

THREE NOTABLE INSCRIPTIONS.

By F. HAVERFIELD.

My third report on Roman inscriptions in Britain contains three items which deserve separate treatment, a dedication from Cirencester, a tombstone from Carlisle, and an altar from Lanchester near Durham. The first two of these go, in some sense, together: they belong to the fourth century, to an age, that is, to which very few of our Romano-British inscriptions can quite confidently be ascribed. We have only the curious inscription of Justinian from Peak near Whitby¹ and some sixteen or twenty milestones.² The addition to this little group of a dedication and a tombstone is, therefore, of some interest. Our knowledge of Roman-Britain in the fourth century is curiously meagre, and, till we can recover certain vanished fragments of Ammian, we must trust to inscriptions to add a little light. Besides this, both of these inscriptions as well as the Lanchester altar, possess points of interest in detail, which it may be well to discuss.

1. THE CIRENCESTER DEDICATION.

This important inscription consist of a dedication and two hexameters, inscribed on three sides of an originally four-sided "basis," of which the fourth side, now lost, may perhaps have contained a third hexameter. The text, with one exception, is certain and the few lost letters can be satisfactorily supplied with ease. It would, of course, be idle to guess at the sense of the lost hexameter, if one has been lost. The text, expanded and completed, is:—

*I(ovi) o(ptimo) m(aximo) L. Sept[imius...], v(ir) p(erfectissimus)
pr(aeses) [pr(ovinciae) Brit(anniae) pr(imae)] restituit civs.*³

*Septimius renovat primae provinciae rector
[sig]num et [er]ectam prisca religione columnam*

¹ C. 268, A. J. Evans, *Numismatie Chronicle*, vii., 207 (*Arch. Cambr.* v. 5, 18).

² Sixteen milestones are certainly of the fourth century (or late third century); two have been found in Cornwall (*Eph.* iii. p. 318 and vii, 1095), three in Cambridgeshire (C. 1153-5), one at Kempsey, south of Worcester (C. 1157), two near Neath (C. 1158-9, *Eph.* vii, 1098), one each at Ancaster (C. 1170), at Brougham

and at Penrith on the York and Carlisle Road (C. 1176-7), and the rest near the wall, at Crindledykes on Stanegate, at Thirlwall and at Old Wall (C. 1188, 1190, *Eph.* vii. 1110-1112). Less certain examples occur at Wroxeter and elsewhere.

³ For the latter Dr. Hübner suggests *c(urante) Justino* but there may have been a letter between v and s.

The scansion of the hexameters is rough, but it agrees thoroughly with the fourth century. In the first line *provinciae* is scanned accentually, in the second the second *i* of *religione* is dropped or made into a *y*. It were idle to quote parallels for accentual scansion; for *religione* we may compare a line in the "Eucharisticos" of Paulinus of Pella (v. 462), who wrote about the end of the fourth century:—

nec ratio aut pietas aut mors religiosa sinebat

The sense of the whole is plain—L. Septimius, governor of Britannia Prima, restored a column and statue of Jupiter which had fallen into disrepair. The monument, therefore, consisted of the existing "base," on which stood a column bearing a statue or statuette of Jupiter. A socket in the base which helped to fasten the column can still be detected, but no trace has been found of the actual column or statue. The type of monument is, however, well-known abroad, though no specimen has been previously identified in Britain. It includes three parts: first, a square pedestal decorated on three or four sides with figures of gods, usually Hercules, Minerva, Juno, and Mercury; secondly, a column, varying from two to six feet in height; and thirdly, a statue of Jupiter on the top, sometimes sitting or standing, more commonly riding over a fallen giant. Wherever an inscription has been preserved, the monument is found to be dedicated to Jupiter. Three years ago Dr. Haug published a list of 218 pedestals belonging to this type, dating, so far as they can be dated, between A.D. 170 and A.D. 246, and occurring most abundantly in the Roman provinces of Rhaetia, Upper Germany, and Belgica. The most perfect specimens of the whole monuments have been found at Schierstein, Hedderheim, and Merten, and may be seen in the museums of Wiesbaden, Frankfurt, and Metz. The Cirencester pedestal is a fourth century restoration, and it is not unnatural, therefore, that the characteristic figures of the three or four gods should be wanting.¹ At Risingham in Northumberland an inscription (C. 1069) mentions a *sigillum* and *columna lignea* erected to Mercury.

