

## VI.—A NEW INSCRIPTION FROM CHESTERHOLM.

By ERIC BIRLEY.

[Read 29th November, 1933.]

The following abbreviations are used:—

- AA *Archæologia Aeliana.*
- AE *L'Année Epigraphique.*
- CIL *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum.*
- C CIL VII.
- EE *Ephemeris Epigraphica.*
- ILS Dessau, *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae.*
- JRS *Journal of Roman Studies.*
- PIR *Prosopographia Imperii Romani.*
- R-E Pally-Wissowa, *Realencyclopädie.*

Since May 1932 the writer has been engaged in the gradual excavation of the *principia* of the Roman fort of Chesterholm-Vindolanda. It will be some time yet before the examination of the building is completed, and a report upon it can be presented to this society; but it seems desirable not to delay publication of the most important single find.

In October 1933, during the clearing of a room on the west side of the courtyard, an inscribed stone was found, re-used in one side of a secondary drain. The stone was originally a square of twenty-two inches, but the left-hand top corner has been trimmed off in ancient times; its thickness is some five inches; in the centre of the reverse side a hole eleven inches by nine, and one inch deep, has been sunk, for what purpose it is not clear. Although the

beginning of the first four lines of lettering is lost, and the upper edge of the first line has been trimmed away, there is little serious difficulty in the reading until the last three lines, which are almost illegible; it is to be hoped that Mr. Collingwood may recover a fuller reading than the present writer has been able to do. The letters average two inches in height; they are well formed, but not deeply cut; in the first lines they still retain traces of red paint. It will be seen that the text is considerably condensed, frequent use being made of ligatures, reminiscent of those in the fine ornamental slab from Risingham, now in the Black Gate museum.<sup>1</sup> The text of the inscription, so far as it has been made out, is as follows (plate xx):—

[imp caes m aur]EL[i]O AN[t]ON[i]NO P[i]O FEL[i]C  
 [aug parth ma]X[i] · BRITANI · MAXI · PONTIF  
 [maxi trib] POTEST · XVI · IMP · II  
 [cos pa]TRI PATRIAE PROCOS PR  
 S. O DEVOTIÖNE COMMVNI  
 [ . . . . . coh]  
 IIII GALLORVM CVI PR[ae]  
 [ . . . . . ]

It is a dedication by the fourth cohort of Gauls (already known as the third-century garrison of Vindolanda)<sup>2</sup> to Caracalla, in the sixteenth year of his tribunician power, that is to say between the 10th December, 212, and the 9th December, 213; but greater precision in dating it is attainable. As regards the upper limit, a comparison with the inscriptions from Whitley Castle and Old Penrith, considered below, suggests that it was set up at the same time as them, and consequently in the fourth consulship of Caracalla, which began on the 1st January, 213: it seems certain that in the Chesterholm inscription the number of consulships cannot have been specified; there is not room for the numerals. The lower limit of the inscription's cutting, also, can be fixed with greater precision; for by the 9th October, 213, Caracalla had taken

<sup>1</sup> C 1003=ILS 2618=AA<sup>4</sup> II, p. 80, no. 89.

<sup>2</sup> C 715; cf. AA<sup>4</sup> VIII, p. 193.

the title *Germanicus Maximus*, and had added a third to the total of his imperatorial salutations, as a result of his successful campaign against the tribes across the frontier of Raetia.<sup>3</sup> Here we find him credited with only two such salutations, and still without the title *Germanicus Maximus*.<sup>4</sup> The inscription, therefore, belongs to the period between the 1st January and about the 9th October, 213.

It is now necessary to consider the occasion of its being set up. The relevant part of the inscription is line 5: *pro devotione communi* ("As a mark of their joint loyalty"). Emphasis on loyalty is most necessary, and was no doubt most common, immediately after marked lack of it; and the inscriptions from the north of Britain include a number of similar dedications, which, taken in conjunction with that from Chesterholm, may throw some light on the history of the province in the years following the death of Severus, and suggest a suitable occasion.

