

## I.

## MARCUS COCCEIUS FIRMUS: AN EPIGRAPHIC STUDY.

BY ERIC BIRLEY, M.A., F.S.A., F.S.A.Scot.

One of the most striking discoveries ever made in Roman Scotland was that of May 1771, when workmen engaged in the construction of the Forth and Clyde Canal dug into a rubbish-pit a short distance south of the fort at Auchendavy on the Antonine Vallum, and found in it, besides two huge iron mallets and a battered relief, four complete altars and a fragment from a fifth.<sup>1</sup> Occasionally there have been groups of altars found within a short time, and close together, in somewhat similar circumstances, in Britain—for example, there is the fine series that came to light at Maryport, in Cumberland, sixty years or so ago;<sup>2</sup> but in this case the interest of the find was enhanced by the fact that the four complete altars, and probably the fifth as well, had all been dedicated by the same man, Marcus Cocceius Firmus, centurion of the second legion Augusta, to as many as twelve different deities. Comment has been made, more than once, on the catholicity of his religion, and on the exceptionally large number of gods and goddesses that he thought fit to honour; and it was with this aspect of the Auchendavy altars in mind that Stuart, in his *Caledonia Romana*,<sup>3</sup> wrote: "All things considered, the antiquary has reason to feel not a little grateful to Cocceius Firmus for the considerable addition which he has been the means of making to the Roman antiquities of Scotland." The point is one to which we must return presently, for it appears that just this combination of deities is capable of throwing considerable light on his previous career; but in the first instance I desire to draw attention to another place where a centurion Cocceius Firmus is referred to.

I. *The Digest*.—In the forty-ninth book of Justinian's Digest of Roman Law, chapter xv. deals with *postliminium*, the restoration of legal rights to Roman citizens who escaped from captivity among enemies; the sixth section is an extract from the first book *Ex variis lectionibus* of Sextus Pomponius, the eminent jurist of the second century, who began writing as early as Hadrian's time, though his *floruit* can be

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Macdonald, *The Roman Wall in Scotland*, 2nd ed., 1934, pp. 287-8, 427-31.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Lapidarium Septentrionale*, 1875, p. 429.

<sup>3</sup> 2nd ed., 1852, p. 331.

shown to fall under Marcus Aurelius.<sup>1</sup> In it he quoted a specific case, as the Roman jurists often did: *Mulier in opus salinarum ob maleficium data et deinde a latrunculis exteræ gentis capta et iure commercii vendita ac redempta in causam suam reccidit. Cocceio autem Firmo centurioni pretium ex fisco reddendum est*—that is to say, “A woman condemned, for a crime, to hard labour in the salt-works, was subsequently captured by bandits of an alien race; in the course of lawful trade she was sold, and by repurchase returned to her original condition. The purchase-price had to be refunded from the Imperial Treasury to the centurion Cocceius Firmus.” Before we consider the question of identification that at once suggests itself, it will be convenient if we dispose of the legal points involved, as we are enabled to do by other passages in the Digest.

1. I. xviii. 6, 8 (Ulpian): *qui universas provincias regunt, ius gladii habent et in metallum dandi potestas eis permissa est*—“Governors of whole provinces have the right to inflict sentence of death, and they are allowed the power of condemnation to the mines.” *Provinciam regere* is not an uncommon expression; compare Tacitus, *Histories*, iv. 74, the speech of Petilius Cerialis to the Treveri and Lingones in A.D. 70, and the inscription of A.D. 225 from Greatchesters on Hadrian’s Wall, CIL, vii. 732. The distinction is between senatorial *legati Augusti pro prætore* and equestrian *præsides* on the one hand, in whom the powers of chief justice, governor-general and commander-in-chief were vested, and subordinate *legati* or *procuratores*, to whom under the governor the immediate charge over a division of a province, or some branch of the administration of it, might be entrusted; such subordinates were competent to deputise for the governor in the majority of his functions, but not in cases for which death or penal servitude might be inflicted.

2. XLVIII. xix. 8 (Ulpian): *in ministerium metallicorum feminæ in perpetuum vel ad tempus damnari solent. simili modo in salinas*—“It is usual to condemn women, whether for life or for a term, to wait upon the convicts in the mines, and similarly to the salt-works.” The convicts were assigned work according to their capacity: the men to act as miners, the women to cook for them and the like.

3. *Ibidem*: *damnatus servus . . . eius remanet cuius fuit antequam damnaretur*—“A slave so condemned remains the property of the man who owned him before his condemnation.” That is to say, on the completion of a term of hard labour, slaves were to be returned to their original owners; but the provision could not apply, for obvious reasons, in the case of a life sentence.

<sup>1</sup> *Prosopographia Imperii Romani*, iii., 1898, p. 74, P 521, and the references there cited.

