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ABSTRACT

The dating of the careers of M. Maenius Agrippa and T. Pontius Sabinus, both of whom participated in an expeditio Britannica during the reign of Hadrian, remains uncertain. The case for the expeditio being the known visit of the Emperor to Britain in 122 or an otherwise unattested occasion later in the reign is considered in relation to new archaeological evidence from the fort at Maryport where Maenius Agrippa was based. The possibility that the well-known series of dedications to IOM at Maryport could relate to either of the days when the Roman army took the annual oath of allegiance to the emperor is discussed.

Introduction

Some people from antiquity evoke more than usual interest. One such person is Marcus Maenius Agrippa, a host to Hadrian, participant in a British expedition and commander of the regiment based at Maryport. His career helps to illustrate the imperial cursus honorum and, through its connections, offers several intriguing problems still unresolved. We hope that Denis would have enjoyed a discussion about these problems.

The plot involves two emperors (Trajan and Hadrian), two senior army officers (Maenius Agrippa and Pontius Sabinus), two locations (Camerinum and the northern frontier of Britain), two events (the expeditio Britannica and a visit by Hadrian), but, alas, only one secure date (Trajan’s Parthian War). The central problem is to date one of the events, the expeditio Britannica; related to that is the duration of appointments.

The officers

M. Maenius Agrippa served first as the prefect of a quingenary cohort, the first post on the rung of equestrian military appointments. He was then chosen by Hadrian and sent on the British expedition (electo a divo Hadriano et misso in expeditionem Britannicam), an appointment he held either
before or at the same time as the next post recorded on his career inscription, tribune in command of the thousand-strong First Cohort of Spaniards which was based at Maryport on the northern frontier of Britain.¹ Clarification of this sequence is not important in the present circumstances, nor is his later career, apart from the fact that his honorific inscription, erected at his home city of Camerinum in Italy, records that he was hospes of the Emperor Hadrian.

T. Pontius Sabinus had an equally distinguished career, though he followed a different path to the top posts.² His first posting, like that of Agrippa, was as prefect of a quingenary cohort, and he also followed the same path as Agrippa by serving as a tribune, but in his case in a legion. While holding that post he was decorated by the Emperor Trajan for service in the Parthian War of 114-117. At that point, he changed from his existing career structure to another, the legionary centurionate. He held two such posts, one at Mainz in Upper Germany and the second in Dacia, before becoming first centurion (primus pilus) of the Third Augusta in North Africa, an appointment only held for a year. At that point he was placed in command of detachments from three legions drawn from the provinces of Upper Germany and Tarraconensis on the British expedition. He later served successively as tribune of three cohorts in Rome and then as senior centurion for the second time (primus pilus bis), an enigmatic post, before ending his service as procurator of the province of Narbonensis in southern France. Again, the later part of the career does not concern us.

The dates

The inscriptions offer us two dates, one for each of our officers, in addition to the reference to the expeditio Britannica. The first is the decoration of Pontius Sabinus. The Parthian War ended in 117 and, although decorations were sometimes awarded during campaigning, the end of the war is the likely date of the decoration; in any case, this is the most probable date for the end of his tribunate. The other is less clear; this is the occasion when Maenius Agrippa could have been host to Hadrian. Tony Birley has noted that Hadrian toured the area of Picenum in which Camerinum lay in 127 and this remains the best guess at a date.³ If this proposal is accepted, it means that Agrippa must have been in Italy in that year and provides a

---
¹ CIL 11.5632 = ILS 2735.
² CIL 10.5829 = ILS 2726.
possible context for his having been singled out by Hadrian for the expeditionary command that followed.

The expