

ON THE EXISTENCE OF A BRITISH PEOPLE ON THE
CONTINENT KNOWN TO THE ROMANS IN THE FIRST
CENTURY.

By THE REV. JOSEPH HIRST.

A six months' residence in Rome during the past winter (1881-2) has made me acquainted with a work on early British history, published during the month of February last by the learned Roman archæologist, Dr. Vincenzo de Vit, the well-known discoverer of the *Sententiæ* of Varro.¹ It is entitled "On the difference between the British of the island and those of the Continent," and occupies the first half of the sixth volume of the uniform edition of the author's minor works, the latter half being in support of the thesis that the Cimbri descended into Italy by the Val d'Ossola.

The first portion of this work, to which I here wish to direct attention is a striking instance of the light that the modern study of Epigraphy, in which the labour of compilation and elucidation inaugurated by Gruthers and Smetius have been so ably continued by Borghesi, Henzen, and Mommsen, is calculated to throw on obscure points of history. It has hitherto been generally taken for granted that the two names of *Brittones* and *Britanni* were used to designate one and the same people, viz., the inhabitants of the island of Britain. A closer study of the matter, necessitated by his publication of an entirely original work called *Onomasticon*, in which he explains all the proper names known to antiquity down to the end of the fifth century, led De Vit to the undoubted conclusion that the names in question referred to two entirely different people. This circumstance, besides the light it throws on history, particularly on the Roman conquests in the north of Europe in the first and second centuries, gives a new and satisfactory interpretation to various passages of Procopius, Livy, Juvenal, Martial, Horace, Lucretius, and Quintilian, while it explains some hitherto quite unintelligible lines of Virgil.

What first attracted the attention of our author was a bronze inscription of a diploma of Domitian [A.D. 85], in which mention is made of the *honestam missionem* being granted to the *Cohors I. Britannica miliaria* and to the *Cohors I. Brittonum miliaria*. That one of these peoples is here discriminated from the other there can be no manner of

¹ Formerly a professor of humanities in the Seminary of Padua, he has continued the classical traditions of that abode of learning by editing an enlarged edition of his predecessor Forcellini's Latin dictionary. By embracing all the Latin words in use down to the end of the sixth century, and by adding such illustration of earlier terms as modern

discoveries suggested, he has expanded the original four volumes in 4to into six large quartos in double columns of closely printed matter of about a thousand pages each, so that this new edition, recently completed, forms by far the largest and most complete work of the kind. The London agent is Dulau, Soho Square.

doubt. Then again, stamped tiles bearing the name of the fourth cohort of Brittones have been found in Cumberland and Yorkshire, while we know from other sources that there were never more than three cohorts of British auxiliaries recruited in England. Moreover, it was not the custom of the Romans to employ troops of the same nation for military service in their own country, just as we station Scotch regiments in Ireland and Irish in England. There is, however, an inscription given by Orelli, n. 804 of *Coh. II. Fl. Britton. equitat. electo a Dico Hadriano et misso in expeditionem Britannicam*. We find inscriptions of Brittones as auxiliaries of the Roman legionaries in Egypt. But most inscriptions of Brittones are found in various parts of Germany pointing to regions above the Rhine as their original home. True, these two peoples, the Britanni and Brittones, were originally identical, both having come, according to our author, from the so-called island of *Brittia*, peninsular Jutland; but according as each nation in turn became subdued the Romans found it necessary, chiefly for administrative and military reasons, to introduce a legal and conventional distinction between names hitherto used indiscriminately. This is the thesis our author devotes himself to establish with much ingenuity and learning.

What places beyond all doubt the existence of two nations having names so much alike is the incontrovertible fact of the two separate armies or levies of auxiliaries raised from amongst them, of which distinct record has been preserved to us. Under the words *cohors* and *ala* our author gives in his *Onomasticon* a complete view of the whole auxiliary Roman army, *cohors* and *ala* forming, according to their local distribution, so many proper names. Under the names *Britanni* and *Brittones* he gives the forces belonging to these separate tribes, each with its respective authority. A list of the *cohortes* of foot soldiers and *alae* of horse apportioned to each tribe, will not be uninteresting to the readers of this *Journal*. Indeed, this is the first time so many British troops marshalled under the Roman colours have ever been brought under the notice of the learned, and his exhaustive treatise on the subject from page 86 to 132 will form for the majority of readers the most interesting and original part of the work.¹

A. TROOPS RECRUITED IN THE ISLAND.

Cohors I Britannica	Pedites singulares Britannici
Cohors I Britannica miliaria	Ala I Flavia Aug. Britannica
Cohors II Britannica	miliaria civium Romanorum
Cohors I Britannica miliaria civium Romanorum	Ala II Britannica Miliaria civium Romanorum
Cohors II Britannica civium Romanorum.	

All these levies of horse and foot were made for the first time between Claudius and Domitian, A.D. 41-96.

¹ Dissertazioni sui Britanni e sui Cimbri coll' aggiunta di tre articoli archeologici

del Dott. Vincenzo De Vit, Edizione seconda, Milano, Boniardi-Pogliani, 1882.

B TROOPS RECRUITED AMONGST THE BRITISH OF THE CONTINENT.

Cohors I Brittonum	Cohors III Brittonum (<i>vel</i> Britan- norum)
Cohors I Brittonum miliaria	Cohors III Brittonum veteranorum equitata
Cohors I Brittonum miliaria equi- tata ¹	Cohors IIII Brittonum
Cohors I Flavia Brittonum	Cohors IIII Brittonum antoniana
Cohors I Ulpia Brittonum miliaria	Cohors V
Cohors I Aelia Brittonum	Cohors VI Brittonum
Cohors II Brittonum equitata	Cohors VII Brittonum
Cohors II Brittonum miliaria	Ala I Brittonum veteranorum
Cohors II Flavia Brittonum equitata	Ala II
Cohors II Flavia Brittonum Alex- andriana	Ala III
Cohors II Aug. Nervia miliaria Brittonum	Ala IV

The seventh cohort of Brittones appears to have been raised in the time of Trajan or Hadrian, A.D. 98-138, and at least one squadron of horse may be attributed to the first age of the Empire.

A.

The British reader in modern times may be curious to know how such an army of bygone days has been conjured into existence. We will therefore append the chief of our author's authorities, which will more-over give some idea of his method of reasoning.

The first levy of British auxiliaries was very probably made under Plautius, who was the first Roman who governed the island (from 797 to 800 A.U.C.), and before the submission of Caractacus; or, at the latest, under Ostorius Scapula, who succeeded Plautius after his victory over the rebellious Britons in 803. That a levy was made in Britain under Claudius we have indubitable proof from a military diploma of Titus in the year of Rome 833 (A.D. 80), which has preserved the memory of a Cohors I Britannica. This inscription of Titus was first published by Arneth, *Militär dipl.* Tab. vii. and viii., p. 33, re-produced by Henzen in his Supplement to Orelli n. 5428, and afterwards by Mommsen in the Berlin Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum, vol. iii., Dipl. xi., in which third volume all the military diplomas have been collected together. From this first British cohort's being registered amongst those of which the soldiers had passed the term of twenty-five years of service it is evident that it must have been first formed at least twenty-six years before, viz., A.U.C. 807, or A.D. 54, the last year of Claudius, though from the words used (*quinto et vicensi pluribusve stipendiis emeritis*) it may have been formed as early as A.U.C. 804.

But from the fact of this cohort's being styled *I Britannica* we are authorised in concluding the existence of at least one other, for if the Romans had levied only one they would not have departed from their usual custom and would have called it simply *Cohors Britannica*.

The cohorts were of two kinds; some were *quingenaria*, that is, composed of 500 soldiers, and some were *miliaria*, consisting of 1000 men. The latter, however, were alone designated by this numerical addition,

¹ A cohort to which a small number of horse was attached.

the former being simply styled *Cohortes*. A *Cohors I Britannica miliaria* is recorded in another diploma of Domitian, only five years after the former, viz., A.U.C. 838 (A.D. 85) published by Henzen (n. 5430) and in the Corpus above quoted Dipl. xii, so that this cohort must have been formed in the year 812, if we allow that the soldiers, when dismissed, may have already remained in it at least some months after the 25 stipends. This Cohort, like the first named, had fought in Pannonia.

There are three other inscriptions in the Berlin *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* that must be referred to this cohort. They were all found in Dacia, so that we may conclude that it dwelt for some time in this province, which was contiguous with Pannonia. In the first of these inscriptions (n. 821) we read CH. (for *cohors*) PRIMA BRITANNICA ∞ (viz., *miliaria*) V.L.P. (*votum libens posuit*) JOVI FULG. (for the well-being of the Emperor, whose name has not been preserved.) The second (n. 829) is a mere fragment on which can be read BRIT in one line and RENSES in the second, which Mommsen explains to be *Britannica miliarensis* for *Miliaria*. The third inscription (n. 1633(2)) is on a tile found in Dacia bearing the stamp COH I BR ∞, viz., *COHORS prima Britannica Miliaria*.

To the three cohorts of native Britons, amounting in all to something over 2,500 men, we must add the cohorts of Roman citizens levied in the island, namely, of those settled there for trade or other purposes, or of colonists and their children, or again, of those amongst the natives who had obtained the privileges of Roman citizenship. That there were such we have undoubted proof in a lapidary inscription of Nomentum, published by Orelli, *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* (n. 208), in which we read that a certain Cn. Munatius Aurelius Bassus, procurator of Augustus, was a *censitor civium Romanorum colonie Victricensis, quae est in Britannia, Camaloduni*. This colony was so called from the veterans of the Sixth Legion, surnamed *Victrix* or *Vincitrix*, by whom it was formed. Besides the two colonies of *Camalodunum* and *Londinum*, there existed also from the time of Claudius, the Municipium of Verulam. There must then, even at that time, have been a good number of Roman citizens in Britain. Hence we find mention made in a diploma of Trajan of the year of Rome 863 (A.D. 110) published by Henzen (n. 5443) of a *Cohors I Britannica miliaria civium Romanorum*, which, for the reasons given above, must have been enrolled at the latest in 837 (A.D. 84) under Domitian. Moreover, from this cohort's being styled *I miliaria civium Romanorum*, there is every reason to believe that there must have been another, enrolled later, of at least 500 men. This first cohort of Roman citizens had seen service in Dacia, as is stated in the diploma.

Besides this cohort there is also mention in the same diploma of a body of troops styled *pedites singulares Britannici*. These were probably a body of picked foot soldiers who had in former campaigns given proof of distinguished bravery. In the *Annali dell' Istituto Archeologico* for the year 1855, p. 29, we find the fragment of a diploma of Antoninus Pius in which there is mention of I SINGUL. BRITANNIC., where instead of I should be read the final T of PEDIT. v. *ib.* p. 37.

From the cohorts, which were all composed of foot, let us pass to the ala, which were of cavalry. These also consisted of 500 men, unless composed of 1000, in which case they were styled *miliaria*. There is mention of an ala styled simply *Britannica*, and therefore consisting of

500 horse, in two inscriptions. One is in the Berlin Corpus (n. 3305) and is thus conceived:

H E R C U L I ·
A U G U S T I ·
M · D O M I T I ·
S E C U N D I N ·
V S · D E C · A · B R I · V
S · L · M ·

namely, *Herculi Augusti* (read *Augusto*) *M. Domitius Secundinus decurio alæ Britannicæ votum solvit libens merito*. This belongs to Lower Pannonia. The second was published by Steiner, *Inscript. Rhen.* (n. 826) and is at Trèves.

T · V A R I O · C L E
M E N T I · P R O C
P R O V I N C · B E L G
P R A E P · E Q U I T · A L A E
B R I T · P R A E F · A U X I L
H I S P · T R E V · C I V
O P T · P R A E S I D I

namely, *Treverorum civitas optimo praesidi*, the word *posuit* being understood.

Of an *ala miliaria*, formed of the natives of Britain, we have record in four inscriptions given in the same *Corpus* under numbers 5211 to 5215, to which may be added a fifth published by Steiner, *op. cit.*, n. 825. All these inscriptions are honorific and dedicated to the same T. Varius Clemens, who, in the first, is called simply PRAEF. AL. BRITANNICÆ MILIAR, and in the others PRAEF. EQUIT. ALÆ BRITANNICÆ MILIAR.

This *ala*, having no number, will have been the only one recruited amongst the natives of the island, the original *ala* of 500 men being raised later to 1,000, as appears from its remaining all the time under the same Prefect, a supposition which, from the dates of the documents in question, can be proved not to be the case with the first cohort of British foot soldiers.

Besides the first wing of British horse there were two other wings, both of 1000 men each, of Roman citizens, as we find recorded in various military diplomas. The first is that of Trajan A.U.C. 867 (A.D. 113 or 114) given by Henzen under n. 6857, or in the Corpus *l.c.* n. xxvi, with this name *Ala I. Flavia Augusta Britannica* (sic) *miliaria civium Romanorum*, which must have been formed about the year 88 or 89 under Domitian, from whom consequently it would have received the name of *Flavia Augusta*. There was another *ala miliaria* styled simply *Britannica miliaria civium Romanorum*, of which mention is made *l.c.* in diploma xlvii, granted by M. Aurelius and L. Verus (A.D. 167). The first, Flavia Augusta, is also recorded on a stone in Orelli (n. 3041) dedicated to the manes of a soldier belonging to it, *EQUES ALÆ I FLAV. AUG. BRIT. ∞ C. R.*, and, though the second appears for the first time in a diploma of the year 167, *II BRITT. ∞ C. R.*, which would refer its conscription at the latest to the year 141, it must have been contemporary with the former which could not otherwise have received the denomination of *first*. Of an *Ala Britannica civium Romanorum*, there is mention among the diplomas of the Corpus under the number xlii and xliii, most probably of A.D. 145 and 146. The mutilated state of the bronze makes it impossible to draw any conclusion from it, as to the difference from or identity of this wing with either of the two former.

B.

Let us now pass to the records in stone and bronze of the auxiliaries raised in the first two centuries of the Roman Empire amongst the British of the Continent.