4. XLIX. xv. 5 (Pomponius): *in pace . . . si cum gente aliqua neque amicitiam neque hospitium neque fœdus amicitiae causa factum habemus, hi hostes quidem non sunt, quod autem ex nostro ad eos pervenit illorum fit, et liber homo noster ab eis captus servus fit [et] eorum*—"In time of peace, a race with whom we have neither friendship nor hospitality nor treaty of friendship are not indeed enemies, but property of ours that reaches them becomes theirs, and a free citizen of ours, if captured by them, becomes their slave." Here the status of the *extera gens* is clearly defined; and we shall see that it has an important bearing on the scene of the kidnapping, that the *latrunculi* came from such a people. The status of *latrunculi*, as opposed to *hostes*, is defined in the next passage.

5. XLIX. xv. 24 (Ulpian): *hostes sunt, quibus bellum publice populus Romanus decrevit vel ipsi populo Romano: ceteri latrunculi vel prædones appellantur. et ideo qui a latronibus captus est, servus latronum non est . . . ab hostibus autem captus, ut puta a Germanis et Parthis, et servus est hostium et postliminio statum pristinum recuperat*—"Enemies are those on whom the Roman people has formally declared war, or who have themselves declared war on the Roman people; the rest are described as bandits or robbers. For that reason, a man captured by brigands is not their slave . . . but a man captured by enemies, for example by Germans or Parthians, is their slave, and can recover his original status by the right of *postliminium*." Here external enemies are contrasted with bandits, who may be internal or, as in the case quoted by Pomponius that has prompted this inquiry, external.

From these passages it appears that the woman was a slave who, for some crime (of what kind we cannot say), had been condemned to a term of hard labour by the governor of the province in which she and her master were living; while at some salt-works, to which she had been sent to serve her sentence, she was abducted by bandits from across the frontier; by them she was sold, presumably to slave-dealers, and in due course her owner, the centurion Cocceius Firmus, had the good fortune to be able to buy her back. Finally, the Imperial Treasury was called upon, after litigation that brought the case to the notice of Pomponius and so preserved the story for us, to refund the purchase money to him. We must infer that the authorities of the salt-works were responsible for her safe custody, for the term of her sentence, and for returning her to her owner after it had expired; and that it was held to be through their negligence that she had left their custody, and Cocceius Firmus had been compelled to buy her back.

II. *The Question of Identity*.—To students of Roman prosopography it is well known that even the most plausible-looking identification,

of two instances of the same names occurring in conjunction, as referring to one and the same man, must be treated with reserve; for in many cases, even though the names are not common ones, the difference in the walks of life in which two instances occur is sufficient to preclude assumption of identity. It will be convenient to give some examples:

1. Four of the altars from Maryport are dedications to Jupiter Best and Greatest by a tribune of *cohors I Hispanorum*, Gaius Caballius Priscus; on three of them his *prænomen* is abbreviated in the usual way, C.,<sup>1</sup> while on the fourth the less common abbreviation G. is employed.<sup>2</sup> Now a man of the same names occurs on two inscriptions from Rome, with his *prænomen* abbreviated once in each way, as a private in the first prætorian cohort;<sup>3</sup> but before the third century (and both instances are unquestionably earlier than that) promotion from the ranks of the prætorian guard did not lead to the tribunate of an auxiliary cohort, which stood to one side of the path, reaching up to the leading prefectures, open to *viri militares*: so that the two men could not have been identical, even if one of the inscriptions from Rome had not been the tombstone of that Caballius Priscus. In that case we may assume a family connection; the prætorian set up the other inscription to the memory of a dead comrade whose home was at Verona, and we may take it that he, and the tribune at Maryport as well, belonged to that place or its neighbourhood; but more than that we cannot assume.

2. More plausible, but equally untenable, is the identification proposed by Haverfield,<sup>4</sup> between Lucius Tanicius Verus, prefect of an unnamed cohort, who set up an altar to Silvanus at Cadder,<sup>5</sup> and a man of the same names (with the added particulars that his father's *prænomen* was likewise Lucius, his tribe the Voltinian, and his place of origin Vienna—that is to say, the modern Vienne, in Gallia Narbonensis) who, as centurion of the third legion Cyrenaica, paid several visits to the statue of Memnon at Karnak in A.D. 80 and the following year.<sup>6</sup> The *nomen* is indeed excessively rare, as Haverfield observed, though we may add an instance of it that the faulty indexing of the *Année Epigraphique* caused him to miss—Lucius Tanicius Zosimus, who with his family set up an altar in Moesia to a local deity;<sup>7</sup> but the two walks of life are incompatible with the assumption of identity. In

<sup>1</sup> CIL, vii. 374–6.

<sup>2</sup> *Ephemeris Epigraphica*, vii. 970.

<sup>3</sup> CIL, vi. 3888–9.

<sup>4</sup> *Proc. Soc. Ant. Scot.*, vol. lii., 1917–18, pp. 178–80.

