

*Observations on some Roman Altars and Inscriptions, erected by a Cohort of the Tungri, and found at Castle-Steeds, or Cambeck Fort, in Cumberland, by Mr. THOMAS HODGSON.*

IT is well known to all, who are any way conversant with the Roman antiquities of this part of the island, that Mr. Horsley, from two imperfect inscriptions given by Camden in his *Britannia*, was induced to believe, that the station of Castle-Steeds, or Cambeck Fort, situated on the Wall, not far from Brampton, and to which he assigned the name of *Petrianæ*, was for a short time garrisoned by the *Cohors Prima Tungro-rum*, before that cohort removed to its long-established quarters at House-Steeds. Considerable doubt has been thrown upon the accuracy of this opinion by two curious and interesting altars, which, since the publication of the *Britannia Romana*, have been found at Castle-Steeds. The first of these altars was recovered in the year 1741; it had been found about 40 years before the publication of Mr. Horsley's work, but was almost immediately sunk in a weir, which was at that time making in the river Irthing. On that weir undergoing some repair in the above year, orders were given by Mrs. Appleby, the then proprietress of the station, that this altar should be sought for, and, if possible, recovered. This search was made, and was happily attended with success. A drawing of this altar was in the following year communicated to the public, through the medium of the *Gentleman's Magazine*, by Mr. Smith. Figures of it have since been published in several works,\* but the most correct one will be found in the eleventh volume of the *Archæologia*, pl.

\* Brand's *Hist. of Newcastle*, vol. i. p. 614. Hutchinson's *History of Cumberland*, vol. i. Castle-Steeds plate, no. i. fig. 14. Gough's Camden's *Britannia*, vol. iii. pl. xiii. fig. 13. ed. 1789.

vi. fig. 21, accompanied with a short explanation by the late Rev. J. D. Carlisle, in whose possession it then was.\* The other altar, which I have mentioned, has been found only within the last few years (in 1818, I believe), and has never, that I know of, been published.† It was communicated in that year to James Losh, Esq. one of the Vice-Presidents of this Society, by Miss Carlyle. It was found near Castle-Steeds, and is now in the possession of William P. Johnson, Esq. of Walton House. The inscription upon it is most fortunately perfect, and in consequence most satisfactorily illustrates some parts of the inscription upon the other altar, which were rather obscure. As its substance, however, is fully contained in the first inscription, and as the examination of this will completely explain all the difficulties of the second inscription, I shall confine my observations principally to the first one.

The first altar was no sooner published, than it gave rise to much learned discussion amongst the antiquaries of that day; the principal of their remarks I shall notice as I proceed.

Though the top of this altar is broken, there can be no doubt, from the *fulmen* on its side, that, like the second one, it was dedicated *Jovi optimo maximo*; and of the second line sufficient remains to shew, that it should be read *Et Numinibus Augusti Nostri*. Thus far all writers spoke with confidence; but the next line making mention of an auxiliary cohort not noticed in the *Notitia*, nor in any of the inscriptions contained in the *Britannia Romana*, was not received without some hesitation. The double numeral was, however, too distinctly cut and too well preserved to admit of a doubt; and scholars soon found, that Tacitus, in his life of Agricola, had expressly mentioned the presence of two cohorts of the Tungri in Britain. Speaking of the battle with Galgacus, “Agricola,” says he, “*tres Batavorum cohortes ac Tungrorum duas cohortatus est ut rem ad mucrones ac manus adducerent*,” &c. Inscriptions mentioning the second cohort of the *Tungri*, have also since been found at Middleby in Scotland, as may be seen in the Appendix to Pennant’s *Tour in Scotland*, 1772.‡ And if any doubt had remained respecting this

\* It is now in the possession of Miss Carlyle, of Carlisle, subsequently mentioned in the text.

† See plate i. fig 1.

‡ Part ii. p. 408.

cohort, it would be completely removed by the last found altar, on which the name and number are perfectly distinct. This well-established fact makes the alleged circumstance of this fort having been at one time garrisoned by the *Cohors prima Tungrorum* extremely problematical. Mr. Horsley, it is well known, was induced to adopt this opinion, from the name of this cohort being apparently expressed in two inscriptions published by Camden, the originals of which are now lost; but an examination of the figures, as given by Mr. Hutchinson,\* will shew that each of them has received such an injury in its centre, as renders it extremely probable, that part of the numeral has been obliterated in the one, and part of the H of coh. for *Cohors* in the other, and that hence these two stones were in fact erected by the *Cohors secunda*, and not the *Cohors prima*,—a probability, which in the sequel I shall, I trust, be able more fully to establish.

