

ART. III.—*Notes on the Garrisoning of Maryport.** By
L. P. WENHAM, M.A.

IN the light of more recent research, a number of the points discussed by Professor R. G. Collingwood in his article, "The Roman fort and settlement of Maryport,"† require further consideration, for they have an important bearing, not only on the garrisons of Maryport itself and upon the movements of various auxiliary regiments in this province, but also upon Roman military practices which have, as yet, received but scant consideration. It is the purpose of the present article to discuss these questions.

The significance of the discovery in 1870 of the seventeen altars found in the so-called 'pit area' just outside the fort of Maryport has never been convincingly explained. Prof. Collingwood,‡ following Haverfield|| and Collingwood Bruce,¶ considered that they were buried by the Romans to prevent them falling into the hands of the barbarians, on some occasion when the latter had broken through the Wall barrier. This explanation is to be rejected, on the grounds that all of these stones show so little weathering that they must each have been interred

* The following abbreviations are employed:—AA (4) = *Archaeologia Aeliana*, 4th series; C = *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, Volume VII, unless followed by some other numeral; CWT. (1) and CWT. (2) = these *Transactions*, old and new series respectively; EE. = *Ephemeris Epigraphica*; ILS. = Dessau, *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae*; JRS. = *Journal of Roman Studies*; *Lapid. Sept.* = *Lapidarium Septentrionale*; *Not. Dig.* = *Notitia Dignitatum*, ed. Seeck; R.B. & E.S. = *Roman Britain and the English Settlements*, by R. G. Collingwood; a number in brackets after the date of a *diploma* refers to Dr. Nesselhauf's notation in C XVI.

† CWT. (2) xxxvi, p. 95 and f.

‡ *loc. cit.* He makes the same point, R.B. & E.S., p. 156 note.

|| CWT. (2) xv, pp. 136 f.

¶ CWT. (1) pp. 175-188 and *Lapid. Sept.* pp. 429-30.

separately and at quite different times, and emphatically not at one and the same time, as this theory would demand. It is instructive to recall the circumstances of their discovery as given in Bruce's account in these *Transactions*:

“The spot on which the altars have been found lies at the distance of about 350 yards from the Roman camp . . . The altars have been clustered together in a space somewhat circular in its character and of about sixty feet in diameter . . . It seems that a series of pits had been formed in the circular space of the ground to which I referred.* These pits were from four to six feet deep, and usually penetrated the subsoil . . . to some extent. The bottom of several of these pits were paved with ‘cobble’ stones. Into these pits the altars had been put. In no one instance was the face of the altar found lying uppermost. In several cases the inscriptions were lying sideways, in some downward. Two of the pits contained three altars each; four other pits contained two each; others only one. Besides the holes in which altars were found others were examined, in which no perfect altar was discovered, but only broken pieces of altars, and a mass of loose stones. The appearance presented by these barren pits, led the excavators to suppose that they too had originally been occupied by altars, but that at some period anterior to the present they had been noticed and removed. The altars have been placed in their beds with care. When more than one is placed in a pit, it has been covered over with loose stones and earth before the next was put in, and a second or third in a similar manner.”

In 1880 another altar (EE VII 970) similar to those found ten years before was discovered by Joseph Robinson† “in a line with the camp, and the site where the

* A diagram illustrating these pits and numbering their contents is given by Bruce, *Lapid. Sept.* facing p. 429.