<sup>5</sup> CIL, vii. 1124, with Haverfield's correction, *loc. cit.*

<sup>6</sup> Dessau, ILS 8759<sup>b</sup> = CIL, iii. 34.

<sup>7</sup> *Année Epigraphique*, 1908, No. 137.

the period before the equestrian military career was revised by Claudius, the prefecture of a cohort was not infrequently entrusted to a former centurion, or even to a veteran private;<sup>1</sup> and we find the same system of promotion in force again in the third century,<sup>2</sup> when fresh avenues of promotion were sought for tried soldiers. But in the intervening period there does not seem to be a single instance of that practice; in order to maintain the prestige of the cohort-prefecture, now a regular part of the equestrian military career, when there was no suitable equestrian prefect available, a cohort was placed under the charge of a centurion seconded for the purpose, with the title of *præpositus*.<sup>3</sup> For that reason I do not think that we can retain Haverfield's identification, attractive though it seems at first sight; we must rather assume, as Mr John Clarke has suggested, that the prefect at Cadder was, for example, a grandson of the centurion in Egypt.<sup>4</sup>

3. Statilius Taurus, centurion of the second legion Traiana in Egypt, and acting commander of *cohors I Flavia Cilicum equitata*, in the time of Pius,<sup>5</sup> cannot be equated with the Titus Statilius Taurus whose full equestrian military career, following on the common preliminary post of *præfectus fabrum*, is given on an inscription from Mainz;<sup>6</sup> and though there was no doubt some connection, we cannot say what the connection was between one or other of these men and the senatorial family,

<sup>1</sup> One instance of each type of promotion will suffice here. (1) Dessau, ILS 2684 (near Præneste): *Sex. Iulius S.f. Pol. Rufus, evocatus divi Augusti, præfectus I cohortis Corsorum et civitatum Barbarica in Sardinia*: this is a time-expired prætorian, given further employment as commander of a cohort. (2) Dessau, ILS 9090 (Aquilaia): *Q. Etruvius Sex. f. Vol. Capreolus, domo Vienna, miles leg. IIII Scyt. ann. IIII, eques ann. X, cent. ann. XXI, præf. coh. II Thrac. in Germ. ann. V . . .*: this instance, of a centurion promoted to the same rank, is not directly dated, but the cohort has left no traces in Germany, and was presumably transferred to Britain at the time of the Claudian invasion. As a warning to prosopographers, Dessau notes that another man, with the same rare names, is recorded on an inscription from Salonæ in Dalmatia (CIL, iii. 9052): he is shown to be different, for his tribe is *Tromentina*, not *Vollinia*.

<sup>2</sup> For example, an inscription from Sirmium, dated A.D. 212 (CIL, iii. 3237): . . .] *Aug. coh. I Camp. Vol. C. R. Antoniniane, cura agente P. Ael. Valerio trib(uno) ex vet(erano) . . .*

<sup>3</sup> The practice is so well attested that references are hardly required here, but the Scottish examples, CIL, vii. 1084 (from Cramond), and 1092 (from Rough Castle), may be noted, though the title is not specified on either inscription; cf. also Tacitus *Agricola*, 28, a centurion acting as commander of the *cohors Usiporum*.

<sup>4</sup> *The Roman Fort at Cadder*, 1933, pp. 3-4. It must be noted that one argument, advanced incidentally by Mr Clarke, has less weight than he would seem to give it: "Tanicius does not seem to have been a primipilus as we should rather have expected him to be before he obtained such a promotion." In the period when the commands of auxiliary regiments were still open to such men, cohorts were often entrusted, as we have seen, to men who had never reached the rank of *primus pilus*; *primipilares*, indeed, were commonly advanced to the command not of a cohort but of an *ala*: cf. Baehr, *De Centurionibus Legionariis*, Diss. Berlin, 1900, p. 11; the latest recorded instance seems to be Dessau, ILS 2544, during the Jewish war in the closing years of Nero. *Primipilares*, as *equites Romani* by promotion, thus remained eligible for such posts slightly longer than ordinary centurions or veteran private.

<sup>5</sup> Dessau, ILS 2615, from Syene.

<sup>6</sup> CIL, xiii. 6817.

prominent in the first two centuries of the Empire, in which the names Titus Statilius Taurus recur time and again.<sup>1</sup>

Even where the ranks recorded are the same, or are compatible with a single career, it is essential to show identity of period, and if possible identity of place, in order to obtain probability for a proposed identification. In the case of the two Coccei Firmi, identity of period seems reasonably certain. The altars from Auchendavy cannot well be earlier than the advance under Lollius Urbicus,<sup>2</sup> and if the current view as to the duration of the occupation inaugurated by that advance is correct, they will not be later than the early years of Commodus;<sup>3</sup> and the case quoted by Pomponius must be contemporary with his active career (as an examination of the similar cases quoted in the Digest shows), which, as we have seen, extended well into the time of Marcus Aurelius. The identity of rank is not in question; but it remains to be seen whether we can establish identity of place. In order to do that, it will be necessary to return to the passage in the Digest, and consider where the salt-works were situated.