¹ F. Haug *Westdeutsche Zeitschrift* x. 9-340; Hettner *Römische Steindenkmäler des Provinzialmuseums zu Trier*, pp.

15 foll.; Florschütz *Gigantensäule von Schierstein* (Wiesbaden 1890).

The monument was erected by L. Septimius..., governor of Britannia Prima. The man is otherwise unknown and need not detain us, but the reference to the province is most noteworthy. We knew already from various provincial lists, such as the Verona catalogue and the *Notitia*, that Britain in the fourth century was divided up on the system introduced by Diocletian and consisted of four provinces, Britannia Prima, Secunda, Flavia Caesariensis and Maxima Caesariensis.¹ We could further assert that this division dates from the year A.D. 296. The title Flavia connects it very plainly with Constantius Chlorus, who in that year defeated Allectus and re-incorporated Britain in the Empire, while the Verona list drawn up soon after A.D. 297, which mentions the four provinces, gives us evidence that they were organised immediately on the conquest. But beyond this we knew nothing. Various conjectures have been made as to the relative positions of these provinces, but the best of them are pure conjectures,² while others betray a conscious or unconscious connection with "Richard of Cirencester," that is Bertram, here adopting a baseless conjecture of Camden's. We now know for certain, that Cirencester was in Britannia Prima. One would gladly go further, but our evidence does not at present permit us to do so. Another discovery may perhaps lay the whole matter clear before us.

Meantime, we learn something definite as to Cirencester. Previous discoveries have made it plain that the site was occupied in early times, though the evidence yet acquired proves only a military occupation in the first century and probably in that part of it which followed immediately on the Claudian invasion. Some such date may well be assigned to the two interesting military reliefs found there.³

¹ Valentia, organised by Theodosius, does not here concern us.

² Even the ingenious suggestions of my friend Prof. Rhys (Celtic Britain ed. 2, p. 99), seem to me to be devoid of real foundation. They are based on a view as to the division of *Britannia superior* and *inferior* which is unproved, and which, even if proven, would not aid Prof. Rhys' views. Kiepert, in his Atlas (1893), arranges the provinces according to a sketch which accompanies the list in the *Notitia* (p. 171 Seeck), but this sketch seems to represent dignity, not geographical position. If it is geographical,

it contradicts our inscription, for it puts Britannia prima half-way up what should be the east coast. It has been suggested to me that the sketch is geographical but misplaced and that the apparent east coast was meant for the south. This suggestion makes the sketch harmonize with the inscription, but its other consequences are less satisfactory. Some more solid result might perhaps be deduced from the analogies of other provinces on the continent, but the two best parallels, Germany and Pannonia, unfortunately suggest opposite conclusions.

³ C. vii, 66, 70 (not 68).

But it is also plain that the place was one of importance in the third and fourth centuries, both when the original monument was erected and when it was restored. The whole character of the objects found there proves this, and the new inscription comes in to confirm their testimony. We dare not suggest that the city was the capital of Britannia Prima, but we may be sure that it was one of its chief towns and one, besides, of the chief towns in Southern Britain.

Some further reflexions may be based on the titles given to the dedicator, *praeses v. p.* and *rector*. The latter is a general term which is common in the fourth century; the former may be briefly noticed. The subdivision of the provinces which dates mainly from Diocletian, resulted in, or at least confirmed, a lowering of the rank given to the provincial governor. In the first two and a half centuries, the governor was usually a man of senatorial rank; in the new order, he was at first by no means necessarily such. In our inscription the governor has not senatorial rank. He is not *vir clarissimus*—he is only *vir perfectissimus*. If we knew more of fourth century history, this would help us to fix the date of the inscription, for at some time or other in that century the provincial *praesides* seem to have gained in dignity and become *clarissimi*. Unfortunately the evidence is inconclusive. Details which may be gathered from the *Corpus*, and the Theodosian Code suggest only that it may have been about at various dates in various provinces: as to Britain we know nothing that affects this question.