First there is a stone from the neighbourhood of Netherby<sup>5</sup> (ill-recorded, unfortunately, and now lost) which was not dated, indeed, closer than to the time of Caracalla,<sup>6</sup> but contained the same explanation of its setting up—*pro . . . devotione*; what words followed is not certain. Then from Whitley Castle<sup>7</sup> and Old Penrith<sup>8</sup> come two inscriptions—the latter only a fragment—set up *pro pietate ac devotione communi* ("As a mark of their joint faithfulness and loyalty"). In the first case the dedicators are the second cohort of Nervii; in the Old Penrith inscription the name of the regiment in garrison is not preserved; in each case the inscription is datable to the year 213. There are two other inscriptions of that year, which may be considered in conjunction with those already cited.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. ILS 451; R-E XII, col. 1319.

<sup>4</sup> For it would not precede one prior title (*Britannicus*) and displace the other (*Germanicus*).

<sup>5</sup> C 963.

<sup>6</sup> The dedication is for the safety of his mother, Julia Domna.

<sup>7</sup> C 310 with EE IX, p. 566.

<sup>8</sup> C 322; comparison with the Whitley Castle stone shows the dating to be justified.

One from High Rochester, a mere fragment, is relevant only because it is dated;<sup>9</sup> the other, from Old Carlisle,<sup>10</sup> unlike the dedications we have been considering, may be a record of building: its main contribution is part of the name of the governor of the province. Of his *cognomen* ]*rco* alone survives, but that is sufficient to show that we have to do with the same governor as was recorded on the milestone found at Welton—C. Iulius Marcus.<sup>11</sup> To sum up the evidence of the inscriptions of this year, we find road works in progress at Welton, on the military way, just west of Harlow Hill; building operations at Old Carlisle—in each case under the direction of the same governor; and at a number of forts in between, dedications recording, not public works, but loyalty to the emperor. Had there been but one such dedication it would have been rash, perhaps, to suggest an occasion for it, but a number of dedications in similar form, in the same year, are another matter. Their occurrence in widely separated forts points to common instructions from a single source. That source must have been either Rome, or the headquarters of the province. There do not appear to be parallels to the form recorded from any other province; so that we must conclude that it was on the initiative of a British governor, and presumably the C. Iulius Marcus of the Welton milestone, that instructions for their erection were issued. It has been suggested above that such an affirmation of loyalty is on general grounds likely to have followed a period of disaffection: a likely occasion is not far to seek.

In February 212, Caracalla had finally succeeded in bringing about the murder of his brother Geta, and henceforward he was sole ruler of the empire. But he did not at

<sup>9</sup> C 1042.

<sup>10</sup> C 351.

<sup>11</sup> C 1186. There is no reasonable doubt as to his names. The form of the inscription requires the number of imperial salutations to be specified in l. 7; and the restoration of *imp. II*, giving Charlton's version preference over Hodgson's, leaves C. as the only possible *praenomen*. Both versions agree on the *nomen*, and the line may be restored with confidence IMP. II C. IVL. MARCO.

once obtain the support of the whole of the army. For a time, Dacia may have been opposed to him;<sup>12</sup> nearer home, the second Parthian legion, in the Alban fortress, for long remained hostile;<sup>13</sup> and it is not, perhaps, unlikely that the army of Britain at first refused to accept Caracalla as emperor.<sup>14</sup> It is noteworthy that no British inscription of his reign datable to 213 shows the title *Antoniniana* applied to a British regiment,<sup>15</sup> while the one inscription dated to 214-217 includes that title.<sup>16</sup> It may be suggested that after a period of hostility the army of Britain was finally placated or brought to its senses in 213; perhaps Iulius Marcus was the first governor appointed by Caracalla alone to assume the British command; and the title *Antoniniana* was only awarded to its units after an unquestionable demonstration had been made of the army's loyalty to the emperor.<sup>17</sup>

There is a further point, however, that it seems necessary to investigate at the present juncture: it is by no means certain of what province Iulius Marcus was governor.

After the defeat of Albinus by Severus before Lugdunum in 197, one of the first measures taken by the victor was the division of Britain into two provinces (expressly recorded at this time by Herodian),<sup>18</sup> so that in future no governor in Britain should be strong enough to imitate the attempt of Albinus to secure the empire.

The evidence for the course of the division is mainly epigraphic, for Herodian gives no details, and Cassio Dio (who does not mention the event—no doubt his epitomizers

<sup>12</sup> Cf. R-E XII, col. 1316.

<sup>13</sup> Script. Hist. Aug. *Caracalla* 2, 7 and 8; *Geta* 6, 1 and 2.

