
Cornicularius 164
Corstopitumnote 138, 139
Cos. I note 148
C: R., Civium Romanorum 184
Cramond note 146, 251 Crane, Rev. T 41
Cultor, omitted, 144 CUMBAS, cum base 144
Cuneus, 'meaning of,' note 67
Cup, inscribed 203
Cup, inserioed 205

Cupa, Cupula, for burial, 210,	211
Curator agrorum	188
" alæ	164

D.

D. for domo 20
Dates mistaken 7, note 35
note 36, 125, note 153, 158, 249
D.D., the imperial family, 26, 249
" in other significations, 124, 127
De 20
Death, place of, rarely men-
tioned note 28
Dec. Decurio
Decumbere, meaning of 28
Dedicare
Defossus
Defunctus, not avoided in epi-
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
taphs note 127
Deities, barbarous, differently
identified mote 81
" " number of, increased
by misreadingsnote 64
" " order of names 191
" " mentioned on altars
found in Britain 63
Delicta confused with dilecta or
delecta 178
Derventio 38
Deva note 3
DeWal, Dr., Mythologiæ Sep-
tentrionalis Monumenta, Ut-
recht, 18473, 62, 65, 144
Dion Cassius, Hist. Rom., Ham-
burgh, 1752, note 4, 34, 73, 150
Г199
Dis mountibus—monentibus? 61
Domo, birth-place 20
Doncaster 27
D·R· 138
$D \cdot S \cdot P$, de suo peculio 61
Duplaris, Duplarius, Duplica-
rius, Dupliciarius
[and additions 138
Durocornoviumnote 62
2 a. 000, noviam noie 02

ÌNDEX.

E.

D 1
Eckhel, J., 'Doctrina numorum
veterum,' Vienna, 1792, note 36
[199
EIS for I 54
Elenborough, Elenfoot note 18
Ellis, Sir Henry, 'Townley
Gallery,' London, 1846 39
Elsdon 140
Emperors and the Imperial Family:
Claudius
Britannicus
Nero
Vespasian
Titus
Domitian
Nerva 23 Trajan 5
Trajan 5 Hadrian,
L. Ælius 260 Antoninus Pius, 58, 229, 230
[231, 232, 233]
Antoninus and Verus, 33, 35, 200
. [919
Severus 101
128, 129, 147, 153, 225
Julia Domna 126
Caracalla i. e., M. Aurelius
Antoninus, 101, 128, 147, 153
[157, 225
Caracalla, or Elagabalus, 162, 198
[228
Geta 101, 129, 147
Severus Alexander 154
Gordian 13, additions to 56
Sabinia Furia Tranquilla, ad-
[ditions to 20
Valerian, Gallienus, and Sa-
loninus 104 Emi, 'I bought' 205
<i>E. Q., Equitata,</i> 15, 58, 59
Equitum
Equestris or Equitatanote 16
Et, intrusion of, note 4, 55, note 102
" omission of
Evocatus Palatinusnote 22

EX'ARG',	EX'ARGENT', on pigs
of lead	
Expeditio	Germanica 128, 129

F.

Fabrica note 187
Fabretti, R., Inscript. Antiq.
Explicatio, Rome, 1699 46
[59, 109, 149, 181, 215
Felix, epithet of Emperors156, 157
Ffoulkes, Mr 10
Foster, Mr 226
Franks, Mr. A 66, 93, note 112
[196
Franz, I., Elementa Epig. Græc.
Berlin, 1840 note 263
Frisianonum, Frixagorum, cohors
primanote 119

G.

Gabrosentis, Gabrosentum, note	21
Galacum note	28
Galatum note	28
Galer., i.e., Galeria, a tribe, not	-0
a bame	5
Germanorum cohors Nervana	22
Gifford, Dr40, note	46
Grannus	254
'Gentleman's Magazine,' Lon-	
don 52, note 81, 88, 97,	
109, 125, 128, additions to	
134, note 169, note 170,	
[172, 217,	91g
	13
Gordianus, cos. 111	19
[and additions.	
Gordon, Λ ., Iter Septentrionale,	
London, 1726 note 28,	142
Gough, see Camden and	177
Governors of Britain :	
Julius Frontinus note	126
	126
Julius Severus	88
	6
L. Neratius Marcellus	•
[and additions to 1	
Platorius Neposnote 1	
Priscus Licinius 2	27

Q. Lollius Urbicus
Calpurnius Agricola 259
L. Alfenus Senecio133, 147
Ti. Claudius Paulinus 162
Egnatius Lucilianus 56, 139
Mæcilius Fuscus
Nonnius Philippus addi-
[tions to 20
Desticius Juba 104
Desticius 5 404 101
Modius Julius 20
Claudius Xenephon 136
Q. Antonius Isauricus (?) note 217
Q. Antonius Isuanicus (.) Hoto III
Quintus Calpurnius errone-
ously 193
Gruter, I. Inscrip. Antiq. to-
tius orbis Romani, Amster-
dam, 1707 138, 143, 151, 185
[215, 314
Glannibantanote 56
Glanoventa note 56
Greek inscriptions9,165, 166, 262
GVBER Gubernator ? 223
Guntia, a town 4
Gutherius, de jure manium,
Græv. Antiq. xii 210
······································

н.

Habitancum note 146
Halton, 84
" Chesters 134
Harland, Mr. J 79
Harimella, a goddess 66, 239
Hastatus primus 120
" priornote 121
Hedley, Rev. A., A. M 220
Henzen, W. Collect. Orell.,
vol. iii., Zurich, 1856, passim.
Hermann, C. F 104
HERO for HERC 261
Herodian, Historia, ed. Irmisch,
Leipsic, 1789 150
Hexameter165, 166, 174, 175, 206
Hinde, Mr. Hodgson, 78 et seqq.
Hints 202

Hippocrates ed. Foesius, Ge- neva, 1657 178
Hodgson, Rev. J., 'History of
8
Northumberland'; 'Roman
Wall,'
Hodgson, Mr. T., 12 et seqq., 111
[note 147, 152, 160
Hodgson, Mr. C 21
Horace, Oxon. 1860ncte 187, 213
Horsley, Rev. J., M. A., Brit-
annia Romana,London,1732, passim.
Hübner, Drnote 90, note 104, 123
[note 183
mugnes, mission in the second second
Ilunnumnote 134
Hunter, Rev. J 192, 193, 194
Hyginus, de castrametatione,
Græv. Antiq., x., 1093 15, 117
Hypobasis 146
_

I.

I for <i>Ipsa</i>	238
II commonly for Enote	70
[and additions.	
Indians, mistake regarding	62
Ingenua, a cognomen	90
Instante, Instantia 16,	252
Interamnates, between the Wye	
and Severn	75
Inverted inscription	112
Invictus, applied to Caracalla.	
IOVCETIO, misreading for LOV-	
CETIO	185
Iovi dilecti	210
Iovi Dolicheno	210
Isca Silurum 100	-182

J.