But we can get further. The dedication is a restoration, the column and statue, erected *prisca religione*, had fallen into neglect in the fourth century. It is no rash conjecture to suggest that the neglect was due to the spread of Christianity and the restoration to some revival of paganism. We know sadly little about early Christianity in Britain, but we do know that in Roman times there were Christians in our island. The Christian symbol occurs at Frampton, at Chedworth and elsewhere, and a building has lately been discovered at Silchester, which has, with great probability, if not with absolute certainty, been declared to be a Christian church. The Christian worshippers were probably not in the majority, except perhaps in the towns,

but they would be enough to justify the otherwise strange phrase, *prisca religio*. We may compare the dedications, common in the North of England, to the *dii veteres* or *deus vetus*, which most probably denote the "old," that is, pre-Christian god or gods.¹ We cannot, of course, determine what particular revival of paganism may (if my theory be right) have caused the restoration of the Cirencester column and statue. The great effort of Julian, called the Apostate, naturally occurs to the mind in this context, and Prof. Domaszewski has pointed out to me a parallel among the Pannonian inscriptions which he has lately edited. It is a stone erected to Julian *ob deleta vitia temporum preteritorum*, and its meaning is unmistakable.² It may be added that Julian governed Gaul and Britain for some years (A.D. 355-360) just before he became Emperor and openly renounced Christianity. There are, however, other possibilities. The persecution of Diocletian was felt, though not severely felt, in Britain, and we have the express testimony of a contemporary writer that Constantius Chlorus, then ruling in Britain and Gaul, allowed the Christian churches to be destroyed.³ Even in the half century which elapsed between the abdication of Diocletian and the accession of Julian, paganism was active in an intermittent fashion which would not be inconsistent with the restoration of a ruined shrine in a far-off province. It would, therefore, be wrong to dogmatize on this matter; but, if one may choose between hypotheses, I may perhaps say that, after much hesitation, I think the most plausible to be that which connects the inscription with the effort of Julian.

3. THE CARLISLE GRAVESTONE.

This inscription was found, face downwards, over a wooden coffin filled with fatty earth and a skull, close to the London Road on the South side of Carlisle, where previous discoveries, made principally in 1829 and 1847, had demonstrated the existence of a Roman cemetery.

¹ See No. 61 (*Arch. Jour.*, xlvii, 261).

² Found at Essegg, C. iii, 10648.

³ In the treatise *De mortibus perse-*

cutorum, which certainly belongs to this period, and almost certainly to Lactantius.

The stone has been intentionally broken across the seventh line and this fact and the position in which it was found shew that it was not *in situ* when discovered, though we may well assume that it belongs to the adjacent cemetery. The text, except in the seventh line, is perfect, but the interpretation of the last three lines, after LX, is open to much doubt. The reading is :—

D(is) m(anibus), Fla(viu)s Antigon(u)s Papias, civis grecus, vixit annos plus minus lx quem-ad-modum accom(m)odatam fatis animam revocavit Septimi(?)adoni . . ?

We may with confidence attribute the inscription to the fourth century or, at earliest, to the very end of the third century. The proofs are the following :—

1. The name Flavius, popularized by the Flavian dynasty of the Constantines, becomes very common in the fourth and fifth centuries. The late military cemetery at Concordia (N. Italy), for instance, contains a large proportion of Flavii, while of the 180 Flavii mentioned in the 5th volume of the *Corpus* (which includes Concordia), certainly 60 and probably nearly 90 lived after the year A.D. 300. The name was taken even by barbarian kings, and always suggests a late date for any inscription which does not belong to the era of the first Flavii, Vespasian, Titus and Domitian.¹

2. The abbreviations *Flas Antigons* for *Flavius Antigonus* are characteristic of a late period. In the first two or three centuries, the Romans abbreviated by the first letter or syllable of the abbreviated word: in the fourth century, they took the first and last letters or syllables, thus commencing the system which in the middle ages still produced *epus* for *episcopus* and *seti* for *sancti*. I do not know whether the actual forms *Flas* and *Antigons* recur elsewhere, but we have abundant parallels from the fourth and fifth centuries, *Julians* for *Julianus*, *Jans* for *Januarias*, *Debres* for *Decembres*, *cus* for *conius*, *Marianus* and *Constius* for *Maximianus* and *Constantius*, the two latter on a boundary stone at Charchell in Africa.²

