PLATE VIII.

ROMAN BROUGH.—Inscribed tablet of the middle of the second century.
Scale 1/7.

PLATE IX.

IMP·CAESARI·AEL·HADRIANO
ANTONINO·AVGVSTO·PIO·PP
COH·I·AQVITANORVM
SVB·IVLIO·VERO·LEG·AVG
PR·PR·INSTANTE
CAPITONIO·PRISCO·PRAE

ROMAN BROUGH.—Key to Inscription on Plate VIII.

NOTES ON THE INSCRIBED TABLET, AND ON THE ROMANO-BRITISH NAME OF BROUGH.

BY F. HAVERFIELD, M.A., F.S.A., HON. F.S.A. SCOT.
Censor and Tutor of Christ Church, Oxford.

I.

THE TABLET.

THE principal epigraphic discovery made at Brough in 1903 consists in four fragments of an inscribed slab of millstone grit, found on August 21-24 in a sunk chamber inside the fort. One fragment, bearing the letters SCOPRAF, was in the wall of the chamber, serving as a wall stone; the rest were found about half-way between the floor of the chamber and the surface of the ground, lying loose in the mud and débris which filled up the chamber. The largest fragment, which forms the centre of the slab, is worn as if it had been much trodden and had formed at some time a step or a paving flag. I have examined the fragments myself: I am also indebted to Mr. Garstang for various information concerning them. See Plates VIII. and IX., which he has prepared.

When perfect the inscribed slab was probably an oblong panel with a plain moulded border, measuring over all two and a half or two and three-quarters feet in height, some four and a half feet in length and four inches in thickness. The inscription was in six lines, the first five each two inches high, the sixth two and one-third inches. It can be completed with some certainty as follows :—

IMmp CAESARI.T *ael. hadr.*

*an*TONINOAV *g. pio p. p.*

COH.I.AQVITA*norum*

SVB.IVLIO.V*ero leg.* AVG

PR.PR.INST*ant*E

PITON*io Fu*SCOPRAF

That is :—

" In honour of the Emperor Titus Aelius Hadrianus Antoninus Augustus Pius, Father of his country, (erected by) the First Cohort of Aquitanians, under Julius Verus, governor of Britain, and under the direct orders of Capitonius Fuscus, præfect of the cohort."

The only points here doubtful are in the last line, where the names of the præfect have to be conjectured and the final letter may be E or F, that is, *prae(fecto)* or *pra(e)f(ecto)*: to me it seemed more like F, but the point is quite unimportant. The letter before P at the beginning of the line might, perhaps, be V, not A.

The Emperor is Antoninus Pius, who reigned from A.D. 131-161. The cohort is known to have belonged to the forces stationed in Britain in, and doubtless after, A.D. 124, and it has left an undated memorial of itself near Bakewell in Derbyshire, an altar dedicated to Mars Braciaca : it is also mentioned on an undated fragment found on Hadrian's Wall at Carrawburgh. The governor, Julius Verus, is also known. His name occurs on an inscription of Antoninus Pius found in the river Tyne at Newcastle only a few days before the Brough fragments were unearthed. Indeed it was this discovery which enabled us to guess that IVLIO V... might be completed *Julio Vero.* Previous to these two discoveries he was not known to have governed Britain ; all that was recorded was that he governed Syria about A.D. 163-5 and received a rescript from the joint emperors, Marcus and Verus. It was not unusual during the second century for the same man to govern first Britain, and then

Syria, and apparently the two posts were held tolerably late
in a man's career, and with no very long interval between them.
In all probability, therefore, Julius Verus governed Britain
during the latest part of the reign of Pius, perhaps about
A.D. 155. Add that he may perhaps be mentioned on a frag-
mentary inscription, probably of this period, which was found
at Netherby, a Roman fort in Cumberland north of Hadrian's
Wall (Lapidarium 777=C.I.L. vii., 767). Add also that his
name may be restored on a slab found at Birrens and dated
A.D. 158, and the sum of our knowledge of Julius Verus is
complete.