Johnson, Dr	84
Josephus, Bellum Judaicum, ed.	
Dindorf, Paris, 1845, note	15
Junia, a common name amongst	
the Spaniards	91
Just, Mr. J	79

К.

Kempe, Mr. A. Jnote	70
Kenrick, Rev. J., M. A., ' Ro-	
man Sepulchral Inscrip-	
tions,' London, 1848, 26,	217
[218, 223,	224
Key, Prof	55
Kiangi 50, ct seqq.	
King, Rev. C. W., M.A 104,	107
[109, note	112
Kilpatrick,	229
Knight, Rev. H. H	127
Kopp, 'Geshichte der Chemie,'	
Brunswick, 1843	45

L.

Lı,
Lampridius, Script. Hist. Au-
gust., Leyden, 1680 188
L. L. laetus libens 236, 247
L. for Λυκάβας (?)note 263
" for Limes ? 119
" for Lingonum (?) 57
Latham, Dr. R. C 36
Lanchester 51
Lange, C. C. L., 'Hist. mutati-
onum rei milit. Rom.' Gottin-
gen, 1846 61, 104, 117
Lead, pigs of 9, 32-55, 77, 172
[199, 200, 201, 202
" Latin terms for 33, 34
" found in France, note 37
" " Spain 54
" " Switzerland
[additions to 54
" " manufacturers'
[marks onnote 49, 54
" law relative to 51
" inscription on tab-
let of
Lee, Mr. J. E., 'Delineations
of Roman Antiquities ;' 'De-
scription of a Roman Build-
ing ;' ' Isca Silurum ;' Lon-
don 99-132
Leemans, Dr note 65, note 119
LEG·AVG· 216

LEG'II'A'P'F' legio secunda adjutrix pia fidelis 92, 197, 180 LEG'II'AVG'... legio secunda Augusta 101, 104, 111, 123 [125, 231, 232, 261, 262 " " ANT' scil. Antoniniana 107 LEG.VI.VIC., Legio sexta victrix 78 [144, 230, 231, 232 " Firma 94 " r.F., scil. pia fidelis...96, 97 LEG VIIII, legio nona 88, 89 LEG'XIIII'GEM', legio quatuordecima gemina, 94, 171, 172 (?) LEG XX'V'V', legio vicesima Valeria victrix, 3, 97, 170, 181 [229, 231, 232, 258 Legali, two at the same time in the sixth legion, note 105 Legatus and Præfectus, different officers at the same time in the second legion 105 Leland, J., Collectanea, London, 1774 -33 Lersch, L 96, 250 Letronne, M., 'Inscriptions de l'Egypte,' Paris, 1842...... 159 Letters, form of,....note 162 Leucetius, Loucetius, epithet of Mars. 186 LIB.COS., Librarius Consulis ... 140 Life, duration of in Roman Britain 121 Little Chesters 136 Livy, Oxon., 1855 ... note 15. note 60, 120, note 146, 219 Locus Suaris note 119 Longovicus 56 Lug;, for Lugdunum 95 LUT', LUTUD', on pigs of lead, 38 **[39, 42, 43** Lysons, Rev. D., M.A., and S. ' History of Derbyshire' 88 Lysons, S. 'Reliquiæ Britannico-Romanæ,' London, 1816. 7 [note 63

Lysons, Rev. D., M A 61
" Rev. S., M.A., 'The
Romans in Gloucestershire,'
London, 1800 63 et segg., 76
М.
M., for Milites 155
MacLauchlan, Mr. H., 'Me-
moir written during a Sur-
vey of the Roman Wall,'
London, 1858, note 14, note
146, 205, 206, note 229, note 236
Maffei, S., Museum Veronense,
Verona, 1749 31, 105 108, 16 ⁹
[182
Мад 10
Maia 203
Malpas 5
Mansfield 42
Marcellus, Neratius, L8 and
[additions to 134
Marchi, G., ' La stipa tributata
alle divinitá delle Acque
Apollinari,' Rome, 1852, note 207
Marini, G., Atti e monumenti
de fratelli Arvali,' Rome,
1795 8, 129, 285, 149
" 'Iscriz. Albane,' Rome,
1785 146
Marmora Oxoniensia, Oxon.,
1763 3
Martini, G. H., Dissertatio super
Claudiana militum missione,
Leipsic, 1788 8
Maryport 18, 24
Masons, mistakes of note 27, 100
Masson, Rev. J., 'Hist. Criti-
que de la Republique des
Lettres,' Utrecht and Amst.,
1712 140
Matthews, Rev. Mr 11
Memoires de l' Acad. Royale de
Belgique, Brussels, 1853, 12, 52
Matres 27, 221, 224
Matlock 42
Medicine stamps 46, 175, 179

Memoria, in sepulchral inscrip-
tions
MET·LUT', METAL·LUTUD', ON
pigs of lead 43, 47
M·F·, monitus fecit or miliarium
fecit ? 106
MIL, miliaria; mille 15, 230
MIL·EQ, miliaria, or milliaria,
equitata 15
Mile-stones 86, 228, 233
MILIT', militans
Militum, mistake for miliaria 137
Missionis honestae tabulae,
5 et seqq., 57, 58
Monimentum, in sepulchral in-
scriptions 98, 100
Monumenta Historica Britannica,
London, 1848note 5, 7,
note 22, 33, 36, 63, 86, 87,
88, 101, 104, 145, 147, note
[148, note 155, note 158, 162
Morcelli, S. A., de stilo Inscrip.
Latin., Padua, 18188, 215,
[note 233, note 234
Mommsen, Theod., Inscrip.
Reg. Neapol. Latinæ, Leipsic,
1852note 28, 30, note 45,
53, 90, 96, 102, 163, note 192
Moresby 59
Morturium, stamp on 127
Muratori, L. A., Novus Thesau-
rus vet. Inscrip., Milan,
1739 66, 138, 149, 224
Musgrave, Dr., 'Dissert. on
20th Legion,' by Rev. Beale
Post 4
N

N.

N, numerus or nomine (?)	81
" numerus or nomine (?)	138
Names of alae and cohortes,	
derived from those of empe-	
rors	24
Names of persons, normal or-	
der of 4 and additions, 27,	102
Nemetona, a goddess	186

Nervana cohors Germanorum	22
" or Nerviana	23
Netherby	21
Newmarch, Prof	179
Newton, Mr. C. S., see Monu-	
menta Historica Britannica.	
Nimpha for nympha	238
Nodons, Nodens, Nudens, a	
god	64
Nodotus, Nodutis, Nodinus, a	
god	66
Northumberland, Duke of	
Inote	
Notitia utriusque imperii, see	
Böcking.	
Noricus, ethnic adjective	135
Numerus, equitum Samatarum	81
" Barcariorum Tigrisien-	
sium	84
" Exploratorum 137,	139
Numinis, governed by cultor	
understood	143

0.