III. *The Situation of the Salt-Works.*—Two points seem sufficiently clear, in the light of the evidence discussed above. The salt-works were in a province beyond the frontier of which there were tribes owing no sort of allegiance to Rome; and they were near enough to the frontier to be exposed to chance raids by such tribes. There were few provinces in which the necessary conditions could be found in conjunction. We must leave out of account the whole of the eastern frontier of the Empire; beyond it were organised kingdoms, enemies in time of war often enough, in time of peace in treaty relationship with Rome. Along the southern frontier there were tribes ready enough to raid, but salt-works were not likely to be found on the edge of the deserts, when the coasts provided such plentiful supplies; and where raiders came within reach of the coast, at Sala on the Atlantic coast of Mauretania Tingitana,<sup>4</sup> there was no opportunity to find a serving centurion, for the province was a procuratorial one, with no legionary garrison. Across the Rhine and Danube frontiers, the majority of the tribes were in some sort of treaty relationship with Rome in this period;<sup>5</sup> there were elaborate arrangements for the guarding of the frontier, though bandits could on occasions find their way through, and Commodus, as a well-known

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Prosop. Imp. Rom.*, iii. p. 266, T 619.

<sup>2</sup> For the date of his governorship, cf. my note, *Eine neue Inschrift von Corstolpitem in Germania* 20, 1936, pp. 21–5.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Macdonald, *op. cit.*, p. 482.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. the long and valuable inscription from Chellah, *Année Epigraphique*, 1931, Nos. 36, 38.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Klose, *Roms Klientel-Randstaaten am Rhein und an der Donau*, Breslau, 1934.

series of inscriptions tells us, had to take measures to stop them;<sup>1</sup> and, though salt was certainly produced here and there, there do not seem to have been salt-works.<sup>2</sup> There are, indeed, only two provinces in which it seems that the necessary conditions might be found—Dacia and Britain. In each case the frontier system was in places less elaborate: the Dacian *limes* was not continuous,<sup>3</sup> and to the north of the Antonine Vallum there was a tract, corresponding approximately to the later Kingdom of Fife, bounded only by the road to Inchtuthil, whose chain of forts and signal-towers offered no such serious obstacle to raiders as the closely guarded Vallum. In each case there were restive tribesmen across the frontier, always liable to raid, but seldom causing enough trouble to warrant a campaign against them. But Dacia must be ruled out, even though there were salt-works there;<sup>4</sup> for in that province, as we learn from two or three inscriptions,<sup>5</sup> the salt was not worked directly by the State. Instead, it was worked by private contractors who, we must suppose, would hire free labourers or employ slaves; we can hardly entertain the notion that a convict, for whose return to her original owner the State was responsible, would be placed at the disposal of a contractor for the term of her sentence. It seems reasonable, therefore, to suppose that the story belongs to the early annals of Britain, where we have no evidence for the working of salt by contract, and where we have a centurion of the same names recorded; and with the conjunction of time, rank, and place we will be justified in identifying Cocceius Firmus of the Digest with Marcus Cocceius Firmus of Auchendavy. But before we return to consider him once more, it will be desirable to pay some attention to the particular situation of the salt-works.

The geographer Ptolemy gives *Salinæ*, "Salt-works," as a place in the land of the British tribe of the Catuvellauni—if we can trust the accuracy of the recorded position, somewhere in the neighbourhood of Boston in Lincolnshire;<sup>6</sup> and the same not uncommon place-name occurs twice in the Ravenna List, first following Corinium (Cirencester),

<sup>1</sup> Dessau, ILS 8913, 395, and several other instances.

<sup>2</sup> The working of salt in the Roman period seems to have left fewer traces than that of pre-Roman times; for the Rhineland, cf. Schumacher, *Siedelungs- und Kulturgeschichte der Rheinlande von er Urzeit bis in das Mittelalter*, ii. (*Die römische Periode*), 1923, pp. 258-9. Blümner's article in Pauly-Wissowa, i. A, 2075-99, is of little help.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Fabricius, art. *Limes* in Pauly-Wissowa, xiii., cols. 641-5.

<sup>4</sup> Pauly-Wissowa, i. A, 1902, gives full references for the Dacian place *Salinæ*, twelve miles from Potaissa, by the salt-works of Maros-Ujvar.

<sup>5</sup> CIL, iii. 1209 = Dessau, ILS 7147 (Apulum), 1363 (Veczel); *Année Epigraphique*, 1930, No. 10 (Domnesti); Rostowzew, *Geschichte der Staatspacht*, 1902, pp. 411-4, generalises from the evidence of the first two of these, but it seems questionable whether he is justified in doing so.