The first cohort of Brittones, of which we have any memory, is that recorded in a diploma of Domitian A.U.C. 838 (A.D. 85) with this title *Cohors I Brittonum miliaria*. The name is written in full, so that we may be certain of its existence, according to the method of calculation given above, at the time of Nero. Perhaps to this same cohort refer two stones and a tile, on the first of which it is called COH. I. BR. ∞ EQ., viz., *Cohors I Brittonum miliaria equitata* (given by Promis in his "History of Turin," p. 365, n. 147), while in the latter two it is styled simply, on the second stone, COH. I. BRIT. (Orelli, n. 3575 and in the Berlin Corpus III, 5455), and on the tile, COH I BR, viz., COHORS I BRITTONUM (given by Hübner in the Corpus VII, 1229.) If these last three inscriptions must be referred, as is probably the case, to one and the same first cohort of Brittones, we may conclude that it was at first composed of only 500 men and was afterwards raised to 1,000; or else, after being first *miliaria*, it became reduced by loss in war, &c., to *quingenaria*, when it was later on brought up to its original strength of 1000 men, and reinforced with a body of horse, whereon it would take the name of *miliaria equitata*.

This first cohort of Britons must be discriminated from three other first cohorts distinguished by different chronological titles, namely:

(a) COH. I. FL. Brittonum on a stone given by Henzen *l.c.* n. 6519, and on another stone in the Corpus III, 2024, COH. I. FL. BRITTONUM; n. 1193 COH. I. FL. BRITTONUM; n. 3256 COH. I. FL. BRITTONUM; n. 4811, CHOR. I. FL. BRIT.; n. 5668, CHOR. I. FL. BT. (*sic.*);

(b) COH. I. ULPIA BRITTONUM ∞ (viz. miliaria) in a diploma of Antoninus Pius given by Borghesi (Œuvres, vol. iii p. 371) and in the Corpus III. n. XLIV.;

(c) COH. I. ÆLIA BRITTONUM on a stone of the year 238, given by Borghesi (*ib. v.* p. 227).

These three cohorts took their names from the Emperor under whom they were raised, namely the Flavian under one of the three Emperors of that gens, Vespasian, Titus or Domitian, the Ulpian from Trajan, and the Ælian from Hadrian. As a rule, no doubt, fresh troops were enrolled every certain number of years, or on the occurrence of any emergency, and each tributary nation had a fixed contingent of auxiliaries to furnish. These distinctive names of the Imperial families appear to have been given to several first cohorts of Brittones in succession, at once to embody the fresh levies, and to supply the losses occasioned in the original first cohorts by death, casualties, or disbandment. These names must have been given them from the beginning or otherwise they could not be discriminated one from another, each being called *Cohors I*.

The name of first cohort always implies at least a second under arms at the same time. The second cohort of Brittones is not far to seek.

The inscription furnished above by Promis contains mention of a prefect, L. Alfius Restitutus of COH. II. BR. EQ., viz. *Cohortis II Brittonum equitate*, the formation of which like the first must be referred to Nero. This second cohort is probably identical with COH. .II BR. ∞, viz., *Cohors II Brittonum miliaria* found on a stone in Hungary and published by Akner and Muller (n. 787).

However two entirely different second cohorts must here be admitted. The first enrolled under one of the Flavian Emperors, and hence called Flavia, is recorded on a stone given by Orelli (n. 804) thus: COH. II. FL. BRITTONUM EQUITAT., and belongs to the time of Hadrian. This inscription enabled Desjardins to supplement another fragment discovered by him in one of the Danubian principalities and published in the *Annali dell'Istituto Archeologico* for 1868, p. 55, thus :

D. M.
ANTONIO
VALERIO 7. C.
II BRITT. . . .
ATUS
.

(The 7 or ill-formed C inverted is meant for centurio.)

The supplement here required is *Coh. II. FL(aviae) BRITTONUM*. It is probable that this same Flavian cohort acquired later by its valour the title of Alexandrian from the Emperor Alexander Severus, with which title it appears on a stone of Lower Mœsia of the year 230, and published in the *Ephemeris Epigraphica*, vol. ii, p. 295, n. 355, thus *Balneæ Coh II. FL. Britt. Alexandrianae a solo restituta*, where Flavian appears to have been the original designation, and Alexandrian an honorific addition.

The other second cohort is mentioned in a diploma already quoted and granted by Hadrian, A.D. 114: COH. II, NERVIA AUG. PACENSIS ∞ BRITTONUM.

The third cohort of Brittones is recorded for the first time with certain date on a stone of the year of Christ 211, under Septimius Severus, discovered at Ratisbon and lately published in the Berlin *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* (vol. iii, n. 5935), where it is called simply COH. III. BRIT., namely *Cohors III Brittonum*. It appears under the same name on two other stones found on the Danube and published by Akner and Muller (nn. 13 and 799). This cohort must have been stationed for a very long time in Rhætia, as we find it there, except perhaps with some short intermission, from the time of Trajan, at the latest, down to the beginning of the fifth century, as we may judge from the testimony of the *Notitia dignitatum utriusque Imperii*, ch. 34, where we read—

Tribunus cohortis tertice Brittonum Abusina.

(Abusina is the present Eining near Abensburg.)

The existence of this cohort at a very early date is attested by two diplomas, one of Trajan (A.D. 107), lately discovered at Weissenberg in Bavaria, and published in the *Corpus*, n. xxiv, p. 867, which brings its formation down to the year 82 at the latest, namely, to the time of Domitian, and the other of M. Aurelius and L. Verus (A.D. 166), published in the *Ephemeris Epigr.* ii. p. 460. This cohort is also mentioned in an inscription given by Henzen (n. 6729) COH. III BRITTONUM VETERANOR. EQUITATA, where the word *Brittonum* is written in full. This inscription of British veterans is attributed by Zaccaria and Promis (p. 47) to the time of Hadrian. If, as Hubner thinks, a tile discovered in Britain bearing the inscription c. III BR (vol. vii of *Corpus*, n. 1230) must be interpreted *Cohors III Brittonum*, we must allow that in the beginning it was stationed for some time in that island; and two other tiles, one (vol. iii, in 1703 [3]) COH. III BRITT. and the other (*Epher. Epigr.* iv, p. 77, n. 206) c III B, interpreted *Coh.*

III Brittonum, found in Dacia, would lead us to believe that it was removed thither for a short time from its ordinary station in Rhætia.

The fourth cohort of Brittones is known only from two stones and a tile discovered in England. They were published by Hübner in the seventh vol. of the *Corpus*. The first is a fragment under n. 177,

GELLI
PRÆ C. III
: V BRIT . . .

and the editor observes that *de Præfecto Cohortis IV Brittonum cogitari posse certum est. cf. tegulae ejus cohortis in Yorkshire et Cumberland repertae infra edendae.*

The second is a fragment under n. 458,

VAE . IVL . GER . . .
NUS . . ACTAR . . .
COH . III . BR . . .
ANTONINIA
L . L . M

The name *Antoniniana* was probably derived from Caracalla when he served with his father in Britain, and obtained for his victories¹ gained there the name of Britannicus (A.D. 210), as attested by coins struck on that occasion. This cohort must have distinguished itself in this war and have obtained the decorative title of the Emperor's cognomen.

The tile is given under n. 1231, thus: COH III BRE (*sic.*) We have two other examples, COH IV BRET and COHORT III BM.

Thus, the first, third and fourth cohorts of Brittones are proved to have been stationed for some time at least in Britain. Now if the Britanni and Brittones were both names of the people of the same island, Britain, the Romans would never have stationed them in their native country, and much less made them fight against their own countrymen.

Of the fifth cohort of Brittones all memory is lost, but it must be admitted to have had an existence as memorials of a sixth and seventh cohort are not wanting.