Ob, followed by ablative note	81
Olenacum note	18
Ollae, no mention of in Bri-	
tain	98
Opfs 150,	151
Ordinarius	248
Ordinatus	248
Orelli, C., Inscrip. Latin. Col-	
lectio, Zurich, 1828passim.	
Ormerod, Dr	72
Overborough note	79
Ovid, Oxon., 1825	82

P.

P., for Pedes	117
" for Per or Passus	
Padley, Mr. J. S	88
Pagus 241,	
Paulinus, Tiberius Claudius	162
Pedaturae 113,	

Pegge, Rev. S.	40
Pennant, T., 'Tour in Scot-	
land,' Warrington, 1774;	
'Tour in Wales,' London, 1784	
[note 22, 40, additions to	54
Petriuna note 14, 204,	
P·F·, pia fidelis	234
Philological Society, proceed-	
ings of, London	54
Phillips, Professor	39
Pius	209
Places, names of on altars, note	138
Places, conjectural names of,	
[note	146
Platzmann, T. A., Juris Ro-	
mani testimoniis de militum	
honesta missione illustrati spe-	
cimen, Leipsic, 1813	8
Plautus, ed. Ritschel, Elberfeld,	U
1849	96
Pliny, Hist. Nat., ed. Brotier,	00
Paris, 167939, 44, 51, 69,	941
Pliny, the younger, ed. LeMaire	
Paris, 1822 note	, 16
Plutarch, ed. Dochner, Paris,	10
1846note	60
Pollentist	170
Potter, Mr. H. G	29
Potter, Mr. H. G	186
P.P., per passus	274
	85
 <i>Praepositus</i> 219, <i>Primipilus</i> 219, 	
Pratectus, of auxiliary cohort,	220
otherwise tribunusnote	58
Praefectus legionis	105
PRI, probably for princeps, 5,	
PRI', probably for princips, 0,	218
PRIM., Primipilus	
Princeps. the first centurion of	919
Principes 17,	120
Princeps posterior	170
Principalis note	197
Principia, meaning of, 59, 196,	101
Pro, followed by accusative, [not	a 81
	917
" confused with ob	

PROC', Procurator	150, 254
Ptolemy, Geographia, ed. No	obbe,
Leipsic, 1843 28, 36,	note
56, note 62, 136, note	167, 224
Pulborough	202

Q.

Que, intrusion of	108
QUECUMO, quaecumque	

R.

Raeti 232
Ratae 87
Ravennas, Anonymus, Monum.
Hist. Britnote 167, 208
Redux, epithet of deities, mean-
ing mistaken note 18, 247
Regnare, misreading of 155
Reinesius, T., Syntagma Vet.,
Inscrip., Leipsic, 1682 91, 259
Relandus, Petr., Fasti Consu-
lares, Utrecht, 1715 149
Remains, removal of human 26
Renier, L. 'Inscriptions Ro-
maines de l'Algérie,' Paris,
1858 30, 93, 122, 138, 141, 164
[188, 209, 210, 212
Reynolds, Rev. R., A.M., Iter
Britanniarum, Cambridge,
1779 note 78
Repingi 188
Rhodiginus, L. C., Antiq. Lec-
tiones, Frankfort, 1665 66
Ribble 85
Ribchester 78
Ricagmbeda, a goddess 66, 242,
[243
Richard of Cirencester, 'De-
scription of Britain,' transla-
ted, London, 1809, 127, note 167
Riechester note 138
Ring, used in bets 69
" inscription on, note 70, 77
Risingham 146
Roulez, Prof. J. E. G 12, 62

Roy, Maj. Gen., ' Military An- tiquities of the Romans in	
Britain,' London, 1793	236
Rudge	203
Rufus, St. Paul's Epist. ad	
Rom	76
Ruina oppressus	197
Rutchester	83

s.

S., Semis 118, 235
S·A·, Severiana Alexandriana 155
Salus Regina 102, 104
Sallust, Oxon., 1854 note 60
Fnote 75
S·C·, singularis consulis 222
Fand additions.
Scarth, Rev. H. M., M.A 168,
169, 170, 171, note 173, 183,
185, 186, 187, 189, 190, 191,
[193, 196, 197, 199, 190, 191,
SCYPUM for SCYPHUM 145
Scultor, sculptor (?) 190
Segedunum 58
Segontium
Senecio, Alfenus 134
100
Sesquiplicarius61 and additions.
Sestantiorum portus
Setlocenia (?) a goddessnote 65
Severus, order of titles of, note 148
Sidonius Apollinaris, ed. Labbe,
Paris, 1652, note 27
Simpson, Dr. J. Y 166, 176, 179
Skene, Mr 60
Slaves, names of 192
Smith, Mr. C. R. Collectanea
Antiqua, London 23,
24, 25, note 27, 29, 63, 64,
97, note 112, note 147, 162,
163, 223, 225, 239, 243,
245, 248, 249, additions to 257
" " ' Journal of
Arch. Association' 9, 39, 49
[50, 116, 119

$\mathbf{274}$

INDEX.	•
--------	---

Swith Dr. W (Distingary of	
Smith, Dr. W., 'Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geogra-	
	01
phy,' London, 1854	, 91
Solinus, Polyhistor, ed. Salma-	
sius, Leipsic, 1777 note	186
Spartian, Script. Hist. Aug.,	
Leyden, 1680	228
Spangenberg, E., Juris Romani	
tabulæ negotiorum solemnium,	
Leipsic, 1822	8
Spon, J. Miscellanea crudit.	
Antiq., Lyons, 1685	4
Statius, ed. Amar, & LeMaire,	
Paris, 1825 note	34
Steiner, Dr., Coder, Inscrip.	
Steiner, Dr., Codex Inscrip. Rom. Rheni., Darmstadt,	
1837; Codex Inscrip. Rom.	
Danub. et Rhen., Seligen-	
stadt, 185166, 67, 93, 135,	107
Bladt, 100100, 07, 93, 135,	197
[249, Stanwix	
	205
Struvius, B. G., Antiq. Rom.	
Syntagma, Jena, 1701	66
Statue	235
Stipendiorum, meaning of mis-	
taken	255
Stone-cutters, mistakes of,	
[note 27, 100,	102
Strabo, ed. Falconer, Oxon.,	
1807 44,	241
Stuart, Mr. R., Caledonia Ro-	
mana, ed. Prof. Thompson,	
Edinburgh, 1852 note 4	92
[229	
Stukely, Dr	182
SvB·C·, sub cura	162
Suidas, Lexicon, ed. Bern-	
hardy, Halle & Brunswick,	
1853	178
	110
Sul or Sulis, a goddess wor-	100
shipped at Bath	
	189
Sunucorum, cohors prima	225
Super, a cognomen	137
Surridge, Rev. Dr	147
Sydenham	5

Т.