<sup>6</sup> So Haverfield in Pauly-Wissowa, i. A, col. 1902.

and again between Derventio and Condate, applied to places that we may identify as Droitwich in Worcestershire, and Northwich or somewhere thereabouts in Cheshire;<sup>1</sup> but these places are all too far away from the northern frontier, and bandits of an alien race, to come into question. We must look farther north, and for salt-works of a different kind.

The production of salt by evaporation from sea-water, no less than by mining, was well known to the Romans; the process is described in some detail by the elder Pliny, in the thirty-first book of his *Natural History*,<sup>2</sup> from which extracts may be quoted in Philemon Holland's version:<sup>3</sup> "As touching salt artificiall, made by mans hand, there be many kinds thereof. Our common salt, and whereof we have greatest store, is wrought in this manner: First they let into their pits a quantitie of sea-water, suffering fresh water to run into it by certaine gutters, for to bee mingled therewith for to helpe it to congeale, whereto a good shower of raine availeth very much, but above all the Sunne shining thereupon, for otherwise it will never drie and harden. . . . In Fraunce and Germanie the manner is when they would make salt, to cast sea-water into the fire as the wood burneth. . . . But those verely of France and Germanie be of opinion, that it skilleth much what wood it is that serveth to the making of such fire. Oke they hold the best, as being a fewell, the simple ashes whereof mixed with nothing else, may goe for salt. And yet in some places they esteeme Hazell wood meeter for this purpose. Now when the said wood is on fire and burning, they poure salt liquor among, whereby not only the ashes but the very coales also will turne to bee salt. . . . There is no salt but raine water will make it sweet & fresh. The more pleasant it will bee and delicat to the tast, in case the deaw fall thereupon: but North-east winds engender most plentie thereof." In the light of this account, we may picture the conditions that guided a choice of a site for coastal salt-works; there must be a plentiful supply of fresh water (though in Crete "the salt is made in the like pits, but of sea-water onely, without letting in any fresh water at all"), as well as suitable wood for the fires, at least in the northern districts where that method was practised; and a place exposed to north-east winds could be accounted particularly well suited. Such conditions clearly obtained on the Fifeshire coast, where indeed salt is still produced to-day, I believe; and though there have not been traces noted of Roman workings, that is not to say that none existed.

<sup>1</sup> *Geogr. Rav.*, 427, 429.

<sup>2</sup> xxxi. 73-92.

<sup>3</sup> *The Historie of the World, commonly called the Naturall Historie of C. Plinius Secundus*, London, 1601: *The second Tome*, pp. 414-7.



So far as I am aware, none have been sought for; and indeed, the tract north of the Vallum and east of the road to Inchtuthil seems to have received less attention from the students of Roman Scotland than its interest warrants. That road can only be explained, as far as the Antonine occupation is concerned, as a frontier enclosing the Fifeshire peninsula within the province; and it seems desirable to direct attention to the point, in the hope that an answer may be found to the question, for what reason it was considered desirable for it to be included. The Romans worked mineral coal in the region of Hadrian's Wall, but it was never important enough to warrant the occupation of the Fifeshire coalfield. But we cannot pursue that subject further now.

To sum up: conditions on the Fifeshire coast were eminently suitable for the production of salt; and in Fifeshire alone were bandits from across the frontier likely, without serious difficulty, to be able to raid salt-works and get away in safety, back across the frontier again. And if the salt-works were indeed there, we may suppose that the slave-woman's crime was committed while her master was at Auchendavy; that will explain why she was sent to serve her sentence there, rather than in the Mendip lead-mines or some place nearer to the second legion's headquarters at Caerleon.

IV. *The Dedications at Auchendavy.*— Let us now return to the Auchendavy altars, and see whether they are capable of throwing further light on their dedicator. The list of deities is a striking one, not merely for the large number, but for the variety of gods and goddesses that are mentioned. Taking the altars in the order in which they appear in the Corpus of Latin Inscriptions, the first <sup>1</sup> is in honour of Jupiter Best and Greatest, the special patron of the Emperor, the Empire as a whole and the army in particular; <sup>2</sup> and coupled with him is "Victorious Victory" (a pleonasm that reminds us of the "Military Mars" of a couple of altars from Maryport <sup>3</sup>), a description of that goddess that appears to be without a parallel. The next altar <sup>4</sup> seems at first sight to be dedicated to two other proper Roman deities, Diana and Apolli; but, as Domaszewski has shown, <sup>5</sup> when they occur in this order these are really the chief deities of Thrace and the neighbouring provinces, cloaked in the guise of their nearest Roman counterparts. The third altar, to the Genius of the Land of Britain, <sup>6</sup> is an example of the

<sup>1</sup> CIL, vii. 1111.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Domaszewski, *Die Religion des r. Heeres*, 1895, p. 22 *et seq.*

<sup>3</sup> CIL, vii. 390-1; for dedications to the same Mars in Germany, cf. Riese, *Das rheinische Germanien in den antiken Inschriften*, 1914, Nos. 3054-6.