The letters coh. following the name of the cohort, are, with much probability, taken by all writers to signify *Gordiana*,—an epithet assumed by, or conferred on, this cohort, in token of its attachment to the Emperor Gordian, in the same manner as was done in the case of the *Cohors I. Ælia Dacorum*, which garrisoned the neighbouring station of Burdowald. The next letters ec. with the monogram ∞, which the sculptor has apparently omitted on cutting the line, and been afterwards obliged to insert in the space above, at first gave rise to some difference of opinion, but are now generally allowed to signify *milliaria equitata*. Mr. Smith was disposed to read them, *mille equitum*,† and the learned Professor Ward, *millenaria equitum*,‡ but not only is there no authority for these readings, but the *cohors milliaria equitata* is expressly mentioned and described by those writers, who treat of the military affairs of the Romans. And though I cannot appeal to any inscription, in which, to my knowledge, these words are jointly expressed in words at length, yet so many inscriptions occur in Gruter mentioning both the *cohors milliaria*, and the *cohors equitata*,|| as to leave no doubt that these two words are the correct

\* Hist. of Cumb. vol. i. Cast. St. pl. no. i. fig. 11. and p. 108.

† Gent. Mag. vol. xii. p. 30.

‡ Gent. Mag. vol. xii. p. 135.

|| In CIL. 3. we meet with coh. i. MILLIARIAE DALMATARVM; and in some which will be noted here-

terms of the description of cohorts under consideration. In the *Notitia* too, both the *cohors milliaria* and the *cohors equitata* are expressly mentioned. According both to Hyginus and Vegetius, the first cohort of a legion, in the times of the lower empire, was called *milliaria*, from its being stronger than any cohort of the legion, and from its generally consisting of about 1000 men; and it was further called *equitata* when it contained a certain number of horse. Hyginus (*De Castrametatione*) informs us, that the *Cohors equitata milliaria* consisted of 760 foot soldiers formed into 10 centuries, and 240 horsemen formed into 10 *turmae*.\* It contained within itself, therefore, a due proportion of both kinds of force, and seems to have been particularly well adapted for the garrisoning of a station like Castle-Steeds, situated in an open country, and liable to the frequent inroads of an enemy. The description here given of the *cohors milliaria*, may not at first sight, perhaps, appear applicable to the cohort now under consideration, from the circumstance of its being the *second*, and not the *first*, cohort of the *Tungri*; but it should be recollected, that it is an *auxiliary*, and not a *legionary*, cohort; and, as is well observed by Mr. Gale, “though the second of the *Tungri*, it might yet be the first, or milliary, cohort of the auxiliary legion to which it belonged.” And there is no reason to suppose that all the cohorts of the same nation were contained in the same legion, any more than that all the battalions of the same regiment are now-a-days always comprised in the same brigade; on the contrary there is abundant evidence, that they were often separated, and even employed in different countries and services.

Turning now to the principal inscription recorded by Camden to have been found at this place, it is highly pleasing to observe how easily and satisfactorily the information, which we have now acquired, elucidates that inscription, and removes the difficulty which Mr. Horsley† found in its explanation. By the simple prefixing of an *M* before the letters *ILEC*, which he was inclined to think might be the name of a place, these to after *equitatae* occurs at length. I can find no inscription in Gruter in which *equitata* is accompanied with *milliaria* either contracted or at length, nor yet expressed by its monogram as in this instance.

\* Habet cohors equitata milliaria pedites septingentos sexaginta, centurias decem, equites ducentos quadringenta, turmas decem.