3. The employment of *civis* to denote nationality is also a mark of late date. In the first and second centuries, the word is used of members of an actual community or of a tribe which could be regarded as a *civitas*: later, it denotes only birth, and *civis Gallus* means exactly the same as *natione Gallus*. The meaning crept even into literature and Sidonius Apollinaris (ep. vii. 6, 2.) speaks of a "Goth by birth" as

¹ C.I.L. v. p. 178, Cagnat *annee epigr.* 1890, n. 143 foll., 1891, n. 101 foll. See also de Rossi, pp. cxii and 390, du Cange, s.v. "Flavius," and especially Th. Mommsen's *Ostgothische Studien* in the *Neues Archiv für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, xiv, p. 536.

² See C. xii. 5351, xiv. 399; le Blant i. 472, 614: *Bulletin epigr.* iv. 234; *Bulletino di Arch. Christ.* i. 65 (DEPS= *deposi(us)*) ii. 108, (FRIS= *fratris*), etc. The thing is almost too common to need explanation.

civis Gothus.¹ It may be added that *Graecus* in this context does not necessarily mean a native of Greece. A Christian inscription, probably of the fourth or fifth century, found in Hungary, mentions a *civis Graecus ex regione Ladicena* (C. iii. 4220) and a Lyons gravestone records a man who was *natione Graecus Nicomedeia* (Allmer *Lyon* i. 322, n^o. 62). The first was a Phrygian, the second a Bithynian. This, of course, agrees with the literary usage of the word *Graecus*. It would be wrong, I think, to connect with this the proper name *Greca* on a Plumpton Wall inscription. (C. 326).

4. The formula *plus minus*, familiar enough to classical scholars as good Latin, is rarely used on tombstones until Christian times and is indeed almost a mark of Christianity.

5. The lettering and general look of the inscription suggest the fourth century as the most probable date.

We may therefore conclude that the inscription belongs to the fourth century. Later we cannot put it, for the evacuation of Britain came early in the next century, and the proofs I have quoted forbid us to put it much earlier. We may, I think, go further and conjecture that the inscription was Christian. The formula *plus minus* is usually, and I think rightly, reckoned as a mark of Christianity, though simple classical scholars will perhaps smile at the idea. The formula D.M., though in its origin Pagan, is not unknown on Christian tombstones and especially, as it would seem, on the earlier ones.² It must be remembered that, as Hirschfeld and Le Blant have pointed out, the early Christians used ordinary burial phrases, indicating their

¹ Mommsen *Hermes* xix. 35. The following examples may convince doubters:—

civis Britannicus, found at Cologne (Brambach 2033 *addenda*).

c. Gallus, Pola (Pais, 1096), Rome (Le Blant 656, 658, both fourth century).

c. Helvetius, Rothenburg (Brambach, 1639).

c. Raetus, Rome, Christian (*Eph.* iv. 943); Birrens and Netherby in Britain (C. vii. 1068, and 972).

c. Noricus, Halton and Castlecary in Britain (C. vii. 571. 1095); Transylvania (C. iii. 966).

c. Pannonius, Africa, Christian C. viii. 8910; Rome, Christian (*Eph.* iv. 953), Chesterholm in Britain C. vii. 723).

c. Mensiacus, (= *Moesiacus*), Bordeaux (Jullian i. p. 146, n. 44).

c. Graecus, Hungary, Christian (C. iii. 4220), Bordeaux (Jullian, i. p. 187, n. 69.)

c. Surus, N. Italy (Aquilaia), Christian (C. v. 1633); Hungary (*Eph.* ii. 895); Cilli (*Oest. Arch. epigr. Mitth.* iv. 127,

seen by myself).

c. Armeniacus Cappadox, Rome, Christian, A.D. 385 (de Rossi, i. 355).

c. Ater, Cilli (C. iii. 5230), and possibly Spain (*Inscr. Christ. Hisp.* 71)

c. Tuscus, Rome, A.D. 408 (de Rossi, i. 558).

c. Thrax, Cherchell (*Bull. Epigr.* iv. 64).

c. Francus, Aquincum (C. 3576), obviously late. See also C. iii. 1324, 3367.