т.
Tabulæ honestæ missionis 5
[et seqq.
Tacitus, Oxon., 1851 12, 51
[note 60, 62, 75, 136, 155, 241
Tanarus, Jupiter
[and additions.
Taras, " " " " "
Taranuncus, " " "
Tesserarius primus 131
Thompson, Prof., see Stuart.
Thor 3
Thurnam, Dr. J., Crania Brit-
annica, London, 1856, 33,
[note 38, 189, 214, note 239, 254
TI., Tiberius
Tile, stamp on 107
T.M.Lv., TR.BR., on pigs of
lead 41, 56
Tomasinus, J. P., de donariis,
Græv. Antiq., xii 66
Transposition of lines, note 27
Tribe 93, 102, 159
Tribunus, of auxiliary cohort,
otherwise præfectus note 58
Triphosa 192
Trollope, Rev. E., M.A 90-96
" Mr. A " "
Tumulus, in sepulchral inscrip-
tions
Tycoch 226
Tynemouth 144

U.

Uriconium,	Urioconium,	&c.,	
		[note	179
Uxelodum		,	203
Uxor, omitte	d	. 140,	216

v.

Valcionum, misreading of	Van-	
gionum		7
V.C., vir clarissimus		133
V.C.Cos., vir clarissimus		
sularis	133,	148

IN	D	Е	X.
IN	D	Е	X.

w.

Wales, north...... 36, 225 Wall of Antoninus ...note 229, 236 Wall, southern...note 229, note 236 Walton House note 14, 205 Warner, Rev. R., 'History of Bath,' Bath, 1801 ... note 4, 183 F184, 186, 190, 193 Watchcross 205 Way, Mr. A. 32 et seqq. 176 Wellbeloved, Rev. C , Eburacum, York, 1842 ... note 172, 213 [216, 221 Whitaker, Rev. Dr., 'History of Richmondshire,78 et seqq., [note 186 Wilson, Prof. D., LL.D., 'Prehistoric Annals of Scotland,' Edinburgh, 1852 ... note 22, 33, 65, 235, 240, 244, 245, 262 Wordsworth, Rev. Dr., Inscriptiones Pompeianæ, London, 1837 note 68 Wright, T., M.A., 'the Celt, the Roman, and the Saxon,' London, 1852 and 1861 5, 7, 8, 19, 25, 39, note 48, 50, 62, 64, 65, note 79, 86, 145, 164, 165, 167, note 169, 193, 216, 241, 257, note 258, 260, note 261, note 262, note 263 Wroxeter 167

Y.

Z.

Zell, Prof. C., Delectus Inscrip. Rom., Heidelberg, 1850...108, 238

$\mathbf{276}$

ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS.

P. ix., note. In addition to the authorities stated in the notes, I have also in some cases had the advantage of inspecting photographs, rubbings, and drawings. I have not, however, admitted conjectural readings into the text, even where I had no doubt of their correctness, as my object was to give as correct a representation as I could of what may be regarded as the received text.

P. 3, note †. Mr. Roach Smith, *Collect. Antiq.*, vi., p. 37, prefers tracing this name to *Tunarus*, the river in the north of Italy. The other derivation seems more probable.

P. 3, note ‡. In the Archaeologia Cambrensis, 3rd series, iv., p. 464, it is stated that "fragments of Roman tiles with the stamp of the Twentieth Legion, VALERIA VICTRIX," were exhibited in the museum at Rhyl. Does this mean that the titles were given in extenso ?

P. 4. The legitimus ordo nominum is—(1) prænomen, (2) nomen gentilitium, (3) nomen patris, (4) tribus, (5) cognomen, (6) patria; e. gr., P·SALLIENIVS · P·F· MAECIA· THALA-MVS·HADRIA, in which P·, Publins, is the prænomen, Sallienius the nomen gentilitium, P·F·, Publii filius, the nomen patris, Mæcia the tribus, Thalamus the cognomen, and Hadria the patria.

P. 8. For "again," read "++ again."

P. 10. Mr. Roach Smith, Collect. Antiq, vi. p. 30 observes :

"Furius Fortunatus, who set up the altar to Minerva, appears to have held the office of *Magister*, a title of very wide signification; but which, in this instance, may be taken to mean the *Magister* either of some temple dedicated to Minerva, or the consecrated place upon which the statue, yet extant, stood. Thus, in continental inscriptions we find *Magister Fani Dianæ*, *Magister Fani Junonis*, etc."

I see no reason for changing the opinion, which I have expressed as to the meaning of MAG.

From Mr. Smith's drawing of the altar it seems as if I at the end of the first line, E at the end of the second, and VS at the end of the third, had been lost by fracture of the stone.

P. 13. In Gruter, p. 1085, n. 10, we also have GORDIANO. COS·III; Clinton, *Fasti_Romani*, ii., p. 48, suggests II as a correction.

P. 20. Horsley expands Cumberland, n. lii., thus: "Jovi Optimo Maximo cohortis secundæ Gallorum equitum Titus Domitius Heron de Nicomedia præfectus." We should read equitata for equitum, as suggested in note p. 59, and I prefer cohors secunda for cohortis secundæ, supplying cui præst before the name of the præfect.

P. 20. Horsley expands n. lv. thus : "Jovi Optimo Maximo pro salute imperatoris Marci Antonii Gordiani pii felicis invicti Augusti et Sabiniæ Furiæ Tranquillæ conjugis ejus totaque domu divina eorum ala Aug. Gordiana ob virtutem appellata posuit cui praeest Aemilius Crispinus præfectus equitum natus in provincia Africa de Tusdro sub cura Nonnii Philippi legati Augustalis proprætoris Attico et Prætextato consulibus."

P. 20. Horsley expands Cumberland, n. lvii., thus : "Jovi Optimo Maximo ala Augusta ob virtutem appellata cui praeest Publius Ælius Publii filius Sergia [*tribu*] Magnus de Mursa ex Pannonia inferiore præfectus Aproniano et Bradua consulibus."

