The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Some Notes Upon Roman Britain

R. Knox McEldebry

The Classical Review / Volume 18 / Issue 09 / December 1904, pp 458 - 461

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00990991, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00990991

How to cite this article:

R. Knox McEldebry (1904). Some Notes Upon Roman Britain. The Classical Review, 18, pp 458-461 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00990991

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

φόνον; and the remainder of his note reveal a misconception of the passage. No more satisfactory is the comment of Dindorf (*Lex. Aesch.*): 'de spe loquitur tanquam de dea, ut Soph. *O.R.* 158.'

To deny a basis of fact to the words of l. 817 is to impair seriously the beauty of the metaphor. To have voted openly for condemnation would have brought only despair to the heart of the prisoner at the bar. But if the juror to conceal the nature of his vote placed a hand also over the urn of acquittal, that simple act was fraught with hope for the one on trial. His hope was centered in the hand. Grammatically, 'hope of the hand' is a periphrastic subject, like βίη Πριάμοιο, and equals 'the hope-laden hand.'

A somewhat similar interpretation was proposed many years ago by H. L. Ahrens, but it has evidently been overlooked by the writers on Greek legal antiquities, and it was unknown to me until I had prepared the entire preceding discussion. 'Sollte nun hierbei,' he wrote, 'das κρύβδην ψηφίζεσθαι . . . nicht vereitelt werden, so musste der Richter, während er in die eine Urne seinen Stimmstein wirklich warf, doch auch zu der andern treten und sich so stellen, als würde er auch in diese.'¹ The handbooks

¹ *Philologus*, Suppl. I. (1860), S. 566. The view entertained by Wilamowitz seems to be similar to that suggested by Ahrens:

'Stein auf Stein
in die Bluturne rollte, welche Troias Sturz

on Greek legal antiquities make no mention of this interpretation of Ahrens, nor have I found any reference to it in any of the editions of the *Agamemnon*, except in that of Keck (pub. 1863), where it is summarily dismissed. 'Die Institution des κρύβδην ψηφίζεσθαι,' he says, 'musste durch andere Einrichtungen als wie Ahrens sie sich denkt, gewährt sein, denn durch diese hätte sich Niemand täuschen lassen.' The central weakness in Ahrens' interpretation, which Keck rightly attacks, is avoided, I believe, in my own. Each juror if he cared to vote secretly, placed his hands simultaneously over the two urns, and not over first the one and then the other. The former method would be the more apt to insure secrecy. Moreover, I believe that the urns in the fifth century were identical in material, so that the click caused by the ψῆφος was the same into whichever receptacle it was dropped. The fact, too, that the urns stood one in front of the other rendered detection more difficult. Finally, it is possible that the urns were placed at the back of the βῆμα in the fifth century, whereas in the fourth century they stood in front on the βῆμα (see *Wasps*, 347, 990; *Demos.* xix. 311; Wachsmuth, *Die Stadt Athen*, ii. l. 371).

JAMES TURNER ALLEN.

University of California.

bezeichnete; zur andern trat zum Scheine nur
mit leerer Hand der Richter. Klar ist der Entscheid.'
Gr. Trag. ii. (1899), S. 78.

SOME NOTES UPON ROMAN BRITAIN.

(Continued from p. 399.)

IV.—THE BATAVI IN BRITAIN.

We know from Tacitus that up to 70 at least the Batavian auxilia were regularly sent to Britain, and that in fact eight 'cohortes Batavorum' were attached to the Legio XIV Gemina which was there in garrison. But in view of the disappearance of the legions which had sworn allegiance to the 'Imperium Galliarum,' there can be no doubt that these more guilty cohorts were disbanded after 70. Yet the tribe retained its former status in the empire; a new levy replaced the old, and crossed to Britain with Cerialis.

In his account of the Battle of Mons

Graupius Tacitus says 'Agricola... Batavorum cohortes ac Tungrorum duas cohortatus est.' The missing number has been variously supplied: 'quinque' say Ritter and Nipperdey, 'tres' Urlichs and Cichorius. But 'quattuor' is read by the new Codex Toletanus—the best MS. of the Agricola—and is to be accepted. Which were the four cohorts?

