

for we know from Dio, lx., 19, 21, that he was sent over by Claudius to the island, in the year when the Emperor was Consul, for the third time, with Vitellius for his colleague = A.D. 43. It would seem, too, as if there were no doubt as to the year in which his administration ended; for Dio, lx., 30, mentions the triumph of Plautius on his return to Rome, and from c. 29 we learn that the year was that in which Claudius was Consul for the fourth time, and Vitellius for the third = A.D. 47.

On the supposition that there was no, or but a short, interval between the end of one administration and the commencement of the next that succeeded, this same year may be regarded as the date of the beginning of the government of Ostorius Scapula. We are, at all events, certain, from Tacitus, *Ann.* xii., 25, that he had command in Britain in the consulship of Antistius and Suillius = A.D. 50.

There is, also,\* no doubt as to the year in which *Petronius Turpilianus* succeeded *Suetonius Paulinus*, for we learn from Tacitus, *Ann.* xiv., 39, that it was the year after his consulship, *i.e.* A.D. 62. Now, from Tacitus, *Ann.* xiv., 29, 31, it is clear that Suetonius was in Britain in A.D. 59, 60, and 61.

The statements of Tacitus. *Hist.* ii., 65, that *Trebellius Maximus*

in Britain, it is scarcely credible that there were two of that name who were both *legati* and *comites* of that Emperor in the island, especially as Tacitus mentions but one. And yet there are objections to this identification. The *Plautius* named in the inscription was *Ti. Plautius M. F.—Silvanus Albanus*; but this change of *prænomen*, from *Aulus* to *Tiberius*, may have been the consequence of adoption. A much more grave difficulty is found in the words of the inscription: HVNC IN EADEM PRAEFECTVRA VRBIS IMP CAESAR AVG VESPASIANVS ITERVM COS FECIT. Orelli's note on *iterum cos* is—"Consulem suffectum anni incerti. Primum fuerat cos. suffectus V. C. 800 p., Chr. 47." Henzen agrees as to the first consulship, but gives A.D. 76 as the date of the second. But if we accept the identification, how can we reconcile this with the words of Tacitus: "Consularium *primus Aulus Plautius praepositus*," and of Suetonius, *Vespas.* 4, "*Auli Plautii Consularis*?" If he had been Consul before A.D. 43, and was also Consul in A.D. 47, then his Consulship in A.D. 76 must have been his third, not his second. It seems as if we must either interpret *Consularis*, in both these passages, as meaning "possessed of consular dignity and authority, without having filled the office,"—a sense in which the word is frequently applied to Governors of Provinces—and regard this *Plautius* as different from the *Aulus Plautius* who had been *consul suffectus* in A.D. 29, or we must reject the identification with the *Plautius*, who was *consul suffectus* in A.D. 47. Of the two solutions, I prefer the first, but I am not satisfied.

\* The words of Tacitus are: "*Suetonius \* \* \* tradere exercitum Petronio Turpiliano, qui jam consulatu abierat, jubetur.*" From this I infer that Turpilianus crossed over to the island in the year after his consulship, which we know to have been in A.D. 61. Horsley, p. 37, takes the same view: "Here," he remarks, "we are also sure, because Tacitus says that Petronius Turpilianus had first finished his consulate; Turpilianus must, therefore, have entered upon the government in Britain in the year 62." And yet Orelli gives A.U.C. 814=A.D. 61, for the commencement of his government, and in this is followed by other editors of the *Agricola*. Mr. Merivale, *History of the Romans under the Empire*, vii., p. 79, also gives the date A.D. 61.