² F. Becker *die heidnische Weihformel D.M. auf altchristlichen Grabsteinen* (Gera 1881). To his 100 examples (not all certain), add instances from S. Gaul (C. xii. 409, 2114, 2311, 4059); Africa (C. viii. 11897, 11900, 11905, 12197; *Eph.* vii. 492; Cagnat *arnee epigr.* 1891, n. 136); N. Italy (Pais *Suppl.* n. 349; *Arch. Epigr. Mitth.* iii. p. 50, C. iii. 1643, 8588, 8575); Salonae (C. iii. 9414); Larisa (C. iii. 7315); Rome (de Rossi, i. 24 and 1192; Brittany (Corneilhan, *Revue epigr.* i. p. 107), etc. See also De Rossi, *Bull. Arch. Crist.* i. 174, and F. X. Kraus, *Roma Sotterranea*, p. 64, who consider the use as a rare one.

religion only by preference for special words and phrases, like *plus minus*, *pius*, *sanctus*, such as would not attract the attention or arouse the fanaticism of the hostile pagan majority round them.¹

So far we have dealt only with the first half of the inscription. The second and less certain half requires a word or so, especially as it seems to me not improbably to be Christian. It is unfortunate that the stone does not tell us whether we should read *quemadmodum* or *quem admodum* or *quem ad modum*. It is also unfortunate that the last line is so broken that we can hardly tell how it ran. SEPTIMIADONI seems to me most probable, but it is also possible to read SEPTIMA, supposing the stroke after M (which is not quite vertical) to be an accident. The passage, thus involved, has puzzled many persons, and various distinguished scholars whom I have consulted, Prof. Domaszewski, Prof. Ellis, Prof. Wölfflin and others, have differed considerably in their interpretations. Of the views suggested, the most attractive is that which takes *quemadmodum* as three words, "at which date," puts a fullstop after *revocavit* and renders it by the rare sense "gave up." Then *revocavit animam* means "he gave up his soul," either as an equivalent to the common Christian formula *reddidit animam* or with the heathen idea (mentioned in Seneca and elsewhere) of life being a loan from the gods. Of the two alternatives, I confess I prefer the former, but, whichever is accepted, it remains a difficulty that *revocavit* in this sense is very rare.² If, however, it be admitted, we shall render "at which time, he gave up his soul resigned to death (or its destiny)". We shall then suppose that *Septimia* (or *Septima*) *Doni* . . . commences a sentence about the person who put up the tombstone. *Dōni* may be part of *donicella*, that is *domnicella*, as Prof. Wölfflin suggests; for the form compare *Dominicellus* on an African inscription of Christian date (*Bulletin epigr.* vi. 39).

¹ *Westdeutsche Zeitschrift*, viii. 138. *Plus Minus* occurs also on a tombstone found at Brougham (*Eph.* iii, n. 91; Bruce, *Lapidarium*, 814).

² Mr. G. Rushforth has pointed out to me that in the African *Gesta Purgationis Felicis* (of the fourth century, Routh, *Itell, Sacrae*, iv. 290), *revocare* is

used as the equivalent of *tradere*, *restituere* and *revocare*. The later African poet Corippus may possibly have used the word similarly in *Joh.* ii. 344, where the manuscript reading *captivos revocet* "let him restore the captives" would make good sense. But it is a far cry from African Latin to Carlisle.

There are however other possibilities. We may take *revocavit* in its ordinary sense and suppose that the nominative to it was in the lost part of the inscription. *Septima* (if that be right) may belong to a date, such as was often expressed on christian inscriptions. *QUEM ADMODUM* may be taken as two words, *quem* being in apposition to *animam* and meaning "whom, a wholly resigned soul. . . ." Prof. Ellis suggests to me that we should render "he lived sixty years more or less, for so it was that, when his spirit was prepared to meet its doom, he recalled it to life (and did not die)". That is, he was often on the point of death but recovered as often and lived to be sixty years old. On the whole, I fear that certainty is unattainable, but I cannot help thinking that the curious wording, whatever exactly it means, savours rather of Christian than of heathen epigraphy.

THE LANCHESTER ALTAR.