The sixth cohort is recorded in two inscriptions, one of which is given by Renier (*Inscriptions Romaines de l'Algerie*, Paris, 1855 in fol., n. 2776) and now reproduced in the *Corpus* (n. 5363).

Q . DOMITIO . . Q . F .
QUIR . VICTORI
PRÆF . COHR . VI . BRITTON
TRIB. MIL. LEG . X . FRETENSIS etc.

The second inscription is registered in the 2nd vol. of the *Corpus* (n. 2424) and runs thus:—

L TERENCEIO
M F QUIR . RUFO
PRÆF . . . COH . VI . . . BRITTO
O . LEG . I . M . P . F. DON. DON. AB.
IMP TRAJANO . BEL . DAC etc.

namely, *donis donato ab Imp. Trajano bello Dacico*. If this Terentius Rufus deserved promotion from the rank of centurion (signified by the

¹ Or for his success. For his *Victoriae Britannicae*, v. Eckhel, D.N.V.T. 7, p. 207.

inverted C) in the Legio I Minervia Pia Fidelis to that of prefect of the sixth cohort of Brittones for his valour in the Dacian war (whether the first or second does not appear), the sixth must have been contemporary with the third cohort of Brittones.

Lastly, the seventh cohort of Brittones is recorded on a stone by Smetius (147, 20) thus :—

I . O . M
L. OCTAVIUS
CELER. PRÆF.
COH . VII . BRIT.
ET COH . I . THRAC.

We can only conjecture that this cohort, certainly not Britannic, as the British cohorts of the Isle do not approach that number, belonged like the foregoing to the age of Trajan and Hadrian, if not to an earlier period. That besides these seven cohorts of foot, which must have existed contemporaneously, three of which were partially strengthened with horse, the Brittones may also have furnished some four *alæ* of cavalry, appears from the *Notitia Imperii Orientalis*, in which is registered a fourth wing of Brittones stationed in the Thebaid.

That there was at least one *Ala Brittonum* in the first ages of the Empire would seem certain from a lapidary inscription lately published by Renier (n. 3835), and now reproduced in the seventh vol. of the *Corpus*. It runs thus :—

D . M . S
MARCUS
ULP. FAUSTI
NUS . LIBRAR
ALÆ (sic) BRITT . . .
VETRAN . . . (sic)

which is there interpreted *LIBRARIUS ALÆ BRITTONUM VETERANORUM Miliar(ice)*.

The question now arises whence the Brittones of the Continent came, and how far they were known to the Romans. To both of these questions our author has a ready answer.

I.

He makes the Britanni and the Brittones both come originally from the same place, namely, from the island of Brittia, mentioned by Procopius, the modern peninsula of Jutland. Procopius flourished in the reign of Justinian, and in his history of the Gothic war (Bk. iv, ch. xx) he wrote as follows :—

Per id tempus milites, qui Brittiam (Βριττίαν) insulam colunt dimicaverunt cum Varnis . . . Brittia autem insula in hoc Oceano sita est haud amplius CC. stadiis procul a littore contra ipsa Rheni ostia inter Britanniam ac Thulem insulam . . . Porro Brittiam insulam nationes tres numerosissimæ suo quæque sub rege habitant, Angli ("Ἀγγιλοι) Frisones (φρίσσονες), cognominesque insule BRITTONES (Βριττωνες).

The geographical knowledge of the ancients was so limited that it is no wonder if Procopius called Jutland an island, whereas we know it to be a peninsula. That the island of Brittia mentioned by him is identical with modern Jutland is sufficiently established by the fact that he places it between Britain and Thule, an island to the east identical

with Scandinavia, called also by the Ancients Scantia and Baltia. As for the assertion that the island of Brittia was 200 stadia from the continent and over against the mouth of the Rhine, Borghesi is of opinion that our author included in the said island a part of Holland as far as the Zuider-Zee.

As for the Angles called by Procopius Ἀγγελοι, by Ptolemy (ii, 11, 15) Ἀγγελοι, and by Tacitus (Germ. XL) Anglii, we know that they inhabited for a long time the lower part of Jutland, namely Sleswig and Holstein, and there seems no doubt that it was these Angles who, together with the Saxons, were in the middle of the fifth century invited by the British of the island to aid them against the Scots and Picts.

That Britain, being an island, should have been peopled from the neighbouring continent, and that there should be a mother country on the continent common both to those who migrated to the island in such force as to change its name from Albion, by which Pliny says it was first known, to that of their own people, Britain, seems in itself in the highest degree probable; and that the greater portion of the British people remained on the continent and gradually came down from the north, and moved from place to place in their southward course, is in harmony with what we know of other similar migratory northern tribes.

In the passage of Procopius, which we have given incomplete in Latin, he not only discriminates the two islands, but says distinctly that he gives the history of each separately. *Sed de Britannia ac Thule in superioribus libris disserui*, he says of the one, and *Hactenus de insula Brittia* of the other.

If it is clear from the position given by Procopius to the two countries that they must be different, so is it from the history he gives of each. For he narrates four particulars concerning the Britons of the continent, or Brittia, which never could be referred to Britain proper or the island, viz. :—(1.) That the Angles submitted to be ruled by a king of these Brittones with whom they were allied, and whom they furnished with ships and men for their expedition against the Varni, a people of the continent, at a time when Procopius, who was a contemporary of these events, knew that the Angles and Saxons were engaged in establishing themselves by force in England, where they drove the British before them; (2) That in the sixth century of the Christian Era the use of the horse was not only unknown amongst the people of Brittia, but that they had never even heard of such an animal, a thing which might be true of the Brittones of the continent but not of the British of the island, as is testified by what we read in all historians from Cæsar to Procopius; (3) That there was a third people in Brittia, viz., the Frisones, of the existence of which in Britain proper we have no trace in history; and (4) that the Angles, Frisones and Saxons went every year from the island of Brittia to the continent into the territory of the Franks, in order to become their subjects, at a time when they were already so successful in founding kingdoms of their own in the island of Britain.

Thus we must admit that the inhabitants of Albion, la Bretagne and Brittia were originally one; that part came down from the grassy plains of Sleswick and Holstein into Belgium where they settled on either bank of the Rhine, while in the middle of the fifth century they pushed their way into Armorica, now Bretagne in France. Both Albion and Armorica had their names changed by the very force and completeness

of the invasion, just as after the Anglo-Saxon conquest Britain became England; after the Frankish conquest Gaul became France; and after the Lombard Conquest the north of Italy became Lombardy.

As regards the hitherto commonly maintained theory that Albion was peopled by British from Armorica, and that Britannia minor was peopled by British refugees from England, it is opposed by insuperable difficulties. The assertion of Bede, who wrote in the seventh century, *In primis hæc insula (Albion) Brittones solum, a quibus nomen accepit, incolas habuit, qui de tractu Armoricano, ut fertur, Britanniam advecti, australes sibi partes illius vindicarunt* (Hist. Eccles. L. i. C. i.), is sufficiently contradicted by the fact that no people bearing the British name were known to the Romans as peopling Armorica, for Cæsar, who traversed Gaul from one end to the other, never mentions them once. It seems incredible that so numerous a people should have passed over into Albion without leaving any trace of their residence in their mother country, a fact the more unlikely as we do find traces of this nation in other parts of the Continent. It may be added here that both Cæsar and Tacitus express complete ignorance as to the early inhabitants of Britain. The former declares (de B. G. v. 12), *Britanniæ pars inferior ab his colitur, qui natos in insula ipsa memoria proditum dicunt*; the latter (Agricola, c. 11) *Britanniam, qui mortales initio coluerint, indigence an advecti, ut inter Barbaros, parum compertum*.

