

Vieux, Normandy. See Smith, *Collect. Antiq.*, iii., p. 98. Line 5 of the first inscription should accordingly be read, an I have suggested, *Brit. Rom. Inscript.*, p. 162, *Sub cura Claudii Paulini, &c.*

It seems also plain that the second inscription is the older of the two, for in it the making, the erection of the building, is commemorated, of which the restoration is noticed in the first. It is not plain, however, what Emperor is named—whether Caracalla or Elagabalus. Dr. Bruce gives the latter as certain; I rather incline to the former. See *Brit. Rom. Inscript.*, p. 163.

From an inscription, found at Netherby (*Castra Exploratorum*), Cumberland, and printed *Mon. Hist. Brit.*, n. 40, we learn the name of the legate of Elagabalus in his second year, *scil.* A.D. 219:—

IM. ANTON
 .. P · F AVG BIS COS VEXIL
 LEG · II · AVG · ET XX V · V ·
 ITEM COH · I · AEL · HISP
 M · EQ · SVB CVRA M
 D IVNII LEG · AVG · PR · PR ..

i.e. *Imperatori Cæsari Marco Aurelio Antonino Pio Felici Augusto bis Consuli Vexillationes Legionis secundæ Augustæ et vigesimæ Valeriæ Victricis item cohors prima Ælia Hispanorum Miliaria equitata sub cura (M) Decimi Junii Legati Augusti Pro Prætore.*

In *Mon. Hist. Brit.* there is a note, in which there is a query whether the Emperor named is Elagabalus, and consequently whether the date is 219. If the reading be correct, the Emperor who is named is certainly Elagabalus; for if it had been Caracalla, who was *bis cos*, his father would have been mentioned. I am not satisfied as to the name of the legate. The M is separated in the *copy, by an interval from CVRA, so that we may not read CVRAM, and this is, besides, unusual. Nor is it probable that it stands for *Marci*. It has occurred to me that, perhaps, there was an O after it, and that IVNII was a misreading for IVLII. We shall thus get MOD · IVLII, *i.e.* † *Modii Julii*, the same legate named on a stone, without date, found at Birdoswald.

An inscription found at Chesters (*Cilurnum*), Northumberland, and printed, *Mon. Hist. Brit.*, n. 66, informs us that *Marius Valerianus* was a legate of the same Emperor in A.D. 221.

* I have seen this inscription only in the *Mon. Hist. Brit.* It is printed, also, by Hodgson, and Lysons, but I am not able to consult either of these authorities.

† In *Brit. Rom. Inscript.*, p. 30, I have offered a different conjecture.