† CWT. (1) v, pp. 237:257.

sixteen* altars were found on 18th April, 1870 . . . ”: it represents another altar of the ‘ pit ’ series.†

It is significant that all these stones (except C 398 which is a personal dedication by a prefect, *Lapid. Sept.* No. 889 which is uninscribed, and C 394 and 391 which are, respectively, dedicated to Victory and Mars) fall into the same category. They are all altars dedicated to *Iuppiter Optimus Maximus*, they each name the cohort and its commander and employ roughly the same formula, which suggests that they were of an official nature and erected regularly as a matter of routine.‡ It is probable that they were annually set up on the regimental parade ground outside the fort, either on New Year’s Day or on the anniversary of the reigning Emperor’s accession, on both of which occasions, as is attested from literary sources, it was customary for the troops throughout the Empire to renew their oaths of allegiance, viz.:—

“ Yet it was to Galba that the legions of Lower Germany took the oath of fidelity annually administered on 1st January . . . The soldiers of the 1st and 6th legions were so mutinous, that some of them threw stones at the images of Galba . . . In the army of Upper Germany, however, the 4th and 22nd legions proceeded on this same 1st January to break to pieces the images of Galba . . . ” (Tacitus, *Histories* I 55).

(Pliny to Trajan). “ We have celebrated, Sir, . . . the day of your accession . . . I have administered the oath of allegiance to my fellow soldiers in the usual form . . . ” (Pliny, *Letters*, 52).

(Trajan to Pliny). “ Your letter, my dear Pliny, was extremely acceptable as it gave me an account of how

* Presumably he did not trouble to take account of the uninscribed altar of the 1870 ‘ find,’ *Lapid. Sept.* No. 889.

† A plan showing the exact position in relation to the fort of the 1870 and 1880 altar finds is to be seen in CWT (2) xv, facing p. 135.

‡ Mr. Birley makes the same point in connection with three altars relating to the *coh. I Nervana Germanorum*, CWT. (2) xxxvi, p. 66.

religiously and joyfully my fellow soldiers . . . solemnized the day of my accession to the Empire, under your presidency . . ." (Pliny, *Letters X 53*).*

At such ceremonies there must have been a recognised and accepted way of disposing of the previous year's altars as it is unreasonable to suppose that they were permitted to stand indefinitely on the parade-ground. They were probably honourably buried. This would explain the reason for their careful burial and, as Prof. Collingwood† failed to show satisfactorily, why they and others‡ of a similar nature from Maryport as well, are so little weathered and are, even to-day, in such remarkably fine condition.§

Presumably the pits in which they were discovered lay at the edge of the parade ground,|| and as this was some distance from the fort their discovery was, as can be seen from Bruce's account,¶ one of sheer good fortune. The fact that, around the parade grounds of other auxiliary forts, altars such as these may be awaiting discovery, suggests a profitable, though highly fortuitous, field for future archaeological spade-work.

The first auxiliary regiment known to have been stationed at Maryport was *coh. I Hispanorum equitata*, which is named there on the following altars:—

* Pliny, *Letters X 35*, 102 and 103 are couched in similar terms to the above two extracts.

† *loc. cit.*

‡ Other altars from this fort dedicated to I.O.M. are C 375, 379, 385, 387 and 388 and possibly the fragmentary VII 976. There can be little doubt that they too were originally buried in the barren pits which Bruce discovered in 1870.

§ In the remainder of this article altars found in the 1870 hoard are denoted ¹; the single stone found in 1880 ²; and others found before these dates but dedicated I.O.M. ³.

¶ Photographs of the majority of them appear in CWT. (2) xv, facing pp. 139, 142, 144, 145 and 146, where the excellence of their present condition is clearly shown.

|| In which case Haverfield, CWT (2) xv, diagram facing p. 135 and p. 136 is wrong in placing the *campus Martius* = parade ground to the south of the fort.

¶ *loc. cit.*

C 379³, 380¹, 381¹ and 382¹ naming M. Maenius Agrippa as tribune.

C 374¹, 375³, 376¹ and EE VII 970² naming C. Caballius Priscus as tribune.

C. 383¹ and EE IX p. 569, C 384¹ and 385³ naming L. Cammius Maximus as prefect.

C 378¹ and 398¹ naming Helstrius Novellus as prefect.

C 375¹ naming L. Antistius Lupus Verianus as prefect.