As for the invasion and peopling of Armorica by the British refugees from England these are the words of Gildas, our earliest authority (de Excidio Britanniae c. xxv). *Nonnulli miserarum reliquiarum (of the British) in montibus deprehensi acervatim jugulabantur: alii fame confecti accedentes manus hostibus dabant in ævum servituri: si tamen non continuo trucidarentur, quod altissimæ gratiæ stabat in loco: alii transmarinas petentes regiones cum ululatu magno; alii a montanis collibus minacibus præruptis vallati et densissimis saltibus marinisque rupibus . . . in patria licet trepidi perstabant*.

Gildas, we must observe, may have written his history less than a century after the events in question, and may have obtained his information from eye witnesses. Now that the refugees from England were not in great numbers we may conclude from what we are here told, that they formed but a fourth portion of those of whom he speaks; and that this portion, which fled to France, was not the largest, we may argue from what he goes on to narrate, namely, that after a short time, on the withdrawal of the enemy, the British who had remained on the island came forth from their concealment, took up a strong position and gained a series of victories over their invaders.

It is very probable that these refugees from Britain did not go over in a body. They were too much discouraged to join together in one plan of action, and too weak and ill-provided with necessaries to attempt the invasion of a kingdom across the waters. It is more likely that scattered, deprived of almost everything, and encumbered with their wives and children, they crossed the channel where best they could, and landing at different points on the coast from Dunkerque to Armorica implored protection from the inhabitants.

Prosper of Aquitaine, who brought his Chronicle down to the year 455, the last of the Emperor Valentinian III, while he carefully records all the invasions Gaul had suffered from so many barbarous peoples, the

Alani, Goths, Franks, and Burgundians, makes no mention of the descent of the British on Armorica. We may say the same of another writer of Gaul, his contemporary, Sidonius Apollinaris, who, though he speaks of the British in the northern provinces, never hints even that they came over from Britain. The same must be said of Gregory of Tours who wrote in the sixth century, and who more than once makes mention of the British in Armorica, but without a word as to whence they came. Moreover it is most extraordinary that not only does Bede observe complete silence as to this invasion of Armorica, but so also does Gildas, who wrote in that very country then peopled by the Brittones, so that if the latter had been his fellow countrymen he would certainly have mentioned that fact as a matter of extreme interest to the British of the island at home and abroad.

As to the question when and whence Armorica received its British population our author answers as follows :

We are told by the historian Zosimus (vi. 5) that about the beginning of the fifth century, during the reign of Honorius, while the whole Roman Empire was being threatened with invasion by the Barbarians, who were hemming it round on every side, Gaul, roused by their success, raised the standard of revolt. Amongst the rebellious provinces he makes especial mention of Armorica (ὁ Ἀρμόριχος ἄπας) which, in imitation of the neighbouring island of Britain, drove out the Roman magistracy and formed itself into a free and independent commonwealth.

The policy adopted in this emergency by the Romans was to make peace with the rebellious provinces by recognising their independence in order to engage their former subjects to make common cause with them against their new invaders. Jornandes (De Getarum origine c. xxxvi) in describing the memorable campaign of Ætius against Attila gives us the following information as to the tribes who fought under the Roman colours :—*Adfuere auxiliares Franci, Sarmata, Armoriciani, Liticiani, Burgundiones, Saxones, Riparioli, Briones* (sic), *quondam milites Romani, tunc vero jam in numero auxiliorum exquisiti.* (The people Briones being altogether unknown to antiquity, De Vit would here read Britones, as, from what he shows further on, that name would correspond to a people living, like the rest of those here mentioned, in the north, and though formerly subdued, then enjoying independence.)

Now, there is mention here of the people of Armorica, who before this date (A.D. 451) were Roman soldiers and now were allies and auxiliaries. If then they had already for some time past cast off the Roman yoke, how can we admit their country to have been successfully invaded by the British refugees from England? and if they were ready to fly to the assistance of the Romans against the Huns, how would they have tamely submitted to a band of fugitives from across the seas, as some historians would have us suppose?

But the real invaders of Armorica are soon mentioned by Jornandes in a passage which has been misunderstood by Lingard and others as referring to the British of the Isle. In chapter xlv. he thus writes :—*Euricus, Vesegotharum rex, crebram mutationem Romanorum principum cernens, Gallias suo jure visus est occupare. Quod comperiens Athemius imperator protinus solatia Britonum postulavit. Quorum rex Riothimus cum XII millibus veniens in Biturgicas civitatem, Oceano e navibus egressus, susceptus est.* This was in 467. Now, it seems incredible that

the British of the island, situated as they were, could at that period, corresponding with the first year of the reign of King Arthur, have sent a well equipped army of 12,000 men by ship in aid of the Romans, nor would it ever have occurred to the mind of the Emperor Anthemius to have recourse to them. Still less could they have been of the number of those British who twelve or fifteen years before had fled from their native island, who could not possibly in the short space of sixteen years have possessed themselves of Armorica, and fortified and garrisoned their position there so as to be able to despatch 12,000 men under their King Riethimus against the Visigoths.

As we must admit an invasion of Armorica by the Britons of the continent about the year 460, at the very time when Britons of the same stock and tongue were flying over from Britain on to the whole western coast of France, the coincidence of the two events has been the cause why historians have merged them in one and attributed the name and population of La Bretagne to the British of the island alone. That the language of some tribes in the north of Germany was similar to that of Britain, we are told expressly by Tacitus in his "Germania," ch. xlv: *Dextro Suevici maris litore Aestiorum gentes alluuntur; quibus ritus habitusve Suevorum, lingua Britannice propior: matrem deum venerantur.* Of the peculiar form of worship mentioned in the last words we shall have occasion to treat presently.

II.

A further elucidation of the question as to whence these Britons, who in the fifth century peopled Armorica and gave it their name, originally came, must be reserved till we have given our author's answer to the second, namely, how far this people of Britons living on the continent was known to the Romans. Our having prepared the way, by showing the necessity we are under of admitting such a continental tribe of Britons, will enable us to understand the meaning and weight of the testimony of various authors, which has hitherto been entirely overlooked or else misunderstood.

It is well known that Pliny the Elder, who finished his work on natural history and dedicated it to the Emperor Vespasian in the year of Rome 830, had served in Germany some thirty years previously, and was hence well acquainted with the places he describes. Now, in the enumeration he gives of the peoples who in his day inhabited Belgium, he makes express mention of the Britons. His words are as follows:—*A Scaldi incolunt extera Toxandri pluribus nominibus, dein Menapii, Morini, Oromarsuci juncti pago, qui Gesoriacus vocatur, Britanni, Ambiani, Bellovaci . . . Frisiabones, Betasii* (l. iv. c. 31, sec. 106.) Hyginus also, who wrote his work *De Castrorum Munitione* during the lifetime of Trajan, twice makes mention of *Brittones* as furnishing auxiliaries to the Roman Legions, together with the Cantabri, the Getæ, and the Dacians (ch. 29 and 30.)

