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Pis. I–II. Altar from Ganuenta (–um?),\(^1\) dedicated to Nehalennia, recovered from the Eastern Scheldt estuary off Colijnsplaat (Noord-Beveland), in the territory of the municipality of Zierikzee (Schouwen-Duiveland), province of Zeeland, in August/September 1970 (RMO, inv. no. 1970/12.7); since 6th December 1978 in the Rijksmuseum Het Catharijneconvent, Utrecht, as a loan. Lotharingian limestone, 90 by 59 by 30 cm. (36 by 24 by 12 in.).

P. Stuart/J.E. Bogaers in Deae Neh., 64, no. 7, and figs. 7a and c.

Date: c. A.D. 150–250.\(^2\)

The upper part of the altar is in the form of a niche containing a temple with pediment, and with engaged pilasters and columns supporting a shell canopy.\(^3\) In the shrine the goddess Nehalennia is seated on a bench. In her left hand she has a dish of fruit resting on her left knee; the right hand holds an unknown object. To her left is a large wicker basket filled with fruit; to her right is a dog, partly lying, partly sitting with crossed forelegs.\(^4\) Both sides are decorated with a cornucopia, the left side likewise with a rudder. The back is unadorned; and on top, on the sacrificial table or mensa, are two apples (in front) and two pears (at the back).

The monument has been rather heavily affected in the sea, mainly by marine boring organisms and salt. As a result at first only a small part of the inscription could be deciphered; especially, the reading of lines 2–4 remained very unsatisfactory. Now, after a new examination, the text can be read and restored as follows:

\[
\text{DE\[ae\] Nehale[nniæ] / VAL\[erius\] MAR\[erius\] / NEGOT\[iator\] CAN\[tianus\] / (?)}
\]

\[
\text{GESERECAN\[canus\] / MERCE\[es\] BENE\[Can\] / (?)}
\]

\[De\[ae\] Nehale[nniæ] / VAL\[erius\] MAR\[erius\] / NEGOT\[iator\] CAN\[tianus\] / (?)
GESERECAN\[canus\] / MERCE\[es\] BENE\[Can\] / (?)\]
recaptured from the Eastern School valley of Cilicia, etc.

PL. I. Altar (90 x 39 x 30 cm), dedicated to Nergalma, by a native from Taghum (Adiabene) (Cilicia, etc.).

RECAPTIONS
To the goddess Nehalennia (.) Valerius Mar(......), merchant trading with Cantia and Gesoriacum, (dedicated this altar) for her good protection of his wares.

L. 2. Before the nomen gentilicium Valerius, the praenomen (abbreviated to one letter) is missing. The cognomen might be restored as, e.g. Mar[cellus], Mar[cianus] or Mar[tialis].


L. 4. Geserican[us], perhaps Geserican[us]. This adjective is sure to refer to G(a)esoriacum/Boulogne-sur-Mer. After this word there is still room for four letters, possibly the (abbreviated) name of the place where Valerius was resident, for instance C(olonia) C(laudia) A(ra) A(grippinensium)/Cologne. This merchant seems to have been especially active on either side of the Straits of Dover, in Cantia and in the region of Gesoriacum, in the *civitas* of the Morini.
Pl. III Altar (63 x 41 x 15.5 cm.) dedicated to Nehaleunia by the freedman P. Arisenius Marius, negotiator Britannicius, recovered from the Eastern Scheldt estuary off Colijnsplaat.
Pl. III. Altar from Gannu(?,um?), dedicated to Nehalennia, recovered from the Eastern Scheldt estuary off Colijnsplaat in February 1971 (RMO, inv. no. i 1974/9.86 + 89, 145 and 182). Lotharingian limestone, 63 by 41 by 15.5 cm. (25 by 16 by 6 in.).


Date: c. A.D. 150–250.

This altar was recovered in four fragments, which were only united in 1981, after a petrographical investigation12 had proved that they belonged together. There is no niche with its representation of the goddess on the front, which is almost completely filled by an inscription. The left side shows a relief of a tree with upright leaves; the right side exhibits an engraved tree. The back is unadorned; on the mensa are two apples.