C 377³ naming P. Cornelius Gaius as prefect.

C 371 naming M. Censorius Cornelianus as *praepositus*.

Of these, it will be noted, only two—C 371 relating to a temporary command and C 395 which is a personal dedication by the prefect—fall outside the I.O.M. category, and, with only five exceptions—C 371, 375, 377, 379 and 385—all were discovered in the pits.* If the thesis advanced above as to the significance of these I.O.M. altars be accepted, an important conclusion is obtained as to the approximate length of the cohort's stay in the fort. Assuming that here we have practically the complete set of the annual dedications of this regiment in this fort, the following time sequence follows:—†

M. Maenius Agrippa, named on 4 altars, therefore tribune for	4 years.
C. Caballius Priscus,	do.	4 years.
L. Cammius Maximus, named on three altars, therefore prefect for	3 years.
Helstrius Novellus, named on 2 altars, therefore prefect for (at least)	2 years.
L. Antistius Lupus Verianus, named on 1 altar, therefore prefect for (at least)	1 year.
Publius Cornelius Gaius	do.	1 year.
					<hr/>
				Total ..	15 years.
					<hr/>

* In view of what is said *supra* there is no doubt that these too came originally from the pits.

† It is not to be assumed that the commanders necessarily followed each other in this order; from what follows this is improbable.

Fifteen years thus represents the minimum for the cohort's stay at Maryport, for Novellus' command may be anything up to a year longer and Verianus' and Gaius, each up to two years longer, while the *praepositus* Cornelianus must also have been there for a short time.

The only command which can be dated with certainty is that of M. Maenius Agrippa. According to his *cursus honorum* (C XI 5632), found at Camerinum in Italy, he was tribune of this cohort immediately after being *electus a divo Hadriano et missus in expeditionem Britannicam* i.e. c. 122, and so the four altars naming him probably date to 123-126.

It is uncertain when the fort of Maryport was built, though a Trajanic date seems more likely than a Hadrianic.* If the earlier date is indeed correct† it is practically certain that either M. Maenius Agrippa or C. Caballius Priscus was the last commander there.‡

It will be noted in the list of the commanders of the *coh. I Hispanorum* as given on page 23 above that M. Maenius Agrippa and C. Caballius Priscus are described as *tribuni* while the other officers are called *praefecti* (except the *praepositus* Cornelianus who, for obvious reasons, need not be considered here). This means one of two things: (1) Either that at some time during its stay in Maryport the regiment was increased in numbers, being transformed from a quingenary into a milliary cohort or (2)

* Cf. Haverfield, CWT. (2) xv, pp. 136 f. and Collingwood, CWT. (2) xxix, pp. 156-7.

† Assuming, however, that the Hadrianic date is the right one, this interesting sequence would follow:—If the fort was built c. 123 and the cohort remained there some 15 years, it must have left c. 138. In 139 Lollius Urbicus commenced his Scottish campaigns, and though there is nothing to show that the Spaniards actually took part in them, they might, on this evidence have been removed in preparation for them. Nothing is known of a *coh. I Hispanorum (quingenaria)* during the remainder of the second century and the *coh. I Dalmatarum* (see below) had definitely taken over the garrisoning of Maryport at the latest under Antoninus Pius. This suggestion, attractive though it may appear is almost certainly to be discounted in view of p. 25 later (and especially footnote ¶).

‡ For further discussion of this point cf. page 27 later.

that these two commanders, because of additional responsibilities placed upon them, were awarded, or allowed to use, the title of greater distinction.* Evidence in support of both of these hypotheses can be adduced:

(1) The only other evidence of the *coh. I Hispanorum*† after it left Maryport is the *Not. Dig.* (Oc. XL 49) which places it in Castlesteads.‡ From at least 213-222 the *coh. I Aelia Hispanorum equitata (milliaria)* was stationed at Netherby§; nothing is known of its earlier or later history. It may be conjectured|| that these two regiments were identical and that their joint history is as follows:—originally at Maryport the cohort was *quingenaria*¶ but after it had been at least seven years** there it was transformed—not later than 123—into a milliary cohort; it remained there as such for at least another eight years†† and adopted—either to commemorate this change or later because of meritorious services performed by it under

* Analogous to this is the example of Marcus Caecilius Donatianus, commander of the *coh. I Hamiorum sagittariorum*, who, on the metrical inscription from Carvoran (C 759), describes himself as *militans tribunus in praefecto*.