† See his *Britannia Romana*, p. 264.

him untoward letters naturally resolve themselves into MIL. EC. or EQ. evidently the contractions of the words *milliaria equitata*. If we are satisfied of this, we can have little difficulty in believing that the numeral in the preceding line has been II. and not I.; for it was the *secunda*, and not the *prima*, *Cohors Tungrorum*, which was *milliaria equitata*. The presence of the latter at House-Steeds is well authenticated by a long series of inscriptions, and in not one of these is it ever described as of that kind. This inscription will then, like the two others, read—

*Jovi optimo maximo Cohors secunda Tungrorum milliaria equitata.*

And if we wanted a further proof, that this altar had been erected by the second cohort of the *Tungri*, we should find it in the letters C. L., which follow the letters ILEC, and which occur in both the others in precisely the same situation. For though these letters are nearly defaced on the principal altar, and so ill defined that Mr. Carlisle was induced to read them FID. for *fida*, yet those who saw the altar at the time of its recovery, all concurred in reading them C. L.; and they are so plain and distinct upon the second altar, that it is impossible to hesitate in supposing, that those individuals read them correctly. The signification of these letters I cannot but consider as somewhat obscure and uncertain. They have generally been supposed to be numerals, but a well-grounded doubt may, I think, be entertained upon the subject. Mr. Smith is almost the only one, who has not taken them for numerals, and he is disposed to read them *Cataphractoriorum Legioni*; although he acknowledges that he is not aware that “the *Cataphractorii* were ever formed into regular cohorts,” and appears, besides, to be not very well satisfied with this explanation. Both Professor Ward\* and Mr. R. Galet looked upon them as numerals. They were induced to do so by the following passage of Vegetius. Speaking of the first cohort of a legion, he says, “*Habet pedites mille centum quinque, equites loricos centum triginta duos, et appellatur cohors milliaria.*”† The number of horse here mentioned not agreeing with the numerals, which it was wished to find

\* Gent. Mag. vol. xii. 1742. p. 135.

† Hutchinson's Cumberland, vol. i. p. 110—112.

‡ Lib. ii. c. 6.

expressed upon this altar, Professor Ward endeavours to account for this difference by observing that “under the lower Emperors, and especially in the provinces, it seems by inscriptions, as if those numbers were not always regularly observed. And therefore, as this second cohort, which was honoured with the name of the Emperor, exceeded the common number both in the foot and the horse,—might possibly occasion its being particularly mentioned.” Mr. Gale expresses himself to the same effect; but unfortunately for this opinion, it is impossible to suppose, that the mere possession of the extra number of 18 troopers would either be considered so extraordinary a circumstance, or so great a distinction as to be particularly recorded on all their inscriptions. Why, moreover, should the number of the horsemen be mentioned, and those of the foot-soldiers of the cohort be passed unnoticed? A very short space of time, too, it may be supposed, would suffice to destroy the distinction arising from these 18 additional horsemen, for the cohort could scarcely for any long continuance be kept up to its full complement; and yet these letters are found upon their inscriptions during the command of three different Prefects. Besides Vegetius, in the passage referred to, is describing the *Cohors milliaria*, or 1st cohort of a legion, and not the *Cohors milliaria equitata*, to which, as we have seen, Hyginus ascribes a very different proportion of horse and foot; and as Vegetius wrote only a very short time before the date of the *Notitia*, and consequently nearly 200 years after the time to which these inscriptions refer—a lapse of time in which we may reasonably suppose some alteration took place in the constitution of the Roman armies,—there is great probability, that his description has but little application to the cohort now under discussion. These considerations are, I think, sufficient to convince us, that these letters cannot be numerals; and what is a further proof to my mind that they are not, I found, on examining further, that almost every *Cohors equitata* had letters, corresponding with these, attached to its name. Thus in an inscription, found at Riechester, near Elsdon, we have COH. I. FID. VARDVL. ∞ EQ. C. R.: in Gruter, CCCCLIX. 9, we meet with COH. I. AFR. C. R. EQ.; in CCCLXXXVIII. 3, COH. III. ASTVR. EQ. C. R.; in XIII. 9. COH. III. A. Q. EQ. C. P. The c. r. in the Riechester inscription is read by

Dr. Taylor, *Civium Romanorum*, and this reading is generally acquiesced in. Indeed it almost seems warranted by some inscriptions in Gruter ; in one of which for instance (MCVIII. 5), we find COH. PRIMAE EQUITATAE CIV. ROMAN ; in another (CCCCXCVIII, 13), COH. II. C. R. which by a third inscription (CCCCXXXIX, 2), seems probable should be read *Civium Romanorum*, since in that we find in words at full length PRAEFECTO COHORTIS SECUNDAE CIVIVM ROMANOR. It from hence, I think, seems most probable that the c. in this case should be read *Civium*, and by analogy that the l. should be read *Latinorum*. The citizens of Latium, it is well known, enjoyed nearly equal privileges with those of Rome. They served as allies in her army, and constituted the principal part of its strength. We learn from Livy that they sometimes furnished two-thirds of the cavalry and also of the infantry ;\* but, as Sallust informs us, were not embodied in the legions.† From this description of them, there is, I think, no incongruity in supposing that a body of them, or of soldiers on whom the privileges of *Latium* had been conferred, might be attached to a cohort of another country.