From inscriptions we know of Cohors I Batavorum miliaria pia fidelis, Cohors II Batavorum miliaria, Cohors III Batavorum miliaria equitata, Cohors IX Batavorum miliaria equitata, and another Cohors I Batavorum which was quingenaria. All the records belong to dates later than 70.

The first two cohorts are traceable in Pannonia from 98, the third in Raetia from 107; clearly they came to Britain, and returned to the continent, with the Legio II Adiutrix. As for Cohors IX, its number, as Cichorius says, shows that it belonged to the original series and was raised simultaneously with it. In the absence of other evidence we may assume from Tacitus that it served in Britain, though it did not belong to the Legio XIV; it survived 70, having taken no part in the rebellion. It is traceable only in Raetia, after the first century. But two inscriptions may be cited as possible evidence of its previous British sojourn. A fragment of tile recently found at Carlisle reads 'GVIII.' which Mr. Haverfield who published it explains as '[Le]g. VIII [Hispana]'. It may be at least equally possible to read 'CVIII' and the reference will then be to this cohort. An altar at Weissenburg (*C.I.L.* iii. 11918)—perhaps the earliest quarters of the cohort in Raetia—is inscribed 'Coh. IX Ba. eq. mil. EXPB.' The last letters are explained by Mommsen as 'Ex provincia Belgica.' But the Batavi were in Lower Germany, not in Belgica; in any case the tribe-name was sufficient indication of origin—the province was never added; while the garrison-province was often specified. Hence B = Britannia, almost certainly.

These, then, were the four cohorts at Mons Graupius—each a thousand strong. As for the remaining Cohors I Batavorum (quingenaria): it can be traced only in Britain, from 124 onwards. It may have been with Agricola, as Cichorius thinks: the reading 'quattuor' does not exclude the possibility that there was a fifth troop elsewhere in garrison. But it is more probable that this cohort, belonging to a distinct levy as its number shows, was raised and sent to Britain after the withdrawal of the other four cohorts by Domitian; there would scarcely be two Cohortes I Batavorum in the same province.

Besides the cohorts, there was one Ala Batavorum in Britain. Tacitus implies its presence at the attack on Mona by Agricola. Though 'cohortes equitae' might possibly be alluded to, the description 'lectissimi auxiliarium' (since horsemen were more select troops than the footmen of the cohorts), the mention of horses, and the speed of the operations make an ala almost certain; the reference to skill in fording and swimming fits only the Batavi. The ala in question was of course not that which revolted in 69 (*Tac. H.* iv. 18) but the

Ala I Batavorum miliaria, which can be traced in Pannonia (*C.I.L.* iii. 11372) and then in Dacia in the second century. Like the three cohorts it was raised for service in Britain by Cerialis, and returned with them to the continent. Its presence at Mona would be an incidental confirmation of the view that the Legio II Adiutrix was then quartered at Deva.

The Cohortes I, II, and III miliariae may have taken the place of six 'quingenariae' in the original series, although the ninth was 'miliaria'; for though the auxilia in Britain (contrary to the general rule) probably outnumbered the legions, yet 8,000 foot with a proportion of alae would be too large a quota for one legion. If the disbanded ala was quingenaria, we have a total new levy by Cerialis of 4,000 men; inclusive of 1,000 old troops undischarged, 5,000 in all, against at least 5,500 before 70. A decrease would not be surprising, because of the losses in the war; but even the decrease indicated was made good as we have seen before the end of the century.

V.—THE DATE OF AGRICOLA'S GOVERNORSHIP.

Most authorities agree in dating Agricola's command 78–85; only Asbach and Gsell argue for 77–84. The probabilities appear to be much in favour of the minority. It is true that Gsell's argument, that the British success whereby Titus won his 15th salutation as 'imperator' in the autumn of 79 (*Dio*, 66, 20; *Chambalu, de magistratibus Flaviorum*, p. 24) must have been in the third campaign, is not convincing; for Tacitus' narrative shows that the second campaign was at least equally successful, and indeed few years passed without at least one victory that was so signalised. But the chronological indications of Tacitus (*Agricola* 9, 18, 39), though vague, in each case more naturally support the earlier date. Why should Agricola's departure have been delayed by his daughter's marriage or by the ceremonial duties of the pontificate, rather than to complete his consulship, the one qualification he lacked? He had been selected at least by popular rumour months before. Can 'praepositus' imply designation only, and was delay in taking up the command usual? 'Media iam aetate transgressus' implies only that the government was usually transferred earlier in the year, as was probably the case with Cerialis and Frontinus; 'nuper' refers more usually to an interval of a few weeks than of a whole