The inscription is interesting in two respects. In the first
place it illuminates the history of the Roman fort at Brough.
It belongs to a class of inscriptions which may be called
memorial. With a reticence that is characteristic of Roman
epigraphy, these inscriptions do not always name the reason
of their erection, but it was usually the building or re-building
of a fort, or a structure in it, or a road or bridge ; sometimes,
perhaps, it was the completion of an arduous campaign or
journey. In the present case we may take the inscription as
showing that the fort at Brough was built, or repaired, or, at
least, occupied in some emphatic fashion about A.D. 158. It
was apparently re-built later. The fragments of the inscription
were found used as building material in a sunken chamber of
Roman workmanship. This chamber may possibly correspond to
the vault of the so-called " Prætorium " at Cilurnum (Chesters),
Aesica (Great Chesters), and Bremenium (Rochester), in North-
umberland, and in that case we might suppose at Brough, as
we can certainly admit at Cilurnum a total re-construction of
the fort. The date of that re-construction at Cilurnum seems
to be in the reign of Septimus Severus. Whether that is also
the date at Brough, we cannot yet tell. A somewhat similar
pit at Lyne seems to belong to the middle of the second
century : but it must have had wooden steps, if it had steps
at all.

Secondly, our inscription throws some real light on the con-
dition of Britain in the middle of the second century of our

era. We now have evidence that under Julius Verus there was activity, about A.D. 158, at Brough and at Newcastle-on-Tyne and Birrens, and very probably also at Netherby. Further, we know from Pausanies (viii., 43) that at some time in the reign of Pius the Roman troops had to deal with unquiet Brigantes, part of whose territory was annexed, and we also know that the territory of the Brigantes covered the north of England from Derbyshire to the vicinity of the Tyne and Solway. Lastly, we read that when Pius died and Marcus succeeded there was serious trouble in Britain. It may well be that the difficulties with the Brigantes began late in the reign of Pius, that forts were built, or repaired, to aid their conquest or coercion, and that the struggle continued on into the reign of Marcus.

It is unfortunate that in the present state of our knowledge we cannot tell how far the other Roman forts in the same hill-country may have played a similar part to that assigned to Brough. These other forts have yielded no datable evidence save coins, and not even coins in sufficient abundance to justify confident conclusions. So far as they go the coins indicate that different forts may have had different histories. Melandra Castle, near Glossop, with coins of Domitian, Marcus, Julia Maesa, and Severus, may have been occupied during the same period as Brough. Slack, near Huddersfield, with coins of Nero to Hadrian, may have been both occupied and abandoned sooner. Templeborough, near Rotherham (Titus to Pius, and a few after A.D. 260) may have also dropped out of military use before the end of the second century. But at present it is impossible to say more than that these things may have been, and perhaps the chief use of saying it is to direct the reader's attention to the great value of such evidence as coins.

P.S.—Since the above was sent to the printer, Dr. Ritterling has discussed the Newcastle slab and the activity of Verus. He inclines to connect Verus with some (supposed) work on the Wall of Hadrian, while he puts the Brigantian troubles down to the time of Lollius Urbicus, fifteen years earlier.

I venture to think that the Brough slab takes Verus quite out of the Mural region, and that the operations of Lollius lay too far to the north to affect the Brigantes. It must be remembered that this latter tribe did not extend any serious distance north of Hadrian's Wall, and Lollius was at work on the Clyde and Firth of Forth.

II.

THE ROMANO-BRITISH NAME OF BROUGH.

THE question of the Romano-British name of Brough is two-fold. We have to determine the ancient name of the site; we have also to decide between rival ways of spelling that name. The first half of the problem was successfully solved in 1876 by Mr. W. T. Watkin, who equated Brough with *Navio* (*Archæological Journal*, xxxiii., 49); the second part has been solved since by the recognition that the name which Watkin spelt *Navio* is properly *Anavio*. Neither Watkin nor anyone else, so far as I know, has stated the full evidence for these conclusions, and it may be convenient to attempt to state it here.