P. 20, note. For "are" read "is."

P. 24. For "cui, præst," read "cui præst."

P. 26. For "essedesiero," read "esse desiero."

P. 27, note. For "third.," read "third ?"

P. 30. Add the note-"Carlisle is regarded as the Luguvallium of Antoninus."

P. 30. Add as an example of the use of *civitas*, Henzen, n. 6832: NATVS IN • PROV • THRACIA • CIVIT • PHILIP POL.

P. 32. After "BRITANNIC ** AVG" add II. See p. 48.

P. 46. For "having" read "have."

P. 54. We have here, as I think, an example of the production

of lead by a "firm," who leased a mine, scil., "the Roscii brothers;" and in Orelli, n. 426, we find mention of "a company" for this manufacture. The inscription is SOCIETAT on a block of lead, "in massa plumbea." In n. 427, we have on another block of the same metal S.LVC.RETI, which is explained by Bruckner as standing for Societatis Lucii Reti. I would accept Societatis in both, but rather suspect that LVC.RETI stand for LVCRETIORVM or LVCRETIANAE. Perhaps there was a pagus Lucretius in Switzerland. From this use of societas, we may, perhaps, explain a perplexing inscription on a cake of copper, found at Caer-hen in Caernarvonshire. It is figured in Gough's ed. of Camden, iii, pl. 9, fig. 13, and thus described: "On an oblong square, sunk in the middle," are the letters—

SOCIO ROMAE

and obliquely across these in smaller characters, NATSOL. Mr. Lluyd supposed the inscription to be "a merchant's stamp or direction to his correspondent at Rome." Mr. Pennant, *Tour in Wales*, i., p. 63, thought that "the mass was consigned by a merchant here to his partner at Rome." "The other inscription may be *natio solvit* or *natale solum*."

There can be but little doubt that neither of these interpretations can be accepted. Does any one suppose that there ever was a time when a consignment, addressed "to my partner at Rome" would have reached its destination ? And what has natio solvit or natale solum to do with such an article as this? And yet it is extremely difficult to suggest a feasible explanation of either of Can it be that SOCIO stands for SOCIORVM, the inscriptions. and that NAT·SOL· are abbreviations of the names of the partners ? The meaning of the stamp will thus be that the cake was the manufacture or property of NAT·SOL partners at Rome. I am disposed to prefer this to a conjecture, which at one time occurred to me, that this object had been an offering. The letters SOL SOCIO suggested SOLI SOCIO, often found on altars to Mithras; and NAT. seemed to be either a misreading of MIT for MITHRAS or N·AT·, N[VMINI] AT[TINOS], i. e., Numini Attinos, Soli Socio, Romæ.

P. 59, note. Horsley expands Cumberland, n. lxi., thus: "Jovi optimo Maximo Lucius Cammius Maximus præfectus cohortis primæ Hispanorum equitum votum solvit libens merito;" and Northumberland, n. lxxxviii., thus: "Numinibus Augustorum cohors quarta Gallorum equitum fecit."

P. 59, note. For "Cumberland, liii.," read "Cumberland, lii."

P. 61. The *duplicarius* received double rations, the *sesquiplicarius* one and a half, and the *decurio* was *triplicarius*. See Lange, p. 58, not 38, as erroneously given in the note.

P. 62. The designation Petriana applied to an ala that served in Britain, as is known from the Notitia and several inscriptions, may be suggested as an exception to this mode of derivation. Some have traced the name to Petra, an Arabian town ; Panciroli regards it as derived from the name of its quar_ ters, scil., Petriana; Brotier suggests that it was called ab equitibus illustribus, quibus Petra nomen ; whilst Henzen asserts that it was formed from the name of some man. Böcking questions this opinion of Henzen, on the ground that the man's name should have been *Petrius*, of which there is no example, although there is authority for Petreius, which would give Petreiana. am inclined to agree with Henzen, and also believe it to be more probable that the place derived its name from the ala than the ala from the place.

P. 69. Omit "(Arab)."

P. 70, note. In Avellino, "Osservazioni sopra alcune iscrizioni e disegni graffiti," p. 20, we have the following inscription, in which II are used for both E and I:

HIIC VIINATIO PVGNABIIT V K SIIPTIIMBRIIS T FIILIX AD VRSOS PVGNABIIT

P. 65, note. Mr. Roach Smith, Collect. Antiq., iv., p. 131, has anticipated me in the reading "ex cohorte."

P. 71. For "supposition. [Originally, &c.]" read "supposition, [originally, &c."]

P. 76. For "vigintiduorum and "fuciendum," read "viginti duorum," and "faciendum."

280

P. 78. Add the note: "Lincoln is the Lindum of Antoninus and Ravennas."

P. 80, note. For "MAPONA," read "MAPONO."

P. 83. For "APO[L]INI," read "APOL[L]INI."

P. 87. This stone may have been erected at any time between August II., 120, and August II., 121.

P. 92, note. For "BRVSCFIL," read BRVSCF. F may stand for FILIVS, but more probably for FECIT.

P. 93. For "observations" read "observation."

P. 99. For "I" the first letter in the third line of the inscription, read "A." See p. xxxiv., n. cxxvi. In the note, and here, I have not counted $D \cdot M \cdot$ and hence have used third for what is really the fourth line.

P. 104, note. For "evasion" read "resort," which more nearly expresses the meaning of the German word.

P. 107. For "opinion," read "opinions."

P. 107. For "ETFBONO" read ETBONO.

P. 111. For "prafectus," and "secundar," read "prafectus and secundar." There are, I fear, other instances in which the italic α and α have been confused.

P. 114, note. For "MAXSV" read "AXSV."

P. 125. For "207," read "208."

P. 134. In the Gentleman's Magazine, December, 1862, there is a report of the proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, at their meeting on November 5. The Rev. Dr. Bruce gave the following account of a recent discovery of two altars at the station of Condercum:

"On Saturday last (Nov. 1) when the workmen, who are putting in order the ornamental ground adjoining the recently-erected edifice of G. W Rendel, Esq., at Benwell Little Park, were proceeding with their labours, they hit upon something that seemed to be unusual. By Mr. Rendel's directions, they proceeded with caution, and thoroughly excavated the spot which had attracted their attention. The portion of the ground which has been examined lies just outside the east rampart of Condercum, near its south-east angle. There are here, as well as on the south of the station, numerous remains of suburban dwellings, which seem to be struggling to N 2 free themselves from the sod which envelopes them. A square building, measuring about 15 ft. (inside measurement) each way, was laid bare; four or five courses of wall were standing. Near the south wall two altars were found, lying obliquely, with their inseribed faces downwards (as is usually the case); and in various positions near the spot were several large stones, portions of a statue, and the fragment of an inscribed slab, which may be afterwards alluded to. At the same spot some burials seem to have taken place. Both the altars contain much that is new to the students of lapidary literature; in attempting to make any remarks upon them therefore, after only a few hours' consideration, we may justly claim the liberty of altering or amending at a future time any opinion we may now give.