year. It is admitted that the consulship was in 77; would not a man of Agricola's importance, with such a command in prospect, have followed immediately the imperial 'consules ordinarii' of the year, and have held office in May and June? With the other view, in order to shorten the interval before midsummer 78, the consulship is usually placed late in the year. Frontinus' command is thus lengthened a year beyond the usual 3-years' term, and as we have seen there was no emergency to make that probable. Liebenam was led by the corrupt text of Tacitus to suppose an unknown governor between Cerialis and Frontinus, and consequently to date the latter 76-78; and he is followed by the Prosopographia. But his view was never probable, and the Codex Toletanus is decisive against it. Mr. Furneaux says 'A strong argument against the earlier date is furnished by the episode of the Usipi, which would thus have to be placed in 82, a year too soon.' Now even if the Usipi were conquered only in 83, the shortness of the time occupied in their conquest, conscription, despatch to Britain, and escape would be very remarkable. The main portion at least of the Usipi were still north of the Ruhr and on the lower Rhine (cf. Furneaux on Tac. *Germ.* 32, 1, and his map). Their submission therefore had no connexion with the war of 83 in Upper Germany: rather were they subdued by Rutilius Gallicus at the end of Vespasian's reign (cf. III. *supra*, p. 399).

Lastly, the earlier date, as we shall see, suits better the changes of imperial policy with regard to Ireland.

VI.—THE INVASION OF IRELAND.

Without entering upon a full-length discussion of the vexed passage in the *Agricola*, the beginning of c. 24, a few points may here be noted. In c. 23, which must be read in close connexion, do not the words 'inventus in ipsa Britannia (in Britain proper) terminus' imply the completion of one task to prepare for the beginning of another? In the campaign of 79 the army had suffered much from stress of weather (c. 22, 1); the Romans had never been in such high latitudes before, and it might well have seemed that further advance into the barren Highlands was useless. The new emperor Titus saw a way to win for his reign a distinctive renown, and the conquest of Ireland was planned instead; to prepare for it the summer of 80 was spent in quiet consolidation, and the line of the Forth was

fortified as a permanent limit of the Empire.

Where, then, were the 'ignotae gentes' attacked in 81? Not beyond the 'terminus,' unless Tacitus is to contradict himself; and why should Agricola have gone by sea at all, when only a small circuit at most would have been necessary, and the new frontier forts would have furnished a ready base? Roman generals were no lovers of the sea. If we look for the tribes south of the 'terminus,' we are met by the words 'omnis propior sinus tenebatur' of c. 23; there were no unknown tribes there. Thus by process of exclusion we are forced to look for them in the North of Ireland. This view is further supported, as Professor Gudeman notes, by the transitional words 'in aliam insulam' at the end of c. 23—though Mr. Haverfield thinks the point too subtle—and by the presumption (for it is not an absolute rule, as Pfizner would have it) that the 'que' in the second sentence of c. 24, where Hibernia is mentioned, implies a close connexion of thought and fact with the first. Thus the location of the 'ignotae gentes' becomes almost certain, even though Tacitus does not name Ireland. His carelessness can be paralleled even from the *Agricola*: in c. 7, 5 there is no mention of Britannia, where clearness would have required it; the reference becomes clear only from c. 8.

'Arma quidem ultra

Litora Iubernae promovimus et modo captas
Orcadas et minima contentos nocte Britan-
nos.'