<sup>14</sup> For Geta had previously governed the province, and unlike his brother was popular with the troops: Cassius Dio LXXVII 1, 3; Herodian IV, 15, 5 and 6; cf. R-E XII, cols. 1316-7.

<sup>15</sup> C 310, 963, perhaps 1002 (where the restoration of *Germanicus maximus* is hardly certain), and the new inscription from Chesterholm.

<sup>16</sup> C 1043 (High Rochester), A.D. 215-216.

<sup>17</sup> If this suggestion is accepted, it will allow a slightly closer dating than that proposed by Mr. Miller (in *Archæologia* LXXVIII, p. 160) for the restoration of the Caerleon amphitheatre, since the tiles of the second legion include this title.

<sup>18</sup> III, 8, 2.

are at fault) merely records that the second and twentieth legions belonged to the upper, and the sixth to the lower province.<sup>19</sup> That distribution is confirmed by inscriptions: Claudius Paulinus, governor under Elagabalus, is described in the well-known inscription from Vieux as *leg. Aug. pr. pr. in Brit(annia) ad legionem sextam*,<sup>20</sup> and an African veteran of the same legion describes it as of the lower province.<sup>21</sup> Again, the twentieth legion is recorded as of the upper province in another African inscription,<sup>22</sup> and in the case of the second legion, though there is no express attribution, the building record of Valerian and Gallienus shows that it was in a consular province.<sup>23</sup> To continue with the military evidence: a third-century *cursus honorum* refers to the second cohort of Asturians as being in the lower province;<sup>24</sup> and in A.D. 225 the cohort was at Aesica;<sup>25</sup> Aesica, therefore, and the line of the Wall so far west, was in *Britannia inferior*. Then, Marius Valerianus is recorded as governor on inscriptions from South Shields,<sup>26</sup> Chesters,<sup>27</sup> and Netherby;<sup>28</sup> C. Iulius Marcus, on the Welton milestone, and at Old Carlisle, perhaps also on a fragmentary text from Netherby;<sup>29</sup> and finally, the series of dedications considered above shows unity of control over a group of forts comprising Old Penrith, Whitley Castle, Netherby, Chesterholm and perhaps High Rochester. Thus the line of the Wall, and three supporting forts in the west, as far south as Old Penrith, can be shown to fall to the same command. Fresh precision is given by the Bordeaux inscription,<sup>30</sup> from which we learn that Lincoln as well as York was in

<sup>19</sup> LV 23, 2, 3 and 6.

<sup>20</sup> CIL XIII, 3162; C 1045 with EE IX, p. 612 shows that he was governor in A.D. 220.

<sup>21</sup> CIL VIII, 5180.

<sup>22</sup> CIL VIII, 2080.

<sup>23</sup> C 107 (Caerleon).

<sup>24</sup> CIL VIII, 2766=ILS 2762.

<sup>25</sup> C 732.

<sup>26</sup> EE IX 1140.

<sup>27</sup> C 585 (A.D. 221).

<sup>28</sup> C 965 (A.D. 222).

<sup>29</sup> C 967; the lettering suggests an early third-century date.

<sup>30</sup> JRS XI, p. 101.

the lower province. There is one more possible epigraphic source. In two inscriptions from Greta Bridge,<sup>31</sup> on the road across Stainmore that connects the two main northward lines of communication, there are references to beneficiaries of the consular governor of the upper province, that have been taken by some scholars to give evidence of the boundary between the two provinces having passed through that place.<sup>32</sup> But it should be noted that, since the governor of the lower province was not a consular, all British *beneficarii consulares* must have owed their appointments to the governor of *Britannia superior*, and the form of the Greta Bridge inscriptions can only be explained on the assumption that the place was *not* in the upper province; if it had been, there would have been no need to specify what province the consular governed—the province (it may be stated, as a rule of general application) is only specified outside its borders.<sup>33</sup> It appears, therefore, that the division must have run from south-east to north-west in such a way as to include both Lincoln and Cumberland in the lower province.<sup>34</sup>

But it must be observed that none of these inscriptions can be dated as early as the time of Severus; and there is a certain amount of evidence, first noted by Ritterling,<sup>35</sup> that seems to suggest a somewhat different state of things in his time. In brief, we find Virius Lupus, a consular (for he had previously governed Lower Germany),<sup>36</sup> in command in Britain, negotiating with the Maeatae;<sup>37</sup> yet, under the division shown by the inscriptions referred to above, the consular governor of the upper province could have no direct concern with the Maeatae, for Lower Britain

<sup>31</sup> C 280, 281.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. R-E XII, col. 1608.