The inscription runs as follows:

DEAE·NEHALENNIAE·P·ARISENIVSMARIVSLIBERT/VS·PARISENIVST
V...H•NEGOTIATO/RISBRITANNICIA/NI·OBMERCES /
BENECONS.RVTA...L·M

Deae Nehalieniae P(ublius) Arisenius Marius libertus P(ubli) Ariseni V(...)/hi, negotiato/ris Britannicae/ni,14 ob merces / bene cons[eRVTA]/s(olvit) l(ibens) m(erito).

To the goddess Nehalennia Publius Arisenius Marius, freedman of Publius Arisenius V(...),us, merchant with Britannia, for her protection of his wares fulfilled his vow, willingly and deservedly.

L. 2–3 and 4. The nomen gentilicium respectively of the libertus and his patronus seems to be unique. Perhaps it has been derived from the Celtic cognomen Arusenus,15 which is very rare too: C.I.L. XIII, 8066 (Bonn, third century A.D.) on the tombstone of Aurelius Arusenus Turesus (from Turum16 in Raetia?), veteran of the Legio I Minervia, and his son Aurelius Avitianus; cf. C.I.L. XIII, 4363 (on a tombstone from Metz).

L. 4–5. The cognomen of the patronus, V...HVS, points presumably to a Germanic origin, especially on account of the H.17 This character may stand for the Old Germanic voiceless fricative ŧ; in the Latin alphabet it was rendered by H, CH or C, and perhaps also by l(f).18
Pl. IV Altar (74.5 × 46 × 21.5 cm.) dedicated to Nehennia by C. Aurelius Verus, negotiator Britannicus, recovered from the Eastern Scheldt estuary off Colijnsplaat.
Pl. IV. Altar from Ganuenta(-um?), dedicated to Nehalemmia, recovered from the Eastern Scheldt estuary off Colijnsplaat (RMO, inv. nos. i 1974/9.123 and 154, and i 1981/10.232). Lotharingian limestone, 74.5 by 46 by 21.5 cm. (30 by 18 by 9 in.).

On 17th September 1981 J. Valster, Goes, during diving activities, succeeded in hauling up a large section of this altar, mainly from the front side with its inscription. In January 1982, P. Stuart, keeper of Provincial Roman Antiquities in the RMO, discovered that some other fragments, which had been earlier recovered in February 1971, belonged to the same altar.

Date: c. A.D. 150–250.

The upper part of the front shows the goddess sitting in a niche on a seat. In her left hand she holds a dish of fruit, which rests on her lap; in her right hand she has an unknown object. To the left of Nehalemmia is a large basket with an upright handle and filled with fruit (apples). To her right a collared dog is sitting on its haunches. The altar is flanked by engaged pilasters decorated with plant motives and crowned by Corinthian capitals. On what remains of the mensa an apple is to be seen on the right. On both sides a cornucopia is represented. The back was adorned with a curtain in relief, part of which has been preserved.

The inscription reads as follows:

DEAE / NEHALENNIAE / C-AVRELIVS / VERVS 5/ NEGOTIATOR / BRITANNICIANVS / EX-VOTO-L-M

Deae / Nehalemmiae / C(aius) Aurelius / Verus / negotiator / Britannicianus / ex voto l(ibens) m(erito).

To the goddess Nehalemmia Caius Aurelius Verus, merchant with Britannia, on account of his vow (dedicated this altar), willingly and deservedly.

The greater part of the text corresponds with an inscription on a slab of black marble which was discovered before 1892 at the St. Pantaleon Church in Cologne and which is now in the Römisch-Germanische Museum in that city: C.I.L. XIII, 8164 a (I.L.S. 7522):19

APOLLINI / C-AVRELIVS-CL / VERVS-NEGOTIATOR / BRITANNICIANVS 5/ MORITEX-D-D / L-D-D-D

Apollini / C(aius) Aurelius Cl(audia tribu) / Verus negotiator / Britannicianus / moritex d(ono) d(edit) / l(oco) d(ato) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum).