(1) The lower part of a Roman milestone in local grit, found in 1862 at Silverlands, Higher Buxton, records a distance of 10 (or possibly 12) miles ANAVIONE. These letters may be equally well interpreted either as *a Navione*, "from Navio," or as *Anavione* "(from) Navio," with the preposition understood. Epigraphically, either phrase is possible, and the milestone, therefore, does not tell us whether the name in question is Navio or Anavio. But it does tell us that a place called by one or other of these names was 10 miles from Roman Buxton. In which direction this place lay, whether north, south, east, or west, we do not learn, but we can guess. The spot where the stone was found, Silverlands, is a little south of the supposed Roman baths, noted in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, but it has lately yielded various

Roman antiquities, and it may well be part of the site of the village or town of Romano-British Buxton. In that case we may reasonably suppose that our milestone stood actually in this village, and was not a wayside stone, but marked the point at which the road for Navio or Anavio started. If we proceed to enquire what Roman site is 10 miles from Buxton, we find that one site only suits—Brough—which is joined to Buxton by the still traceable Roman road, called Batham Gate. Brough, then, is Navio or Anavio.*

(2) This milestone explains, and is in turn elucidated by, a fragmentary inscription found long before at Foligno (Fulginiae), in Italy, which mentions an official styled *censitor* Brittonum ANAVION . . . Watkin was the first to observe that this could be connected with the name on the Buxton milestone, but his general interpretation of it was not satisfactory. In particular, he read the names as *Brittonum a Navion[e]*, " Britons from Navio," which is grammatically impossible. The obvious completion, as Borghesi and Henzen saw long ago, is *Brittonum Anavion[ensium]*, " Anavionensian Britons." The exact meaning of this phrase might be obscure if we had not the Buxton milestone. That indicates that the *Brittones Anavionenses* are a clan or section or division of Britons who lived at Anavio. In turn, this shews that on the milestone we have to read *Anavione*, not *A Navione*. Thus, the second of our problems, the spelling, is solved.†

(3) Two other pieces of evidence deserve quotation. The Ravennas mentions a British river, *Anava* (438, 4). As usual with this writer, the context throws no light on the locality of the river. But the river next named is *Dorvantium;* there

---

* C. I. L., vii., 168 ; Ephemeris vii., 1102. The date of the inscription is unknown : I have no idea why Holder puts it before A.D. 114. The stone, formerly at Derby, is now in Buxton Museum. The numeral of distance seems to my eyes to be X : others have read XII.

† C. I. L., xi., 5213 ; Dessau, 1338. The official in question seems to have held his post of *censitor* quite early in the second century. I do not know whether one should connect his appearance with the development of the province, of which we get indications in different directions, such as, e.g., the appearance of *juridici* (Domaszewski, *Rhein. Mus.*, xlvi., 599). If so, it helps to illuminate a dark period.

is a Derbyshire Derwent, and the *Anava* may also be a Derby-shire river. We may put it near *Anavio*, and suppose that its name survives in the present name of the stream which flows past Brough and into the Derwent, the Noe.*

(4) Lastly, the Ravennas also mentions (430, 5) a place *Nanione ;* so the manuscripts read, though some printed editions wrongly give *Navione*. Here, again, the context gives no proper clue to the situation. But the next place named is *Aquis :* that may well be Buxton, and then we may take *Nanione* to be a mistake for *Anavione*. The manuscripts of the Ravennas not seldom omit initial letters of names, and the confusion of *u* and *n* is easy.

It results that the name of Brough was *Anavio*, and the name of the Noe, which washes it, was *Anava*. The name is doubtless Keltic. The stem recurs in other Keltic names, and is said to denote music or harmony. But whether we should take *Anavio* to be the place of Anavus, or Anava to be the musically babbling brook, I will leave others to decide. And Professor Rhys whom I have consulted on the etymology is equally anxious to pronounce no verdict.

NOTE ON THE REMAINS FOUND AT BROUGH.

By WILLIAM BOYD DAWKINS, M.A., D.Sc., F.R.S., F.S.A., F.G.S., *Professor of Geology, Victoria University of Manchester.*

THESE bones are obviously from a refuse accumulation, and represent the animals which were used for food, " with the solitary exception of the dog," by the inhabitants of Brough.

The most abundant remains are those of the domestic shorthorn, *Bos longifrons*, most of which were killed and eaten when they were full-grown. None belonged to young calves.

---

* Holder, Müller (Ptolemy) and Hübner suggest the Annan (which Holder actually puts in France), but this has no warrant.