† The evidence for the *coh. I Hispanorum equitata* in Britain is as follows:—it is named in the *diplomata* for the years 98 (43), 103 (48), 105 (51), 122 (69), 124 (70) and 146 (93), on a Flavian tombstone (C 1146) from Ardoch and, in addition to the Maryport altars enumerated above, on the following stones from that fort—C 372 (altar), C 1232 (tiles) and presumably on a tombstone (C 406=919) which, though fragmentary and with its inscription illegible, has on it the relief of a Roman horseman and is therefore to be referred to this, the only *coh. equitata* attested in the fort; from Mersch near Trier comes the *cursus honorum* of pre-117/9 date (see footnote ¶ below for dating) C XIII 4030, of one of its prefects.

‡ For the identification of this see page 30 below.

§ The evidence being these inscriptions:—C 967 (dates 213), C 963 (dates 213) C 964 (dates 219), C 965 (dates 222) and C 954.

|| Huebner (C add. pp. 307-8) made this suggestion.

¶ That the prefectures at Maryport fall before and not after the commands of M. Maenius Agrippa and C. Caballius Priscus is attested by the *cursus honorum* from Mersch (C XIII 4030) of an un-named prefect of the cohort. The prefect, after commanding this cohort, was tribune of the *leg. IX Hispana*, which ceased to exist c. 117-9 (cf. Ritterling, in Pauly-Wissowa, *Realencyclopädie*, s.v. 'Legio' cols. 1668-9, and R. G. Collingwood, R.B. & E.S., p. 129 note (2)).

** Deduced from the dating sequence on page 23 above.

†† Deduced from the dating sequence on page 23 above.

Hadrian or Antoninus Pius*—the title *Aelia*. Under Severus (or Caracalla) it was moved to Netherby. Subsequent to 222† and before the composition in the fourth century of the section *per lineam Valli* of the *Not. Dig.* (Oc. XL 49) it had dropped this part of its title and had reverted to that of *coh. I Hispanorum*.

(2) It is Prof. Collingwood's thesis‡—the archaeological evidence though slight does support it—that a line of signal stations stretched along the Cumberland coast from Bowness-on-Solway to St. Bees' Head, its scheme being briefly this: from Bowness-on-Solway to Cardurnock on Moricambe Bay, a distance of some four miles, ran a series of close-set signal-towers, and from Moricambe Bay to St. Bees' Head, about 32 miles, another series of towers. In the latter section occur the auxiliary forts of Beckfoot, Maryport and Moresby, and Prof. Collingwood§ supposes smaller fortlets to have existed at Skinburness, Allonby, Burrow Walls and St. Bees' Head.

How were these towers and fortlets garrisoned? It is unlikely that the regiments in the three auxiliary forts would be called upon to perform this duty as it would very seriously impair their military efficiency. On the analogy of the Wall-turrets|| it may have been done by 'numeri.' Such troops, while retaining their own commanders, were frequently placed under the general surveillance of the commanders of near-by forts.¶ It may have been to some such temporary arrangement as

* The latter is almost certainly the correct explanation, as the cohort does not have the title on any of the inscriptions from Maryport.

† The latest datable inscription of the cohort from this fort (C 965) dates to this year.

‡ CWT (2) xxix, pp. 138-165.

§ *loc. cit.*

|| *cf.* AA (4) IX, p. 213.