The passage of Pliny is in itself as clear and uncontrovertible as that we have given above from Procopius.¹ There are, moreover, various

¹ If any one should object to our admitting a race of Britons on the continent from their being mentioned only once by Pliny, the same objection might be urged against the existence of other peoples, as for instance, the Breuci and the Nervii,

who are mentioned only once by that author, and yet, as De Vit shows in his Onomasticon, we have record of eight cohorts of the former, and of six of the latter serving in the Roman army.

reasons why we should place the primitive seat of this people of Britons nearer the Rhine than the sea, though they were ever moving downwards towards the south in search of better lands, like all the other northern tribes in that age of transmigration, when in the race for new settlements one people pressed as it were on the heels of another.

This theory is confirmed by the discovery of various lapidary inscriptions which will here do us as good service, as they did in the matter of the two separate armies of the insular and continental Britons.

One of these stones was found on this side of the Rhine near Xanten, which is supposed to be not far from the encampment of the Romans called *Castra vetera*, hard by the colony founded there by Trajan, perhaps as early as A.U.C. 851, when he had command of the legions of the Rhine in the lifetime of Nerva. This inscription was published by Dr. Henzen in his supplement to Orelli, n. 5932, and is as follows :

MATRIBUS · BRITTIS · L · VALE
RIUS · SIMPLEX · MIL · LEG
XXX · V · V · V · s · L · M

namely *miles legionis XXX Ulpie Victricis*. The *Matres Brittiæ* or *Brittæ*, to which this inscription is dedicated, cannot but be so called from the name of their country as given us by Procopius, namely, Brittia, whence came the Britons who paid them a sort of worship. The women of that country are called in Greek by Procopius, *Βῑττῑαι*, and we know from Tacitus (*Annals* I, xiv, 30 *et seq.*) and from another stone given by Henzen (n. 5942), and dedicated to the *Matres Britannicæ*, that the women amongst the peoples of the German race, and especially the Britones and Britanni, were held in the highest veneration. (*Cf.* above the *matrem deum venerantur* of Tacitus, Germ. xlv). Now our finding a Roman legionary who discharges a vow in such a place to a foreign divinity is sufficient evidence to declare it a local or neighbouring deity, so that we must place not far hence the British people amongst whom he would find that worship. The assertion of Pliny, therefore, who enumerates the British amongst the population of Belgium in his day receives confirmation from this inscription.

To this worship of the British matrons may be referred that of the *matres Malvisæ* or *deæ Malvisæ* as they are called on a stone discovered at Cologne in an inscription recording a vow discharged in their name by an ordinary soldier of British race. In *H.D.D. diabus* (sic) *MalvasIs et Silvano Aur. Verecundus ordi. Brito V.S.L.M.*, viz., in honorem domus divinæ . . . *ordinarius* (miles) *Brito etc.* (published by Orelli, n. 2080 and later by Brambach, n. 362.) Another stone referring to the worship of the *Matres Brittiæ* of the Continent was found in England bearing this inscription, "To the divine transmarine mothers," *deabus Matribus tramarinis* (sic) (given by Henzen, n. 5940). Besides the Brittian mothers, the *deæ Malvisæ* and the *transmarine matrons*, the British of the continent seem also to have worshipped the *deæ Nealenia*. Several votive inscriptions to this goddess have been found in Zeland not far from West-Capell, between the Scheld and the Meuse, in one of which a merchant connected with that race by trade but not by birth, on his arrival from the island of Britain, discharged a vow for the safe arrival of his cargo on the continent. *Deæ Nehalennia ob merces rite conservatas Secund. Silvannus negotiator cretarius Britannicianus V. S. L. M.* (Orelli, n. 2029, *Vide*

other inscriptions sacred to this divinity, nn. 2030, 2031, 2774, 2775, and 3912, and in Reinesius, cl. i, from n. 177 to 184.)

What goes to strengthen our belief of a British people on the continent hitherto almost unobserved by historians is the record we have, not only of the name Britones always carefully applied to the soldiers recruited on the continent and never once given to those of Britain, but even of various tribes of the former race which cannot be referred to Britain, such as the *Brittones Anavionenses*, the *Brittones Nemaningenses*, the *Brittones Triputienses*, the *Brittones Curvedenses* or *Curuedenses* and the *Brittones Aurelianenses*.

There is mention of the *Brittones Anavionenses* during the reign of Trajan, when the Romans had not penetrated far into the island of Britain, Spartianus telling us that at the beginning of the reign of Hadrian, Trajan's successor, the British of the island, *teneri sub ditione non poterant* (Hadr. 21.)

We have seen above that the legion to which the soldier who discharged his vow to the Brittan mothers belonged, was the Thirtieth Ulpiæ Victrix, which took its name from Trajan, who was surnamed Victrix for the victories he had obtained perhaps in these very regions. Anyhow we have reason to think that various tribes of Brittones were by Trajan subdued on the other side of the Rhine. This circumstance might be argued from a fragment now preserved in the Palazzo Comunale of Fuligno, in which we read—

		<i>primipilo</i>	PRAEFecto
coHORTIS	TRIB		MILitum
pRAEF	EQVIT		CENSITOr
BRITTONUM			ANAVIONens
PROC . AVG .	ARMENIAE	MAjor	etc.

Borghesi, a great authority (*Œuvres*, t. 3 and *Annali* for 1846, p. 315) attributes this fragment to *T. Haterius Nepos*, who must have been prefect of Egypt under Hadrian about A.V.C. 874, and imperial procurator of Armenia during the last year of Trajan, in 867, so that he must have been an extraordinary legate sent by the latter for the enrolling of the said *Brittones Anavionenses*. Certain it is, whoever may have had this office, that we must admit the region where dwelt this tribe, to have been reduced to the form of province, in the time of Trajan, and to have been therefore conquered by the Roman arms at a still earlier period. We are enabled to conclude therefore that they must have been a tribe of Brittones living beyond the Rhine.

We may apply the same reasoning to four other inscriptions which have preserved the memory of two other tribes of Brittones, the *Nemaningenses* and the *Triputienses*. They were all discovered in the Oden-Wald, between the Necker and the Maine, two tributaries of the Rhine, and are all votive, and record a number of each tribe under the charge of a centurion of the Legio xxii Primigenia Pia Fidelis. We know from history that this legion was in Germany in the time of M. Aurelius, and the first of these stones refers to that very period, for it is of the year of Christ 178, and may be read in Henzen (n. 6731). It begins thus—

APOLLINI ET
DIANAE . N . BRIT
ET . EXPLORAT
NEMANING . C
AGENTE . T . AUREL . etc.

and is of the time of consuls we know, *Orfito et Rufo Cos.*

Another stone, taken from Steiner (n. 166), is thus read by Henzen (n. 6731 note,)

I . O . M
N . BRIT
NE . M . ANC. etc.

namely, *numerus Britonum Nemanicensium*.

The *Brittones Triputienses* are known to us by several inscriptions. Those mentioned above are given by Henzen, n. 6787 and Orelli n. 1627.

FORTUNAE SAC
BRITTONES . TRIP
QUI . SUNT . SUB . CURA
T. MANILI . T . F . POLLIA
MAGNI . SENOPE
7 . LEG . XXII . P . P . F . O . P.

That the abbreviation TRIP has not been rendered amiss we know from the second inscription where it is given in full.