<sup>4</sup> CIL, vii. 1112.

<sup>5</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 53.

<sup>6</sup> CIL, vii. 1113.

customary tribute that piety paid to the presiding divinity of the place or sphere in which one's lot was cast; <sup>1</sup> we will return to it later; and the fourth is the most comprehensive of the lot, set up in honour of Mars and Minerva, the *Campestres*, Hercules, Epona, and Victory—the latter this time appearing without any special title.<sup>2</sup> Mars and Minerva are familiar figures in the Roman Pantheon; the former was worshipped throughout the army, as was only natural,<sup>3</sup> whilst the latter found special favour among those grades which were open in particular to men of some education;<sup>4</sup> and Victory was naturally the object of universal worship in the Roman army, which obtained it so frequently. But the other deities are in a rather different category. It was not until the closing years of the second century that Hercules became the object of general worship in the army, and then it was because of his equation with the German Donar, as has been demonstrated by Domaszewski,<sup>5</sup> and the increasing prominence of Germans in the military service. Before that time there is only one quarter in which he is to be found regularly—on the dedications of the *equites singulares* in Rome, to which we must turn presently. Epona and the *Campestres* are in a special category, as the patrons of mounted men. Epona was the goddess of horses; she, too, was widely worshipped, particularly by Celts. Indeed, it has been suggested that she was Celtic in origin,<sup>6</sup> but her cult spread widely throughout the Empire—for example, we meet it in Thessaly, in Apuleius's novel *The Golden Ass* <sup>7</sup>—and it seems safest to leave the question of her origin open;<sup>8</sup> she was worshipped by muleteers and ostlers as well as by cavalry-troopers or even legionaries. In contrast to her the *Campestres* had a strictly limited sphere of influence; we meet with them only on altars set up by mounted men of the auxiliary arm, in cavalry regiments or in the many infantry regiments that included a proportion of horse; they were the deities who presided over the parade-ground or riding-school where, often enough, a temple was set up in their honour, as by the *ala I Asturum* at Benwell, on Hadrian's Wall, in A.D. 238.<sup>9</sup> They were Gallic in origin—like the drill-words to which Arrian refers,<sup>10</sup> an indication that the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. especially Macdonald, *op. cit.*, p. 430.

<sup>2</sup> CIL, vii. 1114.

<sup>3</sup> Domaszewski, *op. cit.*, pp. 4, 33 *et seq.*

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 29; Vegetius, *Epit. rei milit.*, ii. 20, etc.

<sup>5</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 7, 46 *et al.*

<sup>6</sup> So Macdonald, *op. cit.*, p. 429.

<sup>7</sup> iii. 27.

<sup>8</sup> For a full discussion, cf. Keune, art. *Epona* in Pauly-Wissowa, vi. cols. 228–43.

<sup>9</sup> CIL, vii. 510; Domaszewski, *op. cit.*, pp. 50–1.

<sup>10</sup> *Tactica*, 33.

auxiliary cavalry of the Empire was mainly raised, at first, in Gaul<sup>1</sup>—but there do not seem to be any dedications to them by civilians even in Gaul. The last of the altars, on which the dedicator's name is not preserved, is to Silvanus:<sup>2</sup> that rustic Roman god who achieved widespread popularity in many parts of the Empire—in Britain, for example, he is equated with the war-god of North Cumberland, Cocidius<sup>3</sup>—but above all in Illyricum; there, as Domaszewski showed, his name was given to a native deity, and it is from the Danube lands that three-quarters of the dedications to Silvanus come.<sup>4</sup> To sum up: the list includes a number of genuine Roman deities, though not so many as one might think at first sight; but there are others which seem to suggest a connection with the auxiliary cavalry, or with the provinces along the Danube.

“The cult of such an array of gods and goddesses passes the limits of what we should look for, even from the most catholic-minded of private individuals”—such is Sir George Macdonald's comment, at the close of his illuminating discussion of the Auchendavy altars; and he suggests that they were intended as official dedications, by Cocceius Firmus acting on behalf of the auxiliary regiment or detachment of legionaries whom he may be supposed to have commanded at that fort.<sup>5</sup> But it does not seem likely that on an official dedication the name of the body, on whose behalf the dedication was made, would be omitted; we must ascribe the selection of this group of deities to Cocceius Firmus, and see whether it has anything to tell us of the man.