So writes Juvenal; why should a sentence true to fact in two clauses be merely 'rhetorical' in a third? If Juvenal himself commanded the Cohors I Delmatarum at Uxellodunum in Cumberland, he would be well informed. As to that point, certainty is beyond our reach, as Mr. Duff says; but at least the difficulty raised by Cichorius is not conclusive. He argues that Juvenal could not have commanded in Britain since according to the inscription of Aquinum he was trib(unus), and all the cohortes Delmatarum in Britain were quingenariae and under praefecti. But the reading 'trib.' in the Corpus is not so certain as to exclude the possibility of 'praef.' However that may be, in view of the way in which Juvenal couples the Orkneys and Ireland, Tacitus' record of the discovery and 'conquest' of the Orkneys, 'unknown up to that time' shows a remarkable resemblance in phrase to the sentence in dispute (*Ag.* 10, 5.) It is

natural to suppose that he also coupled the two 'conquests,' and that a similarity of circumstance suggested the echo in the language.

Agricola, therefore, in 81 made a tentative movement, a reconnaissance in force, to Ireland. But the death of Titus in September removed the chief supporter of the design. Domitian had not his father's or his brother's personal interest in Britain; and when the next year brought with it the fear of a rising of all Caledonia he had a ready pretext, if he was lukewarm, for deferring the Irish project.

The text of Tacitus may be corrupt; but the Codex Toletanus brings no new light. May we hope anything from the newly found Codex Anconensis?

ADDENDUM.

With regard to the inscription discussed in note I, parallel cases can be quoted, as Mr. Haverfield reminds me, of eastern officers in western legions at least after the early empire. If then, as he thinks possible, the inscription is to be dated about 200 A.D., the improbability of the attribution to Lindus is to that extent lessened; though western officers must always have been the rule in legions whose rank and file at least were almost exclusively western also. But

the improbability is increased in another direction. Rhodes, long decaying while the rest of Asia prospered, had suffered a final blow from which it never recovered—the great earthquake of 155 A.D. (Cf. Van Gelder, *Gesch. der Rhodier*, p. 174 ff.) The dependent town of Lindus was still less likely to produce a Marcus Minicius Martialis after that; while Lindum presumably was then well established. It may be added that *C.I.L.* vii. 187 records a veteran of the Legio XIV at Lindum. Since that legion left Britain only in 68, and after a short stay at Moguntiacum was permanently in distant Pannonia from about 100, it is not unreasonable to assume that the inscription is of the first century; the veteran would thus be one of the 'senes' referred to by Calgacus.

Mr. Haverfield informs me that the genuineness of the Camelon inscription (note II) is doubtful. I subjoin a more accurate text, which he has kindly sent me.

M I L I T E
S · L · Π · A
D I E
V I R T
· L · M

R. KNOX M^cELDERRY.

Queen's College, Galway.

STUDIES OF LATIN WORDS IN -cinio-, -cinia-.

III.—*mantiscinatur*.

The authority for this word is *Capt.* 896, with the following context:

nam filium

873 tuom modo in portu Philopolemum
uiuom, saluom et sospitem
uidi in publica celoce.

891 di immortales, iterum gnatus videor si
uera autumas.
: : ain tu? dubium habebis etiam, sancte
quom ego iurem tibi?
postremo, Hegio, si parua iuri iurandost
fides
uise ad portum. : : facere certumst, tu
intus cura quod opus est.

895 sume, posce, prome quid uis, te facio
cellarium.
: : nam hercle, nisi mantiscinatus probe
ero, fusti pectito.
: : aeternum tibi dapinabo uictum, si
uera autumas.

NO. CXLIV. VOL. XVIII.

Morris, in his note on this verse, renders *nisi mantiscinatus probe ero* by 'if I do not make good provision.' It is not clear to me whether by 'good provision' he means to give an equivocal sense to *mantiscinatus* or not. Certainly Plasberg (*Rhein. Mus.* 36, 738) suggests no equivocal, but derives *mantiscinatus* from *mantisa* which, after Sabbadini, he defines by 'sauce': whence *mantiscinatus* means 'sauce-maker.' As to *mantisa*, I have no opinion to advance, but Plasberg has contributed to the solution of the difficulty raised by Ussing and echoed by Schoell, relative to the interpretation of *mantiscinatus*. That it's plain and evident sense here is 'play the *μάρτυς*' seems to me clear from Hegio's *si uera autumas* in 891 and 897, but there is an equivocal on *μάρτυς*. The well-fed gourmet priest is still in evidence in the world; and even the frugal itinerant minister of our plain Southern

H H