¶ e.g. *Numerus Ac . . .* and *coh. I Aelia Dacorum* at Birdoswald (JRS. XIX, p. 214), *Numerus Exploratorum* and *coh. I fida Vardullorum* at High Rochester (C 1030 and 1037) and *Numerus Exploratorum* and *Raeti Gaesati* and *coh. I Vangionum* at Risingham (C 1002 and 1010) etc.

this that these two *tribuni* owe their title.* Prof. Collingwood† would date these signal-towers *circa* 123-5—precisely the time when M. Maenius Agrippa at least is definitely attested as in command at Maryport. This would suggest that we are correct in placing C. Caballius Priscus as the next in command there, and it would carry these tribunates at least till c. 131.

The second garrison attested at Maryport is the *coh. I Dalmatarum* which is named on the following altars there: C 367, 388, 400 and EE III 93 (naming the prefect P. Postumius Acilianus), C 387¹ (naming the prefect L. Caecilius Vegetus) and EE VII 976 (prefect's name unintelligible). All except the first of these might be placed in the category of official annual dedications comparable with those of the *coh. I Hispanorum*, but obviously in this case nothing like a complete series has been uncovered. Two of these—C 400 and EE III 93—are dedicated to Antoninus Pius, showing that the *Dalmatae* followed the Spaniards into the fort as garrison.‡ In themselves these altars give no inkling as to the length of their stay in the fort, though the evidence of Maryport's third attested garrison—*coh. I Baetasiorum c. R.*—supplies a pretty good indication of it.

The full texts of the five altars erected by the Baetasians at Maryport are:—

* *Numeri* were first used as a regular part of the Roman military system by Hadrian (Rowell, in Pauly-Wissowa, *Realencyclopädie*, s.v. 'Numerus,' Vol. XVII cols. 1327 *et seq.*). If we suppose that regiments of this nature were specially drafted into Britain by Hadrian for the purpose of garrisoning these towers and the Wall-turrets, surveillance over them would be naturally more essential at this particular time than later. This may explain what appears to be the temporary nature of these augmented commands.

† *loc. cit.*

‡ Other records left by *coh. I Dalmatarum* in Britain are:—*diplomata* for 122 (69), 124 (70) and 135 (82); a tombstone (C 1055) from High Rochester, the name Aurelius suggesting that it dates after c. 161; and *cursus honorum* of its prefects from near Aquinum (C X 5382) dating c. 90, from Rome (C VI 1607) dating c. 130, and from Beneventum (C IX 1618), another from Aquileia (C V 40*) being spurious.

- (C 386).¹ I.O.M. coh. I Baetasiorum c. R. cui praeest T. Attius Tutor praef. v.s.l.l.m.
 (C 390). Marti militari coh. I Baetasiorum c. R. cui praeest T. Attius Tutor praefectus v.s.l.l.m.
 (C 394).¹ Victoriae Aug. coh. I Baetasiorum c. R. cui praeest T. Attius Tutor praefect. v.s.l.l.m.
 (C 391).¹ Marti militari coh. I Baetasiorum c. R. cui praeest Ulpus Titianus praef. v.s.l.l.m.
 (C 395).¹ Victoriae Aug. coh. I Baetasi. c. R. cui praeest Ulpus Titianus praefectus v.s.l.l.m.

Prof. Collingwood,* on evidence which is incontrovertible, would date these to the last quarter of the second century, the 'Victory' commemorated by C 394 and 395 probably being that of Commodus in 184.†

Before being moved to Maryport coh. I Baetasiorum c. R. was in Scotland, where it erected two building inscriptions at Barhill—EE IX 1244 and 1245—which show it to have been the original builders and garrison of the fort. In view of this, the other Barhill garrison, coh. I Hamiorum sagittariorum (cf. C 110 and EE IX 1242) must obviously have followed it there. Prof. Collingwood‡ for some inexplicable reason gave the garrisons in the reverse order, i.e. first Hamii, second Baetasi, which is wholly untenable. The Hamii were in garrison at Carvoran§ (C 748, 758, 773 and 774) until at least as late as 162-168,|| and the only obvious date after that for a change of garrison in an Antonine Wall fort is c. 184.¶ The Hamii

* CWT. (2) xxxvi, p. 96.