Dedications to groups of deities are not uncommon, though the groups are seldom as large as this; and it is usually possible to discover the reason that prompted the dedicator to make his particular selection. Thus, Marcus Rubrius Zosimus of Ostia, the regimental doctor of *cohors IIII Aquitanorum* at Obernburg in Upper Germany, thanks Jupiter Best and Greatest, Apollo, Æsculapius, Salus and Fortuna for the health of the cohort's prefect, Lucius Petronius Florentinus;<sup>6</sup> here we have the healing deities, whose co-operation was no less important than medical skill in effecting a cure. Again, Gaius Cornelius Peregrinus from Mauretania, tribune of a cohort at Maryport, dedicating to the Genius of the place, Fortune who leads men home, eternal Rome and

<sup>1</sup> Cheesman, *Auxilia of the Roman Imperial Army*, 1914, pp. 64–5.

<sup>2</sup> CIL, vii. 1115.

<sup>3</sup> CIL, vii. 642; a recently discovered altar to Cocidius, from Risingham (to be published, in *Archæologia Æliana*, by Messrs Richmond and McIntyre), shows him with bow and hunting-dog.

<sup>4</sup> Domaszewski, *op. cit.*, pp. 52–4 *et al.*; Klotz in Pauly-Wissowa, iii. A, col. 123.

<sup>5</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 431.

<sup>6</sup> Dessau, ILS 2602 = CIL, xiii. 6621 (*cf.* also 6620).

good Destiny,<sup>1</sup> is plainly pining for a more congenial post. In the case of Cocceius Firmus, indeed, the list of deities is such a motley one that, at first sight, it might seem no more than evidence for syncretism, the unordered mixture of religious ideas. But it can be paralleled, and indeed surpassed, in one quarter—among the *equites singulares* in Rome.

These were a regiment of cavalry of the guard, first established, it seems, by Domitian towards the close of the first century;<sup>2</sup> in peace time they were stationed in the capital, where they had permanent barracks, and they accompanied the emperor to the front in time of war. In relation to the auxiliary regiments of the frontier armies, they occupied the same privileged position as the prætorian guard did to the legions. But while the prætorian guard was recruited, until the time of Severus, by direct enlistment from a privileged portion of the citizen body, the *equites singulares* seem to have been kept up to strength by the transfer of picked men from the *alæ* in the provinces,<sup>3</sup> as well

COMPARATIVE TABLE:<sup>4</sup>

AUCHENDAVY.		ROME.				
		128	132	133-136	137-141	?
CIL, vii. 1111	I.O.M.	×	×	×	×	×
	Victoria Victrix	-	-	-	-	-
1112	Diana	-	×	×	×	×
	Apollo	×	×	×	×	×
1113	Genius <sup>5</sup>	×	×	×	×	×
1114	Mars	×	×	×	×	×
	Minerva	×	×	×	×	×
	Campestres	×	×	×	×	×
	Hercules	×	×	-	×	×
	Epona	-	×	×	×	×
	Victoria	×	×	×	×	×
1115	Silvanus	×	×	×	×	×

<sup>1</sup> CIL, vii. 370.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Liebenam in Pauly-Wissowa, vi. cols. 312-21; the men discharged in 118 must have entered the army under Domitian (CIL, vi. 31138), and it seems simplest to suppose that the regiment was formed by him, and retained by his successors, rather than that Trajan was its founder.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Cheesman, *Auxilia*, pp. 80-1; Pauly-Wissowa, vi. 318.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. CIL, vi. Add., p. 3069, where there is a full comparative table of the inscriptions from Rome, that removes the need for references to particular inscriptions here; the last column in this table is based on the undated fragments, CIL, vi. 31174-5, which are probably later than A.D. 141.

<sup>5</sup> In Rome, *Genius singularium Augusti* takes the place of the Auchendavy *Genius terre Britannicæ*.

(perhaps) as by the direct recruiting of likely men in the districts which supplied the *alæ* with recruits. In consequence of this system, the *equites singulares* must at all times have contained a greater mixture of races and creeds than any single auxiliary regiment, mainly recruited either from the district in which it was first raised, or from the recruiting-grounds nearest to its place of garrison; and that will explain the great variety of gods and goddesses who found a place on dedications by the corps. By a happy chance, a long series of altars from its quarters in Rome are preserved; most of them were set up by groups of time-expired men, on the occasion of their discharge from the regiment, in the principates of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius; a few are due to individuals on a like occasion, or on the occasion of their promotion to the legionary centurionate—further advancement that we might well expect outstanding men in a *corps d'élite* to obtain. The list of deities varies somewhat; one or two are sometimes omitted, and they appear in varying order, but, as the accompanying comparative table shows, all the Auchendavy dedications with the exception of that to *Victoria Victria* occur regularly on the altars of the *equites singulares*.<sup>1</sup> The parallelism is so striking that it does not seem reasonable to doubt that it is not due to chance. We must suppose that Cocceius Firmus, earlier in his career, had seen service with the *equites singulares*, and in their ranks had learnt to worship this distinctive array of deities.<sup>2</sup>

There are a number of instances recorded of promotion to the legionary centurionate from that corps. Thus, Marcus Ulpius Martialis, on another of the altars from its quarters in Rome,<sup>3</sup> dedicates to Jupiter Best and Greatest, Juno, Hercules and the *Campestres*, on the occasion of his advancement by Hadrian from the rank of decurion (troop commander—as the place shows, in the *equites singulares*) to that of centurion in the first legion Minervia, whose station was at Bonn, in Lower Germany; and there are other examples, that need not be quoted here, of such promotion. It is not unreasonable, therefore, to infer something of his earlier career from the altars that Cocceius Firmus set up at Auchendavy; we may suppose that, before he joined the second legion in Britain as a centurion, he had commanded a troop of the *equites singulares*. In that case we may carry the investigation

<sup>1</sup> See p. 374, note 5.

