

*Parth. Adiaben*ICO,* and the defect in the third line is supplied by *Et. P. Sept. Getae nob. Cæs. Cos.*† In the *Index Rerum et Nominum*, p. cxlvi., *virī consularis* seems to be suggested as the explanation of VOCOS, and *C. Antistio Advento* as another reading of COLANITI ADVENTO.

From what has been stated, it is evident that the parts of the inscription as yet not satisfactorily explained, are the names COLANITI, and the letters O P F S. It appears to me that the difficulties as to the first of these have arisen from mistaking O for C, and *vice-versa*, i.e. reading COL for OCL; and from inverting the order of the first three letters in the ligulate group $\overline{\text{N}}$, i.e. reading NIT for TIN; for I have no doubt that the individual here named is the same *Adventus* who, some years afterwards, in A.D. 218, was Consul with the Emperor Macrinus. His *nomen gentilicium* is variously given as *Coclatinus*, *Oclatinus*, and *Oclatinus*. He is named in the following inscriptions:

VICTORIAE · REDVCIS · DD · NN

* * * * *

PII · FELICIS · AVG · ET · * * *

LIAE * * * * *

IVGI · D · N · MILITES · LEG · II

PARTH · * * * * *

AET · Q · M · COCLATINO AD

VENTO · COS · &c. &c.

(Fabretti, p. 339, and Relandi *Fast. Consul.* p. 137.)

* The learned editor of the *Monumenta Historica Britannica* doubtless had authority for the collocation which he suggests of the titles of Severus; but I am not aware of any example of them in that order. They are usually placed as Henzen gives them in his restoration.

† The addition of COS seems to be justified by the fact, that in the year A.D. 205, Caracalla was Consul for the second time, and Geta for the first. In Dr. Druce's copy of the inscription, we have, in the third line, COS I instead of COS II; but this, I presume, is a mistake. If not, we should omit COS from Geta's titles, as the inscription would then be of A.D. 202. The addition of I after COS, instead of COS alone which is the recognized form for a first consulship, suggests the conjecture, that this style may have been derived by Caracalla from his father, whose coins of his first consulship present the strange peculiarity of I after COS. Perhaps there was some reference to this in the phrase *ter et semel ccs* by which the year 203 was marked. But I must add, that I have never seen an example, in the case of Caracalla, of I after COS on either coins or stones.