

the other inscriptions found at Wroxeter is given, and PATRE is adopted as the true reading of the word in the fifth line, but the letter which follows A in the 4th line is read C instead of G. In the other inscription on this tablet, the I of the fifth line is read by Mr. Scarth as J, and the A in the same line is omitted, whilst the three marks XXX at the bottom are regarded as "more probably merely an ornament, like a leaf introduced at the end of the next inscription." Adopting his readings, with the exceptions of C for G and J for I, I would give the inscriptions *in extenso*, thus:—

D·M	D[iis] M[anibus];
PLACIDA	Placida,
AN·LV	an [norum] LV,
CVR·AG	cur[am] ag[ente]
CONI	conj[uge].
D·M	D[iis] M[anibus];
DEVCCV	Deuccu—
S·AN·XV	s, an[norum] XV,
CVR·AG	cur[am] ag[ente]
PATRE	patre.

If A and XXX be retained in the first inscription, I would expand the contractions in the 5th and 6th lines, thus:—

CONI A	conjugē annorum
XXX	triginta.

*i.e.*, her husband for thirty years.

We have a similar construction in Maffei, *Museum Veronense*, 152, 6 :

C. CASSIVS. C·F  
VESPA  
MANLIA. T·F  
REPENTINA  
VXOR·AN·XXX.

It only remains to add, that I concur in Mr. Scarth's opinion, that the vacant panel was left by the father of Deuccus and the husband of Placida "for his own name and age at his decease."\*

\* Since the above was written, I observe that the author of a very interesting article on *Uriconium*, in *The Gentleman's Magazine* for May, 1859, has adopted Mr. Wright's views, but I am still of opinion that his interpretation cannot be received.