The text and translation of this interesting inscription are fortunately both quite certain. The text, completed and expanded,¹ is as follows:—

Deae Garmangabi et n(umini) [G]o[r]di[ani] n(ostri) Aug(usti), pr[o]sal(ute) vex(illationis) or vex(illariorum) Sueborum Lon. Gor(dianorum) or Gor(dianae), votum solverunt n(erito).¹

In other words, the altar was erected to the goddess named and to the Divinity of Gordian, on behalf of the troop of Suebi stationed at *Lon.* (Lanchester) and bearing the epithet "Gordian." The points of interest are various.

1. The name of the goddess, Garmangabis or whatever the nominative was,² seems to be otherwise unknown both to Keltic and to Teutonic theology, but some sort of Teutonic parallels occur. The Mother goddesses *Gabiae*, mentioned on several German inscriptions, the Rhenish dedication *Deae Idban. gabie* of which name the second half has been rendered the "giver," and the Scandinavian Gefion shew names which may be conceivably connected with the second half of this new name.³

¹ The nominative to *solverunt* can easily be supplied out of *vex. Sueborum*.

² It is quite possible that the name is more or less abbreviated *e.g.* that in full it would have ended in *iae*.

³ For *Idban. gabie* see Ihm *Bonner Jahrb.* lxxxi. 28, *Zeitschrift für deutsches Alterthum*, xxxv. 317. I have been allowed to consult Prof. Napier and Dr. Whitley Stokes as to the name.

2. The emperor mentioned on the altar is Gordian III. (A.D. 238-244), after whom the troop is called, according to third century fashion, "Gordian." In the earlier part of the inscription his name has been so effectively erased that only four letters of it are now faintly legible, and this is noteworthy. Gordian was not one of the Emperors whose names were regularly erased after their deaths; indeed only one instance, and that a poor one, was hitherto known in which his name had suffered this dishonour. That instance occurs on a milestone found near Klein Schwechat on the Roman road from Vienna (Vindobona) to Petronell (Carnuntum), and there the erasure is half-hearted and hardly deserves the name.¹

3. The erection of the altar was made by and on behalf of the *vexillatio Sueborum Lon. Gor(dianorum)*² or as we may almost indifferently expand, *vex(illarii) Suebi Lon. Gor(diani)*. Two interpretations of the technical term are here possible. In the literature and inscriptions of the first and second centuries of our era the words *vexillatio* and *vexillarii* denote soldiers under a separate *vexillum* or flag, either drafts temporarily detached from the legion or, less commonly, from the auxiliary *ala* or cohort to which they belonged, or else veterans who remained "with the colours" under special conditions. It is conceivable that the word is so used here. We have, for example, at Carrawburgh, on the wall, an inscription erected by *Texandri et Sunici vex, coh(oris) ii Nerviorum*,³ that is to say, by a detachment from the cohort mentioned, consisting of Texandri and Sunici.

But it is also possible that we have here another sense of the word *vexillatio*. In the fourth century, that word denotes a "troop of horse" in the movable army and the transition to that meaning has been conjecturally detected in the second century, coinciding with a change in the army. As organized by Augustus, the army comprised the legions

¹ C. iii. 4644, now at Vienna (Hof-museum, Lapidarium 134) where I have seen it. Gordian's name has been slashed but hardly erased. Two other instances, sometimes quoted, are due to mistakes, one to a slip in indexing (C. ii. 3406), the other to a slip in reading, as I have satisfied myself by recent examination (C. vii. 510, above No. 144).

² Or *Gor(diana)*; both forms of nomenclature occur in full. For *Gor(dianorum)* compare C. vii. 1030 and viii. 2716, for *Gor(diana)*, vii. 218, 510; Eph. v. 1047. The difference is purely grammatical.

³ Eph. iii. 103 (*ridi*); compare C. 1068 *Raeti militantes in coh. ii. Tungrorum*; C. 303, 731 are of doubtful reading.

and the auxiliaries on foot (*cohortes*) or mounted (*alae*). The auxiliaries in some cases bore local names, but except at their formation they were not recruited with any reference to these names and they took no great account of the native customs or tactics of the tribes who provided recruits. Early in the second century a change came and a new kind of auxiliary began to appear, organized with some respect to native tactics. The auxiliaries, we may say in short, were renationalized. The name commonly given to these new regiments was *numerus*, but we also meet with *cuneus* and in certain cases Mommsen supposes *vexillatio* to have the same sense. The instances of the latter word are, however, few, and most of them may be explained in accordance with the older usage. Thus the African *vexillatio*, shortly to be mentioned, appears at the precise moment when the legio iii Augusta was not available, and it may be only a temporary substitute drawn from the *auxilia*.