"The first altar which I shall describe is 4 ft. 4 in. high, and 16 in. wide in the body. It is formed of a sandstone of the district, and is in some places reddened by fire. The decorations upon it are of a highly ornate character, tastefully designed and skilfully executed. The face of the capital has been broken off; but a portion of the face was found close at hand, and it enables us to ascertain what the whole was when complete. The altar is carved on all four sides; this is an unusual, though not quite singular circumstance; an altar now at Castle Nook, near Alston, being also ornamented on the back as well as the sides. The altar is provided with a focus ; and the volutes on each side of it seem to have had for their model a bundle of leaves of Indian corn. An altar which I saw in Florence last autumn, impressed me with the idea that the rolls on the top of the capitals of the Roman altar were symbolical of the fagots which were to consume the offering; this altar confirmed me in the opinion. On the sides of the capital we have vine-branches shaded with leaves, and laden with bunches of grapes. The mouldings of the base are graceful; two of them are of the kind called the cable pattern, so often used in Norman architecture, and thought to be peculiar to the Gothic style. One side of the altar has, in basso relievo, the sacrificing knife, the other the pitcher for holding the wine used in the sacrifice; and on the back is a circular garland. The inscription on the face of the altar is well cut, and the letters are of most tasteful form, but several of them are tied together after the manner of our modern diphthongs. These tied letters are generally understood to indicate a somewhat advanced period of the empire. The inscription, deprived of its conplications, is-

> DEO ANTENOCITICO ET NVMINIB. AVGVSTOB. AEL. VIBIVS D LEG. XX. V.V. V. S. L. M.

which may be read in English,—'To the god Antenociticus and the deities of the Emperors, Ælius Vibius, a centurion of the Twentieth Legion, styled

282

the Valerian and the Victorious, freely dedicated this altar, in the discharge of a vow to objects most worthy of it.' The god Antenociticus is quite new to us. Prior to this discovery, we had no idea that any such demon as he graced the calendar of heathen Rome. Beside the greater and lesser deities of Greece and Rome, there is a crowd of local deities that are only known to the 'painful students' of stony mythology. Among the district gods of Roman Britain we have Vitres, Hamia, Sctlocenia, Mounus, Mogon, Belatucader, and Cocidius; and an altar recentty found near Petriana (Walton-house) seems to reveal to us another strange god of the name of Venauntis. This altar, so far as I can understand it, makes known to us still another. Whether the name is derived from the district where the deity was supposed to exercise his sway, or whether it is descriptive of his qualities, I am at present unable to give any opinion. The genius or godship of the emperors was often worshipped, and that seems to have been the case here. It will be observed that the emperors are spoken of in the plural number, -AVGVSTORVM. The other altar also which we have to consider, speaks of a plurality of emperors. Who can have been intended ? We have a plurality of emperors in the time of Antoninus the Philosopher, when he shared the purple with Lucius Verus; in the time of Severus, when he associated his two sons with himself ; and at the close of the short reign of Elagabalus, when he called Severus Alexander to divide with him obloquy and danger. We need scarcely go farther in this enumeration, for the style of this altar does not belong to a later age. Possibly it was carved when Septimius Severus, and his sons Caracalla and Geta, were the lords of this lower creation.

"The other altar is not nearly so ornate as the first. Neither its design nor its execution is good. The letters of the inscription are rudely formed. It has probably been committed to unskilful hands, for circumstances seem to warrant the opinion that it must have been nearly contemporaneous with the other. It has no focus. The inscription reads thus:—

> DEO ANOCITICO IVDICIIS OPTIMO-RVM MAXIMORVM QVE IMPP. N. SVB VIB : (VLP.?) MARCELLO COS. TINE-IVS LONGVS IN PRAE-FECTVRA EQVITV. . LATO CLAVO EXORN. . TVS ET Q. D.

which may be translated,—' Tineius Longus, holding office in the Præfectship of knights, adorned with the broad stripe, and a quæstor, dedicated this altar to Anociticus (qy. Antenociticus), in consequence of the decisions of our most excellent and most mighty emperors given under Vibius Marcellus, a man of consular rank.' The first thing that perplexes us in

this inscription is the similarity of the name of this god with that on the other, and yet they are different. Probably the same god is meant, and most likely the first A on this altar is intended to stand for ANTE on the other, though there is nothing to indicate it. At the end of the first line there is a character resembling a q; close examination induces me to suppose that it is only the leaf-shaped stop so often introduced in inscrip. tions. I was in hope when I saw the epithets optimorum maximorum that I should have been able by them to have ascertained the emperors to whom they were applied ; but I have not succeeded. These terms (optimus and maximus) are frequently applied to Trajan, both on coins and sculptures. and occasionally to Antoninus Pius, but I can find no instance of their being applied to any of the conjoint emperors. The nearest approach to it that I have yet observed is on the Arch of Severus at Rome. Originally the names of the two sons of Severus were appended to his own, but when Caracalla murdered Geta, he had his brother's name struck out from the inscription, and the gap filled up with the words OPTIMIS FORTISSIMISQVE PRINCIPIBVS. It may be that this altar belongs to the time of Severus. The flattery implied in the use of the words optimus maximus will be noticed when it is remembered that these are the epithets almost universally applied upon altars to Jupiter, the king of gods and men. The last letter on the fourth line is indistinct; it tooks like an E, but it is possibly a B, the rounded parts of the letters having been worn off with the angle of the altar. Tineius is a somewhat peculiar name, but several examples of it occur in Gruter. The expression Lato clavo exornatus is new in the altars of the north of England. It no doubt indicates that the person possessed senatorial rank. In Rich's 'Illustrated Latin Dictionary' we have the following explanations of Clavus Latus :- 'The broad stripe ; an ornamental band of purple colour. running down the front of a tunic, in a perpendicular direction, immediately over the front of the chest, the right of wearing which formed one of the exclusive privileges of the Roman senator, though at a late period it appears to have been sometimes granted as a favour to individuals of the equestrian order.' There is a passage in Suetonius's Life of Augustus Cæsar which seems to throw some light upon this subject. He says, 'That the sons of senators might become early acquainted with the administration of affairs, he permitted them, at the age when they took the garb of manhood (toga virilis), to assume also the distinction of the senatorian robe, with its broad border (latum clavum induere), and to be present at the debates in the senatehouse. When they entered the military service, he not only gave them the rank of military tribunes in his legions, but likewise the command of the auxiliary horse. And that all might have an opportunity of acquiring military experience, he commonly joined two sons of senators in command of each troop of horse.' Although Suctonius refers to a state of things more than a century earlier than the erection of this altar, it almost seems as if he had written this sentence by way of explaining to us this inscription. Tineius Longus, though probably not having a seat in the senate-house, was a man of senatorial rank, and was sent to flesh his sword in the flanks of

Caledonians worthy of his steel. The last two letters in the inscription may admit of some question. Probably in addition to his other orders, he held the rank of quæstor, which is indicated by the initial letter of the word. Most likely D stands for dicavit, 'he dedicated.' It will be observed that Tineius Longus, while doing honour to his god, does not neglect his own dignities. These he blazons forth in considerable detail. Is he the only person who has made religion a stalking-horse to personal applause? For many a century the name of Tineius Longus was buried in oblivion; now at length the altar, once more brought to the light of day, is true to its trust, and the blushing honours of its dedicator will gain greater celebrity than ever. All who are familiar with the inscriptions found in the north of England will be prepared to admit the fact, which this stone presses upon us, that Rome sent some of her greatest men to Britain. A leaf fills up a blank at the close of the last line. The letters on this altar have been coated with red paint. The remains of this are clearly to be discerned. I think that the other altar has been similarly treated, though the marks of it are not distinct. Most of the inscriptions found in the catacombs of Rome are painted red, but this is the first time I have known any of our local inscriptions to be coloured."