NYMPHIS
N . BRITTON
TRIPUTIEN
SUB CURA
M . ULP
MALCHI
7 . LEG . XXII
PR . P . F

To the same *Brittones Triputienses* must be referred two other lapidary fragments discovered in Hesse on the Rhine, and published by Bramback, nn. 1392, 1393. There is no reason to believe *Triputiens* to be here a corruption of *Tripotienses*, so that we might refer the stones to *Tripontium* (Dowbridge) placed in the Itinerary of Antonine between London and Lincoln. The diploma of Domitian establishing the distinction between the *Britanni* and *Brittones* make this unnecessary. It may be mentioned here that there is to this day a village, near Mayence, on this side of the Rhine, called *Bretzenheim*, in Latin *Vicus Britannorum*. Whether this name was derived from soldiers of the *Britanni* or *Brittones* being there stationed, is uncertain. There is nothing however against the opinion that the name may be derived from a tribe of *Brittones* having settled there in their transmigration from northern Germany.

The *Brittones Curuedenses* or *Guruedenses* were made known to us by a votive hand discovered in 1831 in Heidernheim in Nassau, on which was engraved the following inscription published first by Becker (drei römische Votirhände, Frankfort, 1862, in 4^{to}), and afterwards by Bramback (n. 1455).

JOVI DOLICENO
C . JULIUS . MARINUS
O . BRITTONUM
CURUEDENS
D . D

This centurion Julius Marinus is recorded, it would appear, on another stone found near the same place (Henzen n. 6794) *C. Julius Marinus, Ara, Armatura eg. XIII. G. M. V. Ann. XXX. Stip. XII*, etc., to which fourteenth legion, stationed as we know in Germany, these B. Curuedenses were perhaps attached as auxiliaries.

Of the *Brittones Aurelienses* we have mention on a stone fragment discovered at Oehringen in Württemberg and given by Brambach, thus:

COH . I . HELVE . ET BR + T
AURE . SUB . CUR . C

However this much must be admitted, that the separation of the name *Brittones* and *Aurelienses* in an inscription in ancient Falleri, and published by F. Garucci in his *Archæological Dissertations* (vol. i, p. 49), which records a *præpositus* whose name has been lost *explorationis Seiopensis numeri Aurelianensis*, as also the separation of the names *Brittones* and *Nemaningensis* in one inscription we have, throws some doubt upon the existence of these two tribes of *Brittones*. That there were however *numeri* composed of *Brittones* we know from various inscriptions, as in the one given by Borghesi (*Œuvres*, vol. iv, p. 199), IDVS OCTOBRES GIINIO (i.e. *Genio*) HORREORUM NUMERI BRITTONVM. Another instance is given by Brambach (n. 1592), while a *quæstionarius numeri Brittonum* is recorded by Akner (n. 262) of A.D. 186, and a *Numerus Brittonum miliaris* is given by Brambach in n. 1563.

That the Romans never placed *cohortes* and *alæ* in the country where they had been recruited is certain; that however this was the case with the *numeri* does not appear. There was a great difference between the last named and the two former bodies, at least in the first ages of the Empire and before Diocletian, to which period all the stones hitherto found are antecedent. The *numerus* seems to have been irregular bodies of soldiers taken from some province, as in the inscription of a PRÆPOS. NUMERI EQUITUM ELECTOR. EX ILLYRICO, given by Henzen (n. 6729) and supposed to be of the time of Hadrian; or else the *numerus* may have meant a body of men detached from the cohorts or *alæ* for some special service; or again a number of men enrolled for some special emergency, as the erection of fortifications or the quelling of a sudden revolt, at the end of which they were disbanded. It does not appear that they had fixed stations like the regular bodies of troops. We learn however from Zozomen that in the fourth century the Roman cohorts began at that time to be called *Numeri*, though the two names continued to exist contemporaneously side by side τα Ρωμαίων ταγματα ἂν νῦν ἀριθμοὺς χαλοῦσι (H. E., i, 8; cf. Vegetius, de re militari, ii, 9).

As it is apparent that the Romans came in contact with a people of *Brittones* on the continent whom they defeated beyond the Rhine, subdued in their settlements and enrolled as soldiers, whom they then stationed in various parts of the vast country now embraced by the name of Germany, as well as in more distant parts of the Roman Empire, we are now in a position to give its true value to the actual statements of Procopius and Pliny, as well as to various other testimonies.

Pliny himself in his *Natural History* records a circumstance of the highest interest. He tells us that when Germanicus, the brother of Drusus and of Claudius, who was afterwards emperor, was at the head of the Roman legions in Germany, between the years 764 and 770, at a time when Britain was still free from the Roman yoke, he came, in the territory inhabited by the Frisians, a people at that time friendly to the Romans, to a certain spring of fresh water near the shore of the German Ocean, beyond the island called Batavia, between the mouth of the Rhine and lake Flevo, the modern Zuidersee, upon drinking which the

Roman soldiers were seized with some scorbutic malady. Hereupon the Frisians made known to them a certain herb which had power to heal that sickness. Pliny was not a little surprised at hearing that herb called by the natives *Britannica*, for though the place was bordering on the German Ocean over against Britain, that island not being yet subdued, could hardly give a name to an article of common use that could not be procured hence in any great quantity: *mirorque nominis causa* (l. xxv, 6, § 21). No doubt the friendly people amongst whom the Romans then were came originally from the not far distant Brittia, as we are told indeed by Procopius, whence the herb derived its name, and though Pliny himself makes mention of a British people on the continent, on the Rhine, he was ignorant of their primitive seat in Jutland. Lipsius in his notes on Tacitus, Annals I, 63, relates that even in his time the Frisians called a certain moist kind of herb Bretanschejde. The same herb is called in Greek by Dioscorides, iv, 3, *Βρεταννίχη*, and by Paulus Egineta, vii, p. 233-9, *Βρεταννίχη*.

As we have seen so far, the distinction between the two names *Britanni* and *Brittones*, having little foundation in any difference of race, as the two people were originally one, though when discovered by the Romans they inhabited parts of Europe somewhat distant from each other, was invented by that eminently wise, administrative and logical-minded people, who did everything by rule and order, at first only for military purposes. A distinction in itself so necessary for the army and civil service, and hence strictly adhered to when possible, though exceptions from the merely conventional nature of the denomination itself did not fail to occur, was not long in being adopted by the writers of Rome. Hence the use of the word *Brittones* to designate the continental Britons becomes of great service in supplying the true meaning to various passages of the authors of antiquity which have hitherto been little understood.

Both Juvenal and Martial mention the *Britanni* and *Brittones*, and with such characteristics that we cannot doubt of their being two different peoples. Of the *Britanni* Juvenal thus speaks (Satire, xv., v. 110):

“Nunc totas Graias nostrasque habet orbis Athenas :

Gallia caudicibus docuit facunda Britannos :

De conducendo loquitur jam rhetore Thule.”

This passage receives light from another of Tacitus (Agric. 21): *Jam vero principum filios* (he is speaking of Roman Britain) *liberalibus artibus et ingenio Britannorum studiis Gallorum anteferre, ut qui modo linguam Romanorum abnucebant, eloquentiam concupiscerent; inde etiam habitus nostri honor et frequens toga; paulatimque discessum ad delentimenta vitiorum, porticus, et balnea et conviviõrum elegantiam; idque apud imperitos humanitas vocatur, quum pars servitutis esset.* And of the same people Martial says (xi., 3)

Dicitur et nostros cantare Britannia versus.