The words which immediately follow c. l., are evidently *cui praeest*, followed by the name of the Prefect. The name upon the larger altar has become so obliterated as to render it uncertain. It was supposed by Mr. Smith, judging from the traces of the letters, that it had been *Sicilius Claudianus*. As this name is as probable as any other, and as Mr. Smith had the earliest and best opportunities for examination, it may as well be adopted. The PRAEF. after his name there can be no doubt is the contraction of *Praefectus*.

The words succeeding PRAEF. have been read generally *instante Aelio Martino Principe*,—a reading, which I have no doubt is perfectly correct, though I cannot agree with the explanation which has been given of these words. *Instante*, say both Mr. Ward and Mr. Gale, is the same as *curante* ; but this I take to be an opinion not exactly warranted by inscriptions. From these it appears to me that by *cura* or *curans*, is expressed one species of duty, and by *instans*, another and inferior duty. The former terms seem to have been applied to those, who gave orders,

\* Liv. iii. 22, 17, et alibi passim.

† Sallust. Jug. 69.

or provided the necessary funds, for the erection of any work; and the latter to those, on whom devolved the duty of carrying the others' directions into execution, and of superintending the progress of the work.\* Thus in an inscription found at Netherby, recording the erection of an equestrian *Basilica*, it is said to have been, *per Curam Marii Valeriani Legati Augustalis Propraetoris, instante M. Aurelio Salvio Tribuno Cohortis*;† and again, in the inscription found at Walwich Chesters,‡ records the erection of some building, *per Marium Valerianum, &c. instante Septimio Nilo, Praefecto*.—But this, perhaps, is not of much moment. Neither can I agree, that the name of the person, who performed the duty *instans*, in the case of the altar before us, was *Aelius Martinus Princeps*. The occurrence of “*Princeps*” as a proper name in Gruter, has been deemed by all, who have ever noticed this inscription, as a certain proof that it is also a proper name in this instance. Of the accuracy of this reading, however, I always entertained the strongest doubts. 1st. Because there is nothing to inform us who this *Martinus Princeps* was; and I thought it strange that in an inscription which declares that *Claudianus*, the commander of the cohort, was its Prefect, the rank of the person who discharged the duty *instans* should not be stated as in other inscriptions. 2d. Because I considered the contraction of *Princeps* irreconcilable with this reading, for I believe it will be found upon examination, that the contraction of a nomen, much less of a cognomen, excepting the common termination *us*, is of extremely rare occurrence, especially on large inscriptions like the present, and that it ought not to be suspected here where *Claudianus* and *Martino* are both inserted at length. 3d. As the contraction *PRAEF.* is the only one in this combination of words to which that of *PRINC.* is analogous, I thought it possible that these two words might also be analagous in their meaning. 4thly. On examining the inscription published by Camden, I found, though the latter part of it is much defaced, sufficient to convince me, that its concluding word was also *Principe*, used as the cognomen, or designation of a person, whose

\* Pliny, *Panegy.* c. 18. speaking of the officers who directed the soldiers to work, uses the expression, “*instant operibus*.”