To Apollo Caius Aurelius Verus, of the Claudian voting-tribe, merchant with Britannia, moritex (?), gave (this) as a gift, the site being preserved by decree of the town councillors.
L. 2. The letters CL are not separated, either by a stop or by an extra space.20 There is no reason to read C-L:21 and so to expand C(ai) libertus. C. Aurelius Verus had Roman citizenship; very probably he was living in C(olonia) C(laudia) A(ra) A(grippinensis)/Cologne, and, as a civis Agrippinensis, he belonged to the tribus Claudia.22 On the one side in this inscription mention is made of C. Aurelius Verus’s tribus, but on the other hand the filiation with the first name (praenomen) of his father is missing, as well as his patria, his origo or the name of the town of which the dedicator was a citizen; cf. C.I.L. XIII, 12058 (Galsterer 1975, 51, no. 200) on the tombstone, found at Cologne, of Q. Didius Lenonia (tribu) Euhodiamus, praefectus of the ala I Thracum.23

There is every reason to presume that the dedicator of the Nehalennia-altar from Colijnsplaat and the man who dedicated an unknown object to Apollo at Cologne are identical. In this connection inquiry is called for into the meaning of moritex, a hapax legomenon, unless one wishes to believe that this word could also be read on an inscription on a stone coffin, which was discovered in 1579 about a quarter mile west of York/Eboracum, and lost before 1796: R.I.B. 678 (C.I.L. VII, 248; I.L.S. 7062). E. Birley and J.C. Mann suggest the following reading: M(arcius) Verecundius Diogenes IIIIIIvir col(oniae) Ebor(acentes) idemq(ue) morit(ex), ēves Biturix Cubi, haec sibi vivus jecit24 = Marcus Verecundius Diogenes, sevir (Augustalis) of the colony of York and also seafarer, tribesman of the Bituriges Cubi [in Aquitania], set (this) up to himself while alive.

Idemque as a link between IIIIIIvir col. Ebor. and moritex (‘seafarer’) makes a somewhat strange impression. It seems preferable to read: (...) IIIIIIvir col. Ebor. idemq(ue) Morinorum [e]īves Biturix Cubi (…) In that case M. Verecundius Diogenes, who was born in the land of the Bituriges Cubi (Bourges and surroundings), would have been sevir (Augustalis) not only of the colony Eboracensis (York) but also of the colony Morinorum25 (Tarucna/Thérouanne, in north-west France, dép. Pas-de-Calais), the chief town of the Morini.26

Regarding the possible meaning of moritex several suppositions have been put forward. This word would indicate an ethnic epithet,27 a cognomen,28 an office or a profession,29 or the object of the dedication to Apollo.30 From an etymological point of view there seem to be no objections if one considers moritex as a Celtic word.31 Then it is a compositum consisting of the Indo-Germanic > Celtic *stem *mori- ‘sea’ in first position, and the root noun *(s)teigh-s ‘striding, going’ in second position. The sound-development (tēx is to be determined with a long ē) are regular; the interpretation is straightforward: who strides the sea > navigates the sea > seafarer.32 In this way, however, the problem is not solved. It is hardly appropriate that C. Aurelius Verus would have called himself, in an inscription at Cologne, not only negotiator Britanniae, merchant with Britannia, but also moritex, seafarer, because this could be a sort of tautology. H. Osthoff and E. Birley have tried to remove this difficulty. The former by presuming that C. Aurelius Verus would
have been the *moritex* par excellence, i.e. ‘etwa der amtliche Vorstand der Kauffahrer- oder Handelsschiffergilde im alten Köln’; the latter by suggesting that *moritex*/seafarer would mean ‘shipper perhaps, rather than ship’s captain’. Nevertheless it is still highly questionable if the etymology given above can provide the right solution of the problem. ‘Die Bedeutung von “moritex” ist unklar’; this word at least appears not yet to have been explained in a satisfactory manner.