† cf. Cassius Dio (Xiphiline's abridgement) LXXII 8 and Collingwood, R.B. & E.S. pp. 151-152.

‡ *loc. cit.*

§ Besides the Carvoran and Barhill inscriptions this cohort is also noted on the British *diplomata* for 122 (69), 124 (70) and 135 (82). The following stones from Carvoran can, for obvious reasons, be referred to it—C 750 and 759. Another stone naming it is C 502c (place of discovery unrecorded), though comparison with C 748 from Carvoran suggests that it too came from there.

|| Since C 758 and 773 both name Calpurnius Agricola, governor of Britain 162-168. (cf. JRS. XII p. 61 and AA (4) XV p. 286, footnote 55).

¶ Collingwood, R.B. & E.S. p. 153 and footnote.

must then have taken over the fort of Barhill from the *Baetasii** who, at the same time, relieved the *coh. I Dalmatarum* at Maryport.

The Baetasian altars from Maryport (texts above) present another point of interest. The last four appear to fall into two very obvious groups—C 390 and 394 dedicated to Mars and Victory respectively by T. Attius Tutor, and C 391 and 395 dedicated to the same deities by Ulpus Titianus. It is possible that they stood in a shrine built in or near the fort (probably c. 184) and dedicated to Mars and Victory. Such shrines were common on the sites of Roman forts† and there are instances of them in Britain.‡ When Tutor§ was in command of the cohort it is to be assumed that the two altars naming him stood in this shrine side by side and, on his promotion, were removed and, on the analogy of the official yearly dedications of the *coh. I Hispanorum*, buried (this would explain why they were found among the 1870 pit finds) and the similar ones of his successor set up in their place.

The Maryport garrison after the Severan re-occupation is unknown. Prof. Collingwood,|| equating *Uxellodunum* with Maryport, placed *coh. I Hispanorum* there again in the fourth century,¶ but Mr. I. A. Richmond's

* Besides the Barhill and Maryport stones, *coh. I Baetasiorum c. R.* is also noted on British *diplomata* for 103 (48), 122 (69), 124 (70) and 135 (82) and in the *Not. Dig.* (Oc. XXVIII 18) where it is given as garrisoning *Regulbium* = Reculver. The *cursus honorum* of the T. Attius Tutor of the Maryport altars comes from Soiva in Noricum (C III 5331); it is undated.

† von Domaszewski, *Die Religion des römischen Heeres*, pp. 11 and 77.

‡ Illustrated examples of such dedications from Britain are:—

(1) C 1001 erected by *coh. IV Gallorum* at Risingham and illustrated *Lapid. Sept.* p. 325 No. 637 and von Domaszewski, *op. cit.*, Taf. II, fig. 4.

(2) C 1003 erected by *coh. I Vangionum* at Risingham and illustrated *Lapid. Sept.* p. 324. No. 626.

(3) C 992 (now lost) erected by the tribune C. Julius Publilius Pius and illustrated in Horsley, *Britannia*, plate 192, No. LXXXIII.

§ There is no evidence shewing that Tutor preceded Titianus in command of the cohort; he is here assumed to have been first merely for the purpose of illustration.

|| *loc. cit.*

¶ On the evidence of the *Not. Dig.* (Oc. XL 49).

examination of the Rudge Cup* has shown that there is no reason for the equation; for *Uxellodunum* was at Castlesteads, and Maryport is to be identified with the *Alauna* of the Ravenna List†—which is not mentioned in the *Not. Dig.*

* AA (4) pp. 338-339.

† Ed. Parthey & Pinder, p. 430, 17.