After the refinement and cultivation attributed to the inhabitants of Roman Britain, the passage to the poverty-stricken and barbarous *Brittones* is too manifest to require further comment. Of the latter Martial speaks thus—*quam v. teres braccæ Britonis pauperis* (xi., 22), while Juvenal in the same satire quoted above classes them with the *Cimbri*, *Agathyrsi*, and *Sauromati*, to whom for barbarity and cruelty they were not inferior (v. 124).

"Qua nec terribiles Cimbri, nec Brittones unquam
 Sauromatæque truces aut immanes Agathyrsi
 Hac sævit rabie imbellæ et inutile vulgus."

It may here be mentioned that not only the inhabitants of Britain, but even the Caledonians, not yet subdued by the Roman arms, are called *Britanni* by Martial (Epigram. x., 44), and Statius (*Silv.* v., 2, 149). Yet that the legal distinction introduced between the two nations was not always strictly adhered to we have a proof in the famous epigram of Ausonius, who wrote in the latter half of the fourth century. Yet even in this cunningly conceived epigram *de quodam Silvio, qui erat Brito*, we may note that he avoids in his repeated antitheses to oppose ever *Brito* to *Britannus*, for *Silvius* was a Briton of the Continent, one of an uncouth race, whom he half in compliment calls *Britannus*; so that if we take away the finely spun opposition existing between the two words we destroy all the point of the severe chastisement inflicted by the poet on his adversary.

Our author shews the value of this distinction between the Britons of the Isle and of the Continent for the elucidation of history. After the copious exposition of all we know concerning the connection of the Romans with Britain from Claudius to Septimus Severus (pp. 77-86), he gives a learned and interesting account (pp. 152-182) of the origin of the fictitious opinion that Augustus made an expedition into Britain, and establishes beyond doubt that Augustus never once visited our island, but that the Britons, subjugated by that Emperor, were those of the Continent. He shews conclusively that Apponius, who flourished probably towards the beginning of the seventh century, attributed the conquest of Britain to Augustus on the authority of Livy, who in a fragment which may belong to the 135th or to the 139th Book, chronicles the victory of that Emperor over the Britons of the Continent (gained A.U.C. 727-30 or 738-741); on that of the Scholiast Servius on the 5th line of the 3rd Book of Virgil's *Georgics*.

"Purpurea intexti tollant aulaeæ Britanni,"

where allusion is made to the same victory; and on the 287th line of the first Book of the *Æneid*,

"Imperium Oceano, famam qui terminet astris,"

which must be referred to Julius Cæsar, dictator.

If we examine impartially all the documents left us by Grecian and Roman classic antiquity, it will appear evident that Augustus never once set foot in Britain. True, it is, that he thrice conceived, or pretended to conceive, the design of subjugating that island, but at the same time we have undoubted proof that he never put his design into execution.

He conceived the design of conquering Britain for the first time in the year of Rome 719, and he even went with this intention into Gaul during the following winter. But an insurrection among the recently subdued Pannonians and Dalmatians obliged him to desist and betake himself into Dalmatia instead (v. Dion Cassius, xlix, 38.) During that and the following six years he was too much occupied with the war against the Dalmatians, the civil war against M. Antony, and the affairs of the East, to think of Britain, which, according to the testimony of Horace in the

Seventh Epode, written about 722, remained untouched by the Roman arms :—

“Intactus aut Britannus ut descenderet Sacra catenatus via.”

Horace here gently hints that the Romans had much better think of the Britons still unconquered instead of tearing one another to pieces in a civil war.

In the year of Rome 727 Augustus again resolved to carry war into Britain. Hence he went a second time into Gaul in order to undertake the command of the expedition in person, but the British sent ambassadors to him there and sued for peace. This is related by Dion (liii, 22). This expedition furnished Horace with a theme in his Ode to Fortune, written in 727, before the Emperor's departure.

All negotiations with the British emissaries having failed, Augustus again, in the year 728, determined on an expedition against the Island, when the Salasi, Cantabri, and Astures once more revolted, so that all his efforts had to be directed against them. Here Dion Cassius and Horace are again our authorities, the former in Book LIII, ch. xxv, the latter in the fifth Ode, Book III, written it would appear in 728, in which the poet would say, that in the same way as Jove is declared a ruler in the heavens by his thunder, so Augustus shall be held for a manifest God on earth by the conquest he will make over the enemies of the Roman name, and by adding to its glories in enlarging the borders of the Empire—

“Cœlo tonantem credidimus Jovem
Regnare ; præsens divus habebitur
Augustus, adjectis Britannis
Imperio gravibusque Persis.”

After that date Augustus dismissed all thought of the conquest of Britain, and we may say the same of his two immediate successors Tiberius and Caius.

That Augustus gained a victory over *some Britons* is beyond doubt, and we are, perhaps, now in a position to give its due weight and meaning to a passage of Jornandes in his book, *de regnorum successione*, written in the second half of the sixth century of our era, and composed, without doubt, with the help of historical authorities that have now in great part perished. He says, *Germanos, Gallos, Britones, Hispanos, Hiberos, Astures, Cantabros occiduali axe jacentes et post longum servitium desciscentes per se ipse Augustus accedens rursus servire coegit, Romanisque legibus vivere.*

Here we have mention of the Britones being subjugated by Augustus, together with other tribes of Gaul, Germany, and Spain. Of the victories of Augustus over these tribes no one doubts. Now, that the Britones here mentioned dwelt on the continent is clear from another passage in the same book of Jornandes, where he says, speaking of Claudius, *Fecit Claudius expeditionem in Britanniam insulam, quam jam nemo ante Julium Cæsarem, sed neque post eum, quisquam, adire ausus fuerat.* It is not improbable therefore that the Britons of the continent came down from Germany and obtained a footing in Belgium between Cæsar's departure from Gaul in 704 and the arrival of Augustus in 720, Pliny recording that they were there at that time. Augustus, therefore, having to wage war against the Germans on both sides of the Rhine, no doubt encountered

and subdued the Britones either in person or by his generals. The ignorance of later authors as to a people of Britones on the continent, has led to their referring passages quoted from Livy and Virgil to the imaginary victories of Augustus over the British of the Isle.

Our author draws at length fresh proofs of his thesis from a consideration of Virgil's Third Book of Georgics, 10th and following verses, and from an epigram of this poet preserved to us by Quintilian in his "Oratorical Institutions," Book VIII, ch. iii, sec. 28.

NOTE.—When writing the above paper I was not aware that the distinction between *Britanni* and *Brittones* had attracted attention in this country. I knew only that since 1843 when Arneth published the famous diploma of Domitian, in which both nations are mentioned, the distinction between them had been recognised, but not insisted upon, by many learned men on the Continent, as Borghesi in 1846, and later on by Henzen, who in so doing did but confirm the surmise of his predecessor Orelli. Since however these sheets were in print, I have been informed by Mr. Hartshorne that the distinction has been admitted by Dr. McCaul in 1863, by Rev. J. Colingwood Bruce in 1867, and by Mr. Thompson Watkin in 1873 and again in 1881. Amongst recent historians the only allusion I have found to the subject is in Pearson's History of England in Early Ages, who simply says at page 6, "The resemblance of name is probably not delusive." A dissertation, in which the Brittones were for the first time traced to their original home on the Continent was published by De Vit in the *Opuscoli di Modena* of 1867.