**IV**


Date: A.D. 221.

Pl. V Part of a dedication-slab (63 × 49 × 14 cm.) of L. Viducius Placidus, found at Clementhorpe, York. (Photo: M.S. Duffy; copyright York Archaeological Trust).
The inscription reads:

[[- -] ET GENIO·LOCI / [---]GG·L·VIDVCIVS / [---]CIDVS·DOMO / [---] VELIOCAS·IVM / [---]EGOTIATOR / [---]RCVM ET IANVM / [---] D·[.] GRATO ET / [--- -]

Tomlin proposed the following restoration: [I(o)vi] O(ptimo) M(aximo) D(olicheno) et Genio Loci / [et nn (= numinis) Au][g (= Augustorum) L(ucius) V]iducius / [L(uci) f(ilius) Pla]cidus domo / [civit(ate)] Veliocas[s]ium / [V]IVIR n]egotiator / [cre(arius) arcum et ianum / [dono] d(edit) l(oco) d(edit) / [d(ecurionum)] Grato et / [Seleuco co(n)s(ulibus)].

The writer (1977) agreed, except for some details:
L. 5. [pr(ovinciae) Lug(dunensis)] n]egotiator.
L. 6. [Brit(annicianus)] arcum et ianum.

Accordingly the translation of the full text could be: 'To Jupiter Best, Greatest and Eternal, of Doliche, and to the Genius of the Place and to the Deities of the Emperors (= Elagabalus and Severus Alexander [as Caesar since 10th July 221]), Lucius Viducius Placidus, son of Lucius, of the canton (or the town: Ratomagus/Rotomagus/Rouen on the northern bank of the Sequana/Seine) of the Veliocasses, in the province of (Gallia) Lugdunensis, merchant with Britannia (= a member of a corpus, collegium, or societas for the trade to Britannia?) gave arch and covered passage-way (or — as an hendiadys — arched gateway?) as a gift, the site being given by decree of the town councillors, in the consulship of Gratus (A.D. 221).''


According to the writer, Tomlin, Hassall and A. Birley the dedicator can be identified with Placidus Viduci fil(ius) cives Veliocassinius negoti(at)or (or Britann(ianus) known from an inscription on the fragment of an altar dedicated to Nehalennia and dating from c. A.D. 200, which was recovered in 1970 from the Eastern Scheldt estuary off Colijnsplaat. In Hassall's opinion the dedicator of the York slab would have been called: L. Viducius Viduci f. Placidus. 'Placidus's filiation in this form [L. 3] occurs on his dedication to Nehalennia from the shrine near Colijnsplaat, and should be the only possible one since Viducus, the father, lacked praenomen, or rather the full tria nomina of a Roman citizen.' At first sight it seems, however, hardly probable that the dedicator of the York inscription would have used the cumbersome and ambiguous patrony-
mic formula ‘L. Viducius Viduci f. Placidus’.

In the Gaulish and German provinces frequently patronymic adjectives ending in -ius or -iniius have been formed from the single peregrine name or from the cognomen of the father; these were practically functioning as a family-name, a nomen gentilicum which, if the person in question did not possess Roman citizenship, may be called better a pseudo-gentilicum.

It often happened, in the north-western continental part of the Roman Empire, the family-name or (pseudo)gentilicum changed every generation, since new (pseudo)gentilicia were continually formed from the cognomina of the fathers. Mostly it is not possible to determine if we are dealing with a (pseudo)gentilicum that could change in the next generation, or with a (pseudo)gentilicum that had become permanent in a peregrine family, or with a genuine nomen gentilicum as characteristic of the Roman citizenship.40

In the inscription from the Eastern Scheldt the dedicator has only ‘a single name, Placidus, appropriate to a man who lacked Roman citizenship (peregrinus), whereas on the York stone he has the tria nomina, Lucius Viducius Placidus, of a Roman citizen.’41 But in his dedication to Nehalennia, Placidus, according to the above-mentioned practice of nomenclature, might have called himself equally the ‘Viducian’ Placidus, Viducius Placidus, with a (pseudo)gentilicum, instead of Placidus, Viduci fil(ius).