<sup>33</sup> EE IX 997, at Cirencester, is not really an exception, since only the dedication in verse specified the province; in the prose dedication there is not room for it to have been mentioned. Cf. Haverfield in *Archæologia Oxoniensis* IV, p. 216 and pl. 1.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. R. E. M. Wheeler in Roy. Com. Hist. Mon. *Roman London*, p. 61, for a detailed discussion of the probable line.

<sup>35</sup> R-E XII, art. *legio*, cols. 1608-9, s.v. *VI Victrix*.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. R-E XII, col. 1314.

<sup>37</sup> Cassius Dio LXXV, 5, 4.

lay between. Again, the consular governor Alfenus Senecio appears on inscriptions as far north as Benwell and Risingham,<sup>38</sup> both undoubtedly in the lower province. These inscriptions, in Ritterling's judgment, provide a clue as to the solution of the problem. In contrast to the record of Alfenus Senecio from Greta Bridge,<sup>39</sup> where he is described as *leg. Aug. pr. pr.*, at Benwell and Risingham he is *cos.*; that is to say his consular rank is emphasized in a way that must show (Ritterling argued) that there is something unusual in his command; and there is another unusual feature in the Risingham stone, which records that Oclatinus Adventus, *proc. Aug.*, had a part in the repairing of that fort. It is remarkable to find a procurator taking an active part in military affairs in a province governed by a senatorial *leg. Aug. pr. pr.*, and Ritterling suggests, with considerable weight, that there is only one reasonable explanation—that Adventus was *proc. et praeses* of the lower, and Senecio *leg. Aug. pr. pr.* of the upper, charged with extraordinary authority over both provinces; and presumably Lupus had been in a similar position previously. A further point of Ritterling's theory is, that we must assume the sixth legion to have been placed under a prefect *agens vices legati*, for we cannot postulate a senatorial legionary legate serving under an equestrian procuratorial *praeses*; and Ritterling appositely quotes the Severan organization of the new eastern provinces as a contemporary parallel—there, the new legions I and III Parthicae were from the first commanded by equestrian prefects.<sup>40</sup>

In two respects Ritterling's theory is open to objection. It is clear that Severus intended to maintain, if not to extend, the Roman hold on Scotland;<sup>41</sup> so that it is not necessary to assume that the geographical division, for which we have evidence, of the period after Scotland had been finally abandoned by Caracalla,<sup>42</sup> was the same as

<sup>38</sup> C 513, 1003; now also at Birdoswald (JRS XIX, p. 214).

<sup>39</sup> C 279; now also at Bowes (JRS XVIII, p. 212).

<sup>40</sup> Cf. R-E XII, col. 1436.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. Cassius Dio LXXVII 13, 1; Herodian III, 14, 5.

<sup>42</sup> Cassius Dio LXXVIII, 1, 1; Herodian III, 15, 6.



that made in an earlier period, when the Scottish Wall was intended to remain the frontier. If we take Ritterling's interpretation of the *cos.* inscriptions, their incidence certainly suggests the possibility that the boundary lay farther north; for the Stainmore line falls, on his showing, to the upper province, which therefore cuts off the western end of Hadrian's Wall from its headquarters at York. But it is hardly conceivable that York itself should be left in the upper province, nor is it likely that the difference in Senecio's titles represents such a difference in status as Ritterling suggested,<sup>43</sup> so that this point need not be laboured; in default of evidence to the contrary, we will assume that there was no change in the line of division.

More pressing is the objection that there is positive evidence for the existence of a single province of Britain in the first decade of the third century. We find Lupus and Senecio, as has been seen already, admittedly in supreme command of the whole area;<sup>44</sup> the same seems to have been the case with the other Severan governors—Antius Crescens Calpurnianus, *iridicus vice legati*;<sup>45</sup> Pollienius Auspex<sup>46</sup> (though in this case we need not stress the point, for his kinswoman's epitaph is not over precise); and Geta.<sup>47</sup> And in the case of procurators, there are two instances that are explicable only if we suppose a single province. Sex. Varius Marcellus, the husband of Iulia Soaemias (the mother of Elagabalus; hence his original *nomen*, Varius), under Severus and his sons, c. A.D. 200-205, was *procurator ducenarius Britanniae*.<sup>48</sup> If he had been *proc. et praeses Britanniae inferioris*, the lack of pre-

<sup>43</sup> The point is discussed further below, p. 137.