When expressed in full, the titles of these troops are all based on the same scheme, which is that which appears also in the fourth century. We have (1) the nationality of the troop, (2) the name of the place at which they served and (3) an epithet taken from the name of the reigning emperor. To quote instances, for *vexillatio*, in whichever sense used, we have:—

Vexillatio militum Maurorum Caesariensium Gordianorum, A.D. 255 (Lambaesis in Africa C. viii 2716).

vex. eq. Maur. in territorio Auziensi praetendentium, A.D. 260¹ (Auzia, c. viii 9045-7).

And similarly for the other and certain names, for which we have British epigraphic parallels;—

cuneus Frisionum Aballavensium Philip(pianorum) A.D. 244-9 (Papcastle Eph. iii p. 130=C. vii. 415).²

¹ Compare Cagnat, *L'armée d'Afrique*, pp. 253, 306.

² I have to thank Mr. J. M. Brydone, for squeezes of this inscription; the reading given in the *Ephemeris* seems certain.—Papcastle must be Aballava; the epigraphic evidence is in agreement with the geographical lists which connect it with Uxellodunum (Maryport). The familiar difficulty about the names in the Notitia (*Occ.* xl.), can be best solved by supposing that after Amboglanna or

Petriae the names of the forts on the Wall have fallen out; no other theory that I know will stand criticism. Even the attractive suggestion of Mr. Ferguson (*Cumberland*, p. 53), that the western half of the Notitia list has got inverted, only accounts for Aballava and Uxellodunum, not for Bremetennacum and what follows. Seeck's idea that Aballava may be identical with Galava in the *Itin. Anton.* (Wess. p. 481), is, I think, impossible.

numerus exploratorum Bremen(ensium) Gor(dianorum) A.D. 238-244 (High Rochester, C 1030, 1037).

numerus eqq. Sar[mat(arum)] Bremetenn(acensium) Gordianus A.D. 238-244 (Ribchester C. 218).¹

Germani, cives Tuihanti, cunei VER. SER *Alexandriani* (Housesteads *Eph.* vii. 1041, *Arch. Ael.* x. 148, 166.)²

I may here add one more doubtful instance, an inscription from the neighbourhood of Lowther in Cumberland, which was copied and sent to Camden by one of his correspondents and has since disappeared. As we have it in Camden's handwriting it reads—

D E A B V S M A
R | 3 V S T R A M A I
V E X C E R M A . P
V . R D P R O S A
L v T E R . F V . S . L . M

It seems possible that the hardly intelligible V.R.D. may be a relic of the Roman name for Plumpton Wall and that the inscription was erected by *vex(illarii) Germa[ni] Voredenses*.³

Similarly with our Lanchester troop, whether it be a "detachment" from some other troop or an independent organization, we have first the tribe name *Suebi*. The name is an interesting one which one expects to meet only at the beginning and end of Roman imperial history. At the beginning we have Cæsar's wars against Ariovistus, the transference of Suebi and Sygambri across the Rhine into Roman territory by Augustus⁴ and the *bellum Suebicum* of Domitian. At the end⁵ we have the invaders of the

¹ Ribchester must be Bremetennacum and not Coccium as Dr. Hübner and some of the older antiquaries suggested. This suits the Itinerary fairly well (Watkin, *Lancashire*, pp. 25, foll), and agrees with the inscriptions. The latter mention a *numerus* or *ala Sarmatarum* (c. 218, 229, 230), as stationed at Ribchester, the former puts a *cuneus Sarmatarum* there (*Occ.* xl. 54, Seeck). This squadron was apparently formed when Aurelius transferred some 5000 Iazyges Sarmatae to Britain, in A.D. 175; its title of *ala* is a misuse for which there are parallels (C. viii. 9906, &c).

