

point out to any one familiar with Latin sepulchral epigraphy the frequency of such a notice of the mode in which the sepulchre was obtained. Fabretti, p. 153, gives many examples of such purchases. Nor is the use of the first person rare. *Vide* Fabretti, pp. 236 and 252. The only doubt which remains is as to the meaning of E· C. Various interpretations may be proposed, such as *ei carissimo, ejus carissima, ejus causa, ex communi*, scil. sumptu, or according to the received interpretation of these *notæ* on other stones, *erigendam* (i. e. *memoriam*) *curavi*, for such sarcophagi stood above ground.

According to my views, the whole inscription may be read thus:—*Memoria Caii Valerii Theodoriani Nomento. Vixit annos (or annis) xxxiv, menses (or mensibus) vi. Emi Theodora mater [et] erigendam curavi.*

I have no grounds for the selection of *Caii* as the *prænomen*; it is wholly conjectural. If there had been room for the *Nomen gentilicium* and the *Nomen patris*, I should have supplied G or P before AL, thus taking it for either GAL· or PAL·, the abbreviations of the Galerian or Palatine tribes. After *emi* I understand *locum* as is usual, (or *memoriam*,) and supply *et*, the omission of which is not rare.

9. In the year 1726 an altar was found at Corbridge, in Northumberland, which bore the following inscription, as given in the Appendix to Gordon's *Iter Septentrionale*, and in Horsley's *Britannia Romana*, Northumberland, n. cviii. :

LEG· A.....
 Q· CALPVRNIVS
 CONCESSINI
 VS· PRAEF· EQ
 CAESA· CORI
 ONOTOTAR
 VM· MANV PR
 AESENTISSIMI
 NVMINIS DEL VS.

The altar and inscription are imperfect, as a portion of the stone has been broken off at the top. Horsley supplies the deficiency in the first line with VG· PR· PR·, and reads the whole thus:—“*Legato Augustali proprætorè, Quintus Calpurnius Concessinius Præfectus*