<sup>44</sup> In the case of Lupus, it is worth noting that in a rescript of Severus to him he is described as *Britanniae praeses*: Digest XXVIII, 6, 2. Hübner in R-E III, col. 878, begs the question.

<sup>45</sup> ILS 1151.

<sup>46</sup> ILS 8841.

<sup>47</sup> Herodian III, 14, 9.

<sup>48</sup> ILS 478. AE 1888, no. 108, shows that his previous post, *procurator aquarum centenarius*, falls between 198 and 209; he was dead before 217, and from the variety of his later career it is clear that his British appointment must fall early in the period.

cision is remarkable in that detailed *cursus honorum*; if, on the other hand, the administrative division into two governorships did not affect the position of the procurator as chief finance officer, we should expect Marcellus to be described as *proc. Britanniarum*; and, incidentally, the appearance of Adventus on the Risingham inscription would once more provide a problem; for Ritterling's assumption of the lower province having been governed by a procurator would have to be rejected. Then, L. Didius Marinus, who was *procurator familiarum gladiatoriarum* in the western provinces in 212,<sup>49</sup> gives as his sphere *per Gallias Bret. Hispanias German. et Raetiam*: if Britain had recently been divided into two provinces, we should not expect the abbreviation.

It seems difficult to avoid the conclusion that the evidence of Herodian must be rejected. His authority is never very great,<sup>50</sup> and it seems best to suppose that he was mistaken in attributing to Severus the division of Britain into two provinces, and to give the credit for that to Caracalla, who is known to have subdivided the consular province of *Pannonia superior*;<sup>51</sup> although the very precision of the statement, and the known division by Severus of Niger's province, Syria,<sup>52</sup> appear to support his story of the division of Britain, as a precaution against Albinus finding imitators. For of the five governors known for the period 197-211, all appear to have been governors of the whole of Britain, and Sex. Varius Marcellus in this period was clearly procurator of the whole province. We must suppose, further, that after his evacuation of Scotland, Caracalla divided the province into two, and that the geographical division for which we have evidence was due to him. It must be admitted that this solution does not remove all difficulties. The mention of Oclatinus Adventus at Risingham remains an

<sup>49</sup> ILS 1396. A dedication by him in Spain (AE 1911 no. 5) gives the date.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. R-E VIII, s.v. *Herodianus* (3).

<sup>51</sup> Cf. R-E XII, col. 1310.

<sup>52</sup> Cf. R-E XII, cols. 1309 f., 1525.



INSCRIPTION OF CARACALLA FROM CHESTERHOLM.



enigma;<sup>53</sup> and the *cos.* inscriptions have to be explained anew. But, in passing, it may be noted that in any case a new explanation of them seems desirable; for the inscription of Ulpus Marcellus from Benwell describes him also, not as *leg. Aug. pr. pr.*, but as *cos.*;<sup>54</sup> and if Ritterling's interpretation held good for Senecio, we should have to apply it to Marcellus as well, and enrol him among the Severan governors of *Britannia superior*, were it not that he is described as *leg. Aug. pr. pr.* on an inscription from Chesters.<sup>55</sup> True, at least three men of the name appear to be vouched for; but it seems difficult not to identify this governor with the Ulpus Marcellus who was general in the British war of Commodus, even though the inscriptions mentioning him cannot both be assigned to the period of that emperor's sole rule.<sup>56</sup>

On the assumption, then, that it was Caracalla who put into effect the division for which we have epigraphic evidence; it still remains uncertain whether Iulius Marcus was governor of the whole province, or of lower Britain only; it is not until we reach Claudius Paulinus and the year 220 that we can say for certain that *Britannia inferior* was separately governed, under a praetorian *legatus Augusti pro praetore*.

<sup>53</sup> It may be noted that two other *procc. Aug.* appear on northern inscriptions: C 875 (from near Castlesteads; Caracalla is mentioned) and 1082 (Inveresk).

<sup>54</sup> C 504 = ILS 4715.

<sup>55</sup> EE IX 1171.

<sup>56</sup> Cf. PIR<sup>1</sup> III, V 556-558; Cassius Dio LXXIII 8, 2; D. Atkinson in JRS XII, p. 68.