On the other hand it is quite possible that the altar from the Eastern Scheldt dates to the period before the promulgation of the Constitutio Antoniniana (c. A.D. 212–213),42 the edict of Caracalla which granted Roman citizenship to all free-born peregrini in the Empire. Placidus may have become civis Romanus as a result of that constitution43 and have formed at that time a nomen gentilicum from his father’s single, peregrine name, Viducus, which clearly indicates a native, Celtic origin.44 If Viducus was still alive then, without doubt he too had gained citizenship; on account of the inscriptions from Colijnsplaat and York his full name may have become then: Lucius (?) (+ unknown nomen gentilicum formed from his father’s single, peregrine name? +) Viducus, whereas his son was called L. Viducius (Luci filius?) Placidus. In case the father of the latter had already died — as peregrinus — before c. 212–213, the son when taking the tria nomina may have attributed a fictitious praenomen to his father and called himself L(uci) f(ilius).45

In his restoration of the York inscription Hassall suggests, as mentioned above, that the full name of the dedicator would have been L. Viducius Viduci f(ilius) Placidus. If this is right, there would be two possible explanations of the filiation: (a) the father was called L. Viducius Viducus; in that case, in the nomenclature of the son, the father’s praenomen would have been replaced by his cognomen;46 (b) the father had only a single peregrine name; after the son was granted Roman citizenship he formed, not only his nomen gentilicum from his father’s name, but also used that name once again in his filiation, and would have given, in that way as it were, a tautological double filiation. It seems to be very difficult to find any more or less exact parallels for such a phenomenon,47
and even then it is not possible to say if they refer to a nomen gentilicium which was only newly-formed from a father’s single name or cognomen, or to a permanent one already borne by more than one generation of the family in question. In A.E. 1977, 512 is to be found the comment that the dedicator of the York inscription ‘paraît à première vue identifiable à Placidus Viduci fil(ius)’ mentioned on the altar from the Eastern Scheldt. ‘Toutefois, la forme plus romanisée peut suggérer qu’il serait plutôt un parent, peut-être même le fils de ce dernier.’ In 1981 A. Chastagnol returned to this question. In contrast with the views of others (see above), ‘qui ont émis l’opinion qu’il s’agit en fait du même homme, et l’on pourrait songer alors que le pérégrin [Placidus Viduci fil(ius)] a été naturalisé romain en application de l’édit de Caracalla, (...) il est beaucoup plus probable, selon une suggestion que nous a faite H.-G. Pflaum, qu’on a affaire ici au fils (ou, à la rigueur, au petit-fils) de Placidus, Viduci filius’. According to the practice of nomenclature in the Gaulish and German provinces, however, Placidus Viduci fil. might have named himself also the ‘Viducian’ Placidus, Viducius Placidus. In consequence it is highly improbable that a son of this Placidus Viduci filius or Viducius Placidus would have been called Viducius Placidus. His name undoubtedly was either Placidius, (pseudo?)-gentilicium formed from the single name or cognomen of his father, followed by a cognomen, or possibly Viducius followed by a cognomen, but presumably not Placidus, so that his name could be distinguished from his father’s. Supposing that Viducius would have become a permanent nomen gentilicium of the family in question, a grandson of Placidus Viduci fil. or Viducius Placidus could indeed have been named L. Viducius Placidus, but if the grandson in his turn has formed a nomen gentilicium from his father’s cognomen, then as a matter of course that nomen gentilicium can only have been Viducius if his father bore the cognomen Viducus. . . . For the time being it seems to be better to accept the real possibility that Placidus Viduci fil. and L. Viducius [L. f.] Placidus are identical.