† Hutchinson's *History of Cumbelriand*, vol. ii. Netherby pl. fig. 1. ‡ *Arch. Aeliana*, vol. i. p. 128.



preceding name is illegible, but evidently not *Ael. Martinus*, and who had also performed the duty *instante*; and I thought it extremely improbable that there should have been two persons of the same cognomen, who should at different times, (for it is evident that the inscription in Camden refers to a period, when the Cohort was commanded by a different Prefect), have performed the same duty of *instante*. On the perusal of the inscription, on the last found altar, however, I felt this doubt strengthened into certainty, for I considered it to be impossible that the duty in question, could, at three different times, have devolved upon three different persons, each bearing the cognomen of *Princeps*; and I thought it much more probable, that this duty should have devolved upon these three persons, because they had each, at different times, filled the same office, the proper designation of which was *Princeps*. In this conjecture, I have been fully confirmed by an inscription which I have since met with in Gruter,—p. CCCXLVII, no. 1. It commences thus:

P. AELIO. P. F. PAPIR  
MARCELLO. CENT  
FRVM. SVB. PRINCIPE  
PEREGRINORVM. ADSTATO (hastato)  
ET PRINCIPI. ET PRIMIPILLO  
LEG. VII. GEM. PIAE FEL. &C.

This inscription will be best explained by the quotation of a passage from Manutius.\* “In a legion,” says he, “there were three kinds of foot soldiers, *hastati*, *principes*, and *triarii*; and in each there were ten centurions, who were called the 1st *hastatus*, 2d *hastatus*, 3d, &c. and so on up to the 10th; 1st *princeps*, 2d, and so on; but the *triarii*, the bravest of all, were named in a different manner, for they did not call them 1st *triarius*, but *primipilus*, or *primipili centurio*.” A portion of each of these descriptions of soldiers was, as is well known, contained

\* Erat primipilus summus ordo inter pedites legionarios: nam in legione tria peditum genera erant hastati, principes, triarii; et in singulis deni centuriones, his nominibus, primus hastatus, secundus hastatus, tertius usque ad decimum; primus princeps, secundus, et similiter; in triariis, omnium fortissimis, alia ratio; non enim dicebant, primus triarius, sed primipilus, aut primipili centurio; priscis autem temporibus primus centurio.—*Manut.*

within each Cohort, and the auxiliary Cohorts were formed upon the same model as the legionary.

Having thus, in general terms, proved the existence of the term *princeps*, as the title of an officer in the Roman army, I know not that more is required of me, though it may perhaps be expected by some, that I should point out its particular application in the present instance, and why the duty *instante* should devolve upon the *princeps*, in preference to any other officer. But this I am unable to do, and it must be evident that this would require an intimate knowledge of the internal construction and arrangement of the *cohors milliaria equitata*, and perhaps of this very cohort in particular, and I am not aware of any source from which such a knowledge can be derived. Several conjectures have certainly suggested themselves to my mind, but I conceive it of no use to trouble the Society with them.

The remaining part of the inscription presents little difficulty with respect to the reading of it,—it being evident that it records the date of the erection of this altar. The small I in the belly of the L is generally taken to be the initial letter of the name of the month, which of course must be one of those beginning with J. These lines may therefore be read, *decimo kalendarum J——, Imperatore Domino nostro Gordiano Augusto III. Pompeiano Consulibus*. From the *Fasti Consulares* it appears, that it was in the year 241 of our era that Gordian was Consul with Pompeianus; but here an unexpected difficulty occurs, for according to the *Fasti*, it was in his second consulate that he had Pompeianus for his colleague, and not in his third, as here recorded. Various inscriptions also occur in Gruter, in which Pompeianus is mentioned as his colleague in his second consulate; and also in an inscription found a few years ago in Cockermouth Castle. This difficulty has been a source of much doubt and futile conjecture to all who have endeavoured to explain this inscription. Professor Ward concluded, that as there was “no mention made of this third consulate any where, but here, and in another inscription given us by Gruter (MLXXXV. 10),” that it “must be a mistake.”\* Mr. Ward’s conclusion has been acquiesced in by many;

\* *Gent. Mag.* vol. xiii. p. 30.