² The meaning of VER. SER. is unknown, but it is probable, as Mommsen suggested (*Hermes* xix. 233.) that *Ver.*

belongs to a place-name, possibly *Ver-covicium*, another form for *Bor-covicium* (compare the Ravenna *Velurtion*) and that SER. is for *Severiani*.

³ C. 303. Professor Hübner's account of the authorities for this inscription is inaccurate.

⁴ Exactly where they were settled is uncertain. The notion, mentioned for instance by Dräger on *Taz. Agr.* 28, that they migrated to Flanders and left traces of themselves there, seems to rest only on false etymology.

⁵ First mentioned, probably in the Appendix (early third century) to the Verona list of A.D. 297. Compare the citations in Mommsen *Hermes*, xxiv. 25.

Empire who became and gave their name to the inhabitants of Swabia. In between we have few references Tacitus and Ptolemy and other writers who follow them use the name vaguely, so vaguely indeed that some writers have even identified *Suebi* and "Slav." At some date which is after about A.D. 120 and probably before the middle of the third century we find a Suebe serving in the *Equites singulares*.¹ In the neighbourhood of Cologne we have three dedications to *Matres Suebae*, one dated to the year A.D. 223.² In France we meet a tombstone to a certain *Tertinia Florentinia, cives Sueba Nicreti*, which Prof. Zangemeister connects with various milestones and other inscriptions containing the letters SN found near Heidelberg. He infers that near this town there was a community of Suebes settled in Roman territory, called the Suebi Nicretes. The inscriptions prove that this community was existence under Trajan, from whom it got the name *Ulpia*, and lasted on into the third century. It is possible that it dates from much earlier days, conceivably even from Cæsar's arrangements on the eastern (then not Roman) bank of the Rhine. From this community, we must suppose, came the Suebe of Lanchester, the *eques singularis* and the lady who was buried in Gaul.³ It may be worth adding that the presence of our Suebe is in accordance with a definite rule. As Prof. Domaszewski has pointed out, the German and British armies of the second and third centuries exchanged auxiliaries. As we find Sunici, Suebi, Tuihanti and others in Britain, so we find various Britons in *numeri* of the German armies. Britons also appear to have served in at least one of the German legions, the Thirtieth *Ulpia*.

Lon, as has been already indicated, gives us the first syllable of the Roman name for Lanchester. What that was in full, we cannot definitely say, but it perhaps was Longovicium, a fort mentioned in the *Notitia* (*Occ.* xl. 30). We must, however, admit that Lancaster has still a claim. The first syllable of this name appears quite as ancient as that of Lanchester, and it may or may not have been *Longovicium*, while Lanchester may or may not have been

¹ Eph. iv. 935, Mommsen *Hermes*, xvi. 459 n. ascribes him to the Mattiaci.

² Ihm Nos. 273, 289; *Westdeutsches*

Correspondenzblatt, ix. (1890), 147.

³ Zangemeister. *Neue Heidelberger Jahrbücher*, iii. pp. 1-16.

some other *Lon*.¹ One is, therefore compelled to remain in the unsatisfactory attitude of Buridan' ass.²

It remains only to point out that this inscription gives us one more proof of the importance, at the time it was erected, of various northern forts which were not on the Wall. That the Wall was still defended is certain, but in the first half of the third century and especially between the years A.D. 220-250, we meet many inscriptions belonging to forts in the east and west which were not *per lineam valli*. Some of these were connected with roads. The Lanchester inscription can be combined with other inscriptions from Binchester, Ebchester, Risingham, High Rochester, all certainly, or nearly certainly, of this date and all on the line of Watling Street. It is obvious that this state of things fits in well with the arrangements described in the *Notitia*, the British military sections of which represent the condition of the garrisons before Diocletian's or at least before Constantine's reforms. It also corresponds curiously with some details in the Itinerary of Antonine.

¹ If these Suebes were only a detachment from a regiment stationed elsewhere, the place-name might belong to the station of the regiment, not of the detachment. But in that case the coincidence between *Lon*. and Lanchester is miraculous.

- Dr. Hübner in the *Corpus* (vii. p. 70),

made Lancaster to be *Longovicium*. I cannot help thinking that in this, as in some other case, he has identified his British place names a little too confidently, at least in his Indices and references.