V

Fig. 1. Sandstone dedication-slab, 66 by 48 by 5 cm. (26 by 19 by 2 in.), discovered in 1903 in dredging the north channel of the Swing Bridge at Newcastle upon Tyne; in the Museum of Antiquities, Newcastle upon Tyne. R.I.B. 1322 (I.L.S. 9116). Date: A.D. 154/155–158/159.
Imp(eratori) Antoni/no Aug(ustus) Pio p(atris) / pat(riae) vexil(latio) / leg(ionis) / Aug(ustae) / et leg(ionis) / Vic(trici) et leg(ionis) / V(aleriae) V(ictrici) con(t)i / buti ex Ger(manis) dulobus sub Iulio Ver(ero) Aug(usti) pr(o) p(raetore).

For the Emperor Antoninus Augustus Pius, father of his country, the detachment (of men) contributed from the two Germanies for the Second Legion Augusta and the Sixth Legion Victrix and the Twentieth Legion Valeria Victrix, under Julius Verus, emperor’s propraetorian legate, (set this up).'

L. 3. In VEX ILATIO one L is missing. The stonemason made two mistakes; after the X he left room for an I, and of the following I he ought to have made an L. Vexillatio (= vexillarii) ... (L. 6/7) contributi is to be taken as a constructio ad sententiam (ad synesin).52

L. 6. CON(i)R(i). The stonemason omitted to make a ligature of N and T, and of R and I, but he could also have cut out the last letter at the beginning of L. 7.

L. 7–8. ex Ger(manis) duobus instead of ex Ger(manis) duabus?

This inscription is generally regarded as recording the arrival at Pons Aelius/Newcastle upon Tyne of military reinforcements from the legions of the two German provinces, which were destined for all three British legions, in response to an emergency, i.e. a serious rebellion of the Brigantes in the Pennines, that involved the evacuation of the Antonine Wall and much of southern Scotland. Cn. Julius Verus, previously governor of Lower Germany, ‘may well have brought the legionary vexillations with him, and the date should not be later than 155.’53
Before the publication of *R.I.B.* I in 1965 some abbreviations used to be expanded in another way: (...) vexil(l)atio leg(ionis) II Aug(ustae) et leg(ionis) VI Vic(tricis) et leg(ionis) XX V(aleriae) V(ictricis) con(t)r(i)buti ex Ger(maniis) duobus (...)54 = ‘(...) a vexillation (draft) of the Second August and Sixth Victorious and Twentieth Valerian Victorious Legions, contributed from the two Germanics (Upper and Lower), (...)’55

It is difficult to decide which view is to be preferred. Both readings seem to be possible, but in inscriptions relating to *vexillationes* (or *vexillarii*) these words are usually followed by a genitive mentioning the parent units from which the detachments had been taken or to which they had belonged.56


The ‘expansion *ex(ercitibus) Ger(manici) duobus* rather than the ungrammatical *ex Ger(maniis) duobus* of *RIB* and earlier editors’ is owed to J.J. Wilkes, and seems to be fortuitous at first sight. It is, however, to be remarked that in this case, on account of the Latin, the inscription would supply information exactly opposite from what is usually inferred. Then the three British legions can have been mentioned only in the genitive dependent on *vexil(l)atio*, whereas *ex(ercitibus) Ger(manici) duobus* has to refer to *con(t)r(i)buti*, and the translation must read: (...) the detachment (of soldiers) of the Second Legion Augusta and the Sixth Legion Victrix and the Twentieth Legion Valeria Victrix, contributed to the armies of both Germanies (...).58

A detachment of soldiers of all three British legions sent to the Continent in A.D. 154–9, as a reinforcement for the armies of both (!) provinces of Lower and Upper Germany, would be very odd, and moreover, with regard to the known history of Britannia as well as that of the *duae Germaniae*, completely inexplicable.

To solve the problem there appears to be only one possibility, viz. to assume that line 7 of the inscription presents a case of haplography.