Mr. Gale, however, was of a different opinion, and advanced the following hypothesis :—" It is no mistake," says he " of the emperor's being the third time consul instead of the second : for in the inscriptions of Gruter he is mentioned as consul the second time with Pompeianus, and as it was in the 4th year of his reign that he was consul with him, these numerals cannot refer to a third consulate which he never took, but must refer to his being the third emperor of that name. If it is objected, that it was not usual for the Roman emperors to style themselves I. II. III., I answer, there were never three of the same name, thus nearly succeeding one another, as the three Gordians, if at any time. However, the inscription in Gruter MLXXXV. must include a mistake when it represents this Gordian as TRIB. POT. COS. III. P. P. the III. immediately following COS. and so cannot be applied to any other word, but it is a mistake of the stone cutter."\* With neither of these opinions can I wholly agree. I have a great repugnance to every conjecture founded on a supposed mistake of the workman, especially when it would be so soon perceived, and could be so easily corrected as here ; and the occurrence of the same supposed mistake, in another instance and in a different country, tends strongly to the belief that there was something more than accident in the inscribing of this numeral. And if he was here styled III. on account of his being the third emperor of that name, it seems to me not a little singular that he should not be always so styled, which he certainly is not, indeed I do not at the present moment recollect any instance of such a designation. Neither of these opinions, therefore, are satisfactory to me, but I know not that I can advance any conjecture which will be found much more effective in removing the difficulty.— In considering this point, an idea once struck me, that what had hitherto been taken for the last I. of the numeral, might in reality be the remains of a ligature for ET, which word otherwise is wanting in this line, and which in the Cockermouth inscription is curiously incorporated with the P. of Pompeiano.† With the hope that it might prove so, I ventured to take the liberty of requesting Miss Carlyle, in whose pos-

\* Hutchinson's *History of Cumberland*. v. i. p. 110.

† Lysons's *Cumberland*, p. clxxxi.

session the altar is, to examine this mark most particularly, to ascertain if it had hitherto been misunderstood. With the greatest politeness and attention, for which I feel extremely obliged to her, and beg thus publicly to express my thanks,\* Miss Carlyle instantly complied with my request, but unfortunately the result of her examination was completely destructive of my conjecture. The *1.* proved too distinctly cut to be mistaken. Driven from this supposition, I was led to entertain the hope, that a solution of the difficulty might be found in the practice which, it is well known, prevailed under the emperors, owing to the difficulty of finding a sufficient number of persons of consular dignity to fill all the posts requiring persons of that rank, in consequence of the great number of provinces, of creating consuls only for a few months, in order that others might be substituted for them, who were called, petty, substituted, or lesser consuls, and of reckoning the first ordinary consulate as a second consulate when it was preceded by such petty consulate.† But unfortunately for such an opinion, I cannot find that any such petty consulate was ever held by this Gordian; our list of the petty consuls is, however, so imperfect, that it is not improbable that such may have been held by him, and no record of it have transpired to us. It is highly probable, I think, that he might have served as consul, either whilst Cæsar or immediately after his elevation to the empire in 238, and thus his consulate with Aviola in 239 would be his second, and this with Pompeianus, in 241, his third. But then again the difficulty occurs, why this last consulate is so positively called the second in the Cockermouth inscription. It is, however, as positively called the third in this and the other inscription, so that the evidence is as strong one way as the other. Great uncertainty on this point seems evidently to have prevailed amongst the Romans themselves, and on the whole I

\* I must also beg leave to express my obligations to Wm. P. Johnstone, Esq., for his polite attention to, and ready compliance with, my request for a more correct drawing of the second altar than the Society was then in possession of, and also for his communication of some further information.

† According to this rule, Claudius having taken the consulship in the month of January, A. D. 42, and the second of his reign, is styled consul for the second time, because he had been petty consul the 1st of July in the year 37, and 1st of Caligula. It is the same with Vespasian, whose second consulate marks the year 70, because he had been petty consul in the two last months of the year 51.

am strongly inclined to think that a solution of the difficulty can best be found in the belief of some unrecorded or forgotten petty consulate.

If the preceding observations are correct the reading of the first found altar will be

*Jovi optimo maximo et Numinibus Augusti nostri Cohors secunda Tungrorum Gordiana milliaria equitata Civium Latinorum, cui praeest Sicilius Claudianus praefectus, instante Aelio Martino principe, decimo Kalendarum J——, Imperatore Domino nostro Gordiano Augusto tertium Pompeiano Consulibus.*

That of the second will necessarily be,

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

Should the preceding attempt to explain these difficult inscriptions prove satisfactory to the Society, I shall feel much gratified. Though not deficient in the hope that I might throw some light upon them, I have been principally instigated by the belief that a combined view of these inscriptions would materially tend to clear up an obscure part of the history of a cohort which has lately so much occupied the attention of the Society, and by which so large a portion of the collection of antiquities in its possession was erected. I have, I trust, laid sufficient grounds for believing that the first cohort of the Tungri never garrisoned any other station on the wall than that of House-Steeds.