<sup>2</sup> It may be conjectured that at least one other of his altars remains to be found at Auchendavy; for Juno, Fortuna, Felicitas, Salus and the Fates occur with equal regularity. The absence, from the Auchendavy series, of Mercury and the Sulevian Mothers may be due to another cause, as is suggested below.

<sup>3</sup> Dessau, ILS 2213 = CIL, vi. 31158.

further. His name shows that his father or grandfather obtained the citizenship from the emperor Marcus Cocceius Nerva; from his service in the *equites singulares* we may assume that he himself came, not from Italy (in the second century still the home of the majority of centurions) or one of the fully romanised provinces, but from one of the frontier provinces which provided the regiment with its drafts. An examination of the inscriptions—for the most part, tombstones of members of the corps who died before the completion of their service, and were buried in the regimental cemetery in Rome—on which the provinces of origin are stated, shows that something like half of the men came from the Danube provinces; it is an even chance, therefore, that he came from that part of the Empire. But a consideration of the regimental deities that he retained, in his dedications at Auchendavy, will be seen to strengthen the probability considerably; for while Mercury and the Sulevian Mothers, typical Rhineland deities, have dropped out, Silvanus, Diana and Apollo (who, as we have seen, have Danubian connections) remain. It is on the Danube, then, and (if we take Diana and Apollo as our guides) on the Lower Danube that we must look for the home of Cocceius Firmus.

V. *The Inscription from Histria*.—For many years now Roumanian archæologists have been engaged in excavation on the site of Histria, a town on the coast of the Black Sea, in the Dobruja, not far south of the mouth of the Danube; and among their discoveries has been a fine series of inscriptions. One of these <sup>1</sup> is an altar, dated to the 13th June A.D. 169, set up to Jupiter Best and Greatest for the health of the Emperor (as the date shows, Marcus Aurelius) by *vet(erani) et c(ives) R(oman) et Bessi con(sistentes) vic(o) Q(uintionis)*—"ex-soldiers, Roman citizens, and Bessi (a Thracian tribe, a portion of which had long been settled in that part of Lower Moesia <sup>2</sup>) living in Quintio's ward." Like the others in the series, this altar was set up under the care of two magistrates and a quæstor, and the quæstor's name is Cocceius Firmus. Our previous consideration has pointed to the Lower Danube as the home of the Auchendavy centurion; the date is not unsuitable; and to the identities of place and time we may add, if not identity of rank, at least compatibility. For the term *veterani* includes ex-soldiers of all ranks up to and including the centurionate; and it is not unreasonable to suppose that the Cocceius Firmus who set up the altars at Auchendavy, and found his way into the pages of Pomponius, returned to his home in Lower Moesia on leaving the army, and there in his retirement played

<sup>1</sup> *Année Epigraphique*, 1924, No. 143.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Journal of Roman Studies*, xvii. p. 97 *et seq.*

the honourable part in civil life that ex-soldiers so often played in the towns of the Roman Empire.

Our prosopographical study may claim at least a high degree of probability for its identification, as referring to one and the same man, of the three scattered records, each of a Cocceius Firmus; but the mere identification is not the main interest of the study. I would rather adopt something like Stuart's view-point, and emphasise the suggestiveness of those records, for the study of Scotland in the Roman period. If I am right, the salt-works to which the slave-woman was sent, and the bandits who captured and sold her, provide an appendix to Dr James Curle's discussion of the discoveries of Roman objects on native sites, and the intercourse between Roman and native on that distant and often unquiet frontier of Empire.<sup>1</sup> They give direct evidence of the trade in that perishable commodity, human beings; and they direct attention to the Roman occupation of the land to the east of the road to Inchtuthil, across the Antonine Vallum. As for Cocceius Firmus himself, the career that we have enucleated emphasises—what the Auchendavy altars have long emphasised—the extent to which the Empire moulded the most diverse elements into the same Roman form: the auxiliary soldier from Lower Moesia became a centurion in the second legion in Britain, and gave a place in his dedications alike to the *Genius* of that land, the gods of the Empire and the army, and his native deities.

<sup>1</sup> *Proc. Soc. Ant. Scot.*, vol. lxvi. 1931–32, pp. 277–397.