The text was probably intended to run more or less as follows:

\[
\text{IMP-ANTI/NO*AVG-PIO-P } / \text{PAT-VEX<IL>LATIO} / \text{LEG-\textit{II} AVG-ET-\textit{LEG} 4/VI VIC-ET-\textit{LEG}/XX VV-CON<T>R<1>/BVTI-EX-<EX(ercitis)SUR<1>/GER<manici>-DV/OBVS-SVB-IVLIO-VE/RO-LEG-\textit{AVG}-PR-P.59}
\]

In this way the inscription incontrovertibly relates to a detachment sent from the armies of both German provinces. The three British legions mentioned in L. 4–6 may have been referred to either in the genitive dependent on *vexillation* (this seems to be more probable) or in the dative relating to *contributi*. The stone-
mason obviously made a serious mistake because he omitted one EX so that the text appears either to present a grammatical blunder or to proclaim precisely the opposite of what was intended.

Finally, there remains another problem: why did the stonemason not correct the mistakes he made in L. 2 and L. 6 by afterwards cutting out or finishing some letters of the words VEXILLATIO and CONTRIBVTI? In so doing he could very easily have retrieved these errors. As a matter of course the constructio ad sententiam vexil(l)atio... con(t)r(i)bui is not to be taken for an error, as contrasted with the haplography in L. 7, which seems to raise a great difficulty for a correct understanding of the text.

'Twin altars, dedicated respectively to Oceanus and Neptune were dredged from the river [Tyne] in 1875 and 1903. They came from a bridge-shrine erected by the Sixth Legion and intended to protect the structure [of the bridge built by Hadrian, from which Pons Aelius took its name] against tides and floods. In this shrine, too, reinforcements from the German provinces for the three British legions set up an inscription on their arrival in or before A.D. 158.'

One may wonder if the dedication-slab with its inscription recorded in R.I.B. 1322 was ever placed in that shrine, or anywhere else. As to lines 3 and 6 the text is apparently incomplete and unfinished. The reason may very well be that the irretrievable omission, the haplography in line 7, caused the slab to have been condemned and thrown away as unsuitable. . .

**ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THE TEXT**

A.E. *L’Année épigraphique.*


RMO *Rijksmuseum van Oudheden, Leiden.*
NOTES


4. On many altars (from Domburg and Colijnsplaat) Nehalennia is shown flanked by a basket of fruit and a dog, but the crossed forelegs are fairly exceptional; cf. Deae Nehalenniae (see note 2), no. 11, and Stuart, P. and Bogaers, J. E., op. cit. (see note 3).

5. cf. C.I.L. XIII, 8793 (from Domburg), Deae Nehalenniae (see note 2), nos. 11 (L'Année épigraphique, (1973), 370) and 32 (L'Année épigraphique, (1975), 646, according to Bogaers, J. E., Nosaga, xix, (1972), 7—9), and infra, no. II.


8. C.I.L. X, 7612 and XI, 5068 (I.L.S. 7524); Bogaers, J. E. in Deae Nehalenniae (see note 2), 39 (and 69, no. 20 = L'Année épigraphique, (1973), 374); Hassall, M., op. cit. (see note 7), 43 f.


11. cf. Chevallier, R. (ed.), op. cit. (see note 1), 52; Delmaire, R., L'indice archéologique de la partie orientale de la cité des Morins (civitas Morinorum), Arras, 1976, 51—3 and 309. — N.B.: the nouns mentioned by Pliny, Natural History, IV, 106, was called C(h)ersiacus, not Gesoriacus; cf. L'Année épigraphique, (1972), 148. It is not at all certain that the nouns C(h)ersiaiacus is 'sans doute le Boulonnais', that 'Le nom de Cersiacus est certainement lié à celui de Boulogne: Gesoriacum', and that the Cersiaci (L'Année épigraphique, (1972), 148) should be identical with the inhabitants of Gesoriacum = Boulogne (Delmaire, R., op. cit., 51 f. and 309).


13. cf. supra, note 7.
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