The report then gives a conversation relative to the building and skeletons, in which Mr. Rendel, Mr. Clayton, and Dr. Bruce took part.

"Mr. Clayton then said that he had that morning inspected these altars, and sketched out a reading of the inscriptions, which he had the satisfaction now to find was substantially the same as that of Dr. Bruce. The altars are dedicated to a god hitherto unknown, probably a British god. One of them is very beautiful in design and execution, and (with the exception, perhaps, of the fine altar preserved by Lord Lonsdale in Whitehaven Castle) is superior to any thing yet found in Britain; this altar is probably of the date of Hadrian, it is dedicated by a centurion of the 20th Legion, which was stationed in this part of the country in the reign of Hadrian, and was soon afterwards moved southwards. The other altar is of ruder workmanship, and would seem to belong to a lower period of the Empire. If he (Mr. Clayton) rendered correctly the words SUB ULFIO MARCELLO, the date would be fixed in the reign of Commodus. Dr. Bruce had justly observed that Tineius Longus, the dedicator of this altar, appeared to have been a vain man. Not so Ulpius Marcellus, the general of Commodus, who retrieved the Roman affairs in Britain, then in a desperate state, and yet no traces of his name have been found any where on the Roman Wall, except on a fragment of a stone at Ciluraum. It was the practice of the Roman soldier, in dedicating to a god of the country in which he was placed, to join one of his own divinities. The combination with the British god of the 'deities of the emperors,' on the first altar, is not unusual. The combination on the second altar of the 'judicial decrees of the best and greatest of our emperors' was, he believed, unique.

"Dr. Bruce said that as soon as he had seen the altars he wrote to Mr. Roach Smith, one of their best Roman antiquaries, asking for his opinion upon it. He had received a reply to that letter on his way to the meeting. The Rev. Dr. then read the letter alluded to, in which Mr. Smith, after the usual acknowledgments, went on to say, 'I am quite delighted to see such discoveries. I hope we shall be puzzled with them much more. Who the god Antenociticus was, I expect will, after all our researches, be a question. It may be a topical name; or it may be an epithet applied to Apollo, or the Sun. . . . I never before met with the *latus clavus* in an inscription.'

"Dr. Bruce said he thought Mr. Clayton's suggestion, that the prænomen of MARCELLUS was ULPIUS and not VIBIUS, was very valuable, and most likely correct. The only letter about which there could be a question was the L, and as the three letters vLr, were crowded together at the end of the line, it would be nothing wonderful if the bottom stroke of that letter should be shorn of its due proportions. The last letter, the B, E, or P, was confessedly imperfect, in consequence of the angle of the stone. Profiting by Mr. Clayton's suggestion, he would again examine the altar."

In the number for January, 1863, there is a notice of the December meeting of the Society of Antiquaries, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, in which further information is given relative to this discovery.

"Dr. Bruce produced rubbings of the two altars recently found at Benwell, shewing clearly that $v \perp p$, as suggested by Mr. Clayton, was the correct reading. If, however, the general Ulpius Marcellus had been meant, he would have been designated as legate; and the stone also speaks of a plurality of emperors. But there was a jurist of the name, the legal adviser of Antoninus Pius; he flourished during the period of Aurelius and Verus, who were both Augusti in the years 161-169. There may be some connexion between the jurist and the judiciis of the inscription. The jurist seems distinct from the soldier of the reign of Commodus."

The difficulty common to the two inscriptions is the name of the deity. It is not improbable that Antenociticus and Anociticus represent the same god, but I have never before met with either designation, and an unable to offer any probable suggestion on the subject. The other portions of the first inscription are so plain that it is unnecessary to offer any remark on them; but the second is by no means clear. Dr. Bruce's translation and interpretation appear to me very unsatisfactory; nor can I at all understand on what ground he states, with reference to the passage that he cites from Suetonius, Augustus, 38,—"it almost seems as if he had written this sentence by way of explaining to us this inscription." To me it seems to render the interpretation more difficult, for on

the stone we find Tineius Longus, whilst he was præfectus equitum-for this is clearly the meaning of in præfectura equitum -adorned with the laticlave. There is a passage, however, in Suetonius, Claudius, 25, which when compared with Vegetius, ii., 7, seems to me to throw much light on the inscription. The first is-equestres militias ita ordinavit, ut post cohortem, alam; post alam, tribunatum legionis daret; the second-tribunus major per epistolam sacram Imperatoris judicio destinatur. Minor tribunus provenit ex labore. From these passages we learn that Claudius made the tribuneship of a legion a higher grade of service than the præfecture of an ala, i. e., that the promotion should be from prefectura equitum to tribunatus legionis. We also learn that there were two classes of tribunes-the greater and the less. The higher office was conferred by order or decision of the emperor-the other, the lower, was obtained by service. There can, I think, be no doubt that these two classes are the same otherwise called-tribuni laticlavii, and tribuni angusticlavii. Compare Suetonius, Domitian, 10, Otho, 10, and Horace, Sat. i., 6, Accordingly I regard the words-in præfectura equitum 25 - 28.lato clavo exornatus-as denoting that Tineius Longus was promoted to the office of tribunus laticlavius whilst he held the office of præfectus equitum. And in precisely the same sense I understand the verse, in the inscription found at Caervoran, given by Dr. Bruce, Roman Wall, p. 393:

Tribunus in præfecto dono principis.

Henzen, n. 5863, remarks :--- "*Tribunus in præfecto* quid sit nescio, nisi forte ita se appellavit tribunus cohortis auxiliaris, quippe qui, re præfectus, honore tribunus esset."

The meaning I believe to be that Marcus Cæcilius Donatinus was, by the gift of the emperor, promoted to the office of tribunus laticlavius whilst he was præfectus equitum, or in the words of the Benwell inscription, in præfectura equitum lato clavo exornabatur.

Although I have used the word "promoted," I am inclined to think that the *tribunatus legionis* was merely a brevet rank *titulo tenus*—held along with the *præfectura equitum*.

It is proper that I should add that Lange, Hist. mut. rci milit.

Rom., p. 58, asserts that the regulation of Claudius was not continued, and that in the time of Hadrian the præfectus equitum was of equal rank with the tribunus legionis.

As to $Q \cdot D \cdot$, I am inclined to take them as standing for *quæstor designatus*, as in Horsley's Westmoreland, viii.

But we have to take up the preceding lines, scil. judiciis optimorum maximorumque imperatorum nostrorum sub Vibio (or Ulpio) Marcello consulari. The term *judiciis* is plainly not to be regarded as a deity, as Mr. Clayton strangely understood it ; nor yet is there any ground for Dr. Bruce's supposition that "there may be some connexion between it and the jurist, Ulpius Marcellus." It is evidently used in the same sense as judicio in the passage cited from Vegetius, and the reason of its being in the plural seems to be, that by one judicium the appointment of tribunus laticlavius was conferred, by another that of quæstor designatus. Hence it appears that there is no necessity for looking for conjoint emperors in explanation of IMPP·N·, nor for an example of optimi maximique applied to such. These judicia may have been by different emperors at different times ; and, in my judgment, it is not improbable that the two emperors referred to are Trajan and Hadrian, each of whom was styled optimus maximus, e. gr., Orelli, nn. 795, 3742; or, it may be, Nerva and Trajan. The Marcellus, under whom Tineius Longus served when he was promoted, was, as seems to me, neither Ulpius Marcellus, the general under Commodus, nor Ulpius Marcellus, the legal adviser of Antoninus Pius, but L. Neratius Marcellus, who is named in Trajan's diploma of A.D. 104. See p. 6 of my notes. He was consularis, for he had been consul in A. D. 103, and there are examples of the omission of both legatus and proprætore. \mathbf{But} how can this opinion be reconciled with the statement that Dr. Bruce's rubbings "shewed clearly that VLP, as suggested by Mr. Clayton, was correct ?" Can it be that Marcellus had two nomina gentilitia-Ulpius and Neratius? Or may I venture still to question the reading and to suggest a re-examination of the stone, with the view of ascertaining whether the letters may not be NER, or L·NE, or NE ?

P. 140. For "Horsley, n. xcvi," read "Horsley's n. xcvi." P. 144. For "ENDOVELICO," read "ENDOVELLICO." P. 157. For "IMPERATORES" read "IMPERATORI." For this error Dr. Bruce is in no way responsible : it is a typographical mistake of my printer.

P. 181. The suggestion, noticed in §87, is based on the suspicion that Horsley's drawing does not correctly represent the figures as they were originally cut on the stone, or perhaps even as they appeared in his time, for he may not himself have examined the original. It is certain that his figures differ in some importand particulars from those given by Dr. Stukely, in his *Itinerarium Curiosum*, p. 196. The authority of the former, however, is much to be preferred to that of the latter. My suggestion had been so favourably received by those to whom I mentioned it, that it seemed worthy of notice, but I must confess that I regard its correctness as very doubtful.

P. 151. For "AVG." in the sixth line of the restoration, read "AVGG," for on comparing the representations of this slab, in the Archaeologia Æliana, iv., and i. (new series), and Dr. Surridge's Observations, &c., I am of opinion that the abbreviation is not AVG. applied to Caracalla alone but AVGG. applied to both him and his father. We should, of course, remove, the AVG. in the third line of the restoration. Dr. Hübner's strictures, *Rheinische Museum*, 1856, p. 44, on this inscription as read by Dr. Bruce and Mr. Hodgson, especially his suspicions as to the names Alfeni Senecionis and Advento, are unjust.

P. 151, note.* For "P F and P." read "P. F. and F."

P. 158. For "TRIB.POTEST XVIII.," read "TRIB. POTEST XVIIII."

P. 182. For "VPPO," read VPO.

P. 208. I find that I have inadvertently omitted two points, which I intended noticing relative to this inscription. One of these is the strangeness of the collocation, whereby we have to read from left to right of the circle. The only example, which I remember of this, is in the verses denominated $d\nu\tau\iota\sigma\tau\rho\epsilon\phi\sigma\nu\tau a$, but this is certainly not one of them. The other peculiarity is that A may be introduced after each of the names, and yet the appearance of an Hexameter will be preserved. I say appearance, for it will not be metrically correct.

P 217. "LEG · AVG for LEGATI AVGVSTI." The Rev. o 2 J. B. Deane in the same way explains the same abbreviations in an inscription found at Chester, referring them to the commanding officer of the 20th legion. See Mr. R. Smith's *Collect. Antiq.*, vi., p. 41.

P. 220. Strator consulis may also be suggested as an expansion, fig. 2, of S. C. See Mr. C. R. Smith's Collect. Antiq., iv., pl. xiv.

P. 236. For "COA." read "COH." This inscription has unaccountably been omitted in p. xx.

P. 238. For "NYMPAE" read "NYMPHAE."

P. 260. I have not seen Mr. Hodgson's statement relative to the Dea Hammia as noticed by Mr. Wright. Mr. Roach Smith, Collect. Antiq., vi., p. 39, remarks :--- "The first cohort of the Hamii, mentioned in several inscriptions found at Magna, and in one found in Scotland, Hodgson considered, with his usual sagacity, as coming from Apamea on the Orontes. The conclusion indeed seems obvious; and it may be added, that while the inscriptions naming the Hamii appear to be not much later than the time of Severus, and one or more, earlier, this cohort is not named as being in Britain when the Notitia was compiled ; but the cohors prima Apamenorum, no doubt the same, was then stationed in the Thebaid, having been recalled, as we may infer, from Britain. The Dea Hamia, whose name is found in the footsteps of the Hamii, is, of course, the goddess of Apamea or Hamea, or, in the convertible nomenclature of the Pagan mythology, the Dea Syria herself."

In the absence of Mr. Hodgson's work, I am at a loss to understand the meaning of Mr. Smith's remarks, nor can I reconcile them with the statement of Mr. Hodgson's views as given by Mr. Wright. According to the latter, the *Dea Hamia* was "named from Hamah on the Orontes," and to the same place I supposed that the first cohort of Hamii was traced, until I saw Mr. Smith's observations, from which it appears that Mr. Hodgson considered this corps "as coming from Apamea on the Orontes." It seems very probable that both the goddess and the corps derived their name from one and the same place : and yet it is certain that the town on the Orontes, called Hamah, viz., Epiphania, was not the same as Apamea. Nor is there the slightest ground, so far as I am aware, for identifying the cohors prima Hamiorum of inscriptions with the cohors prima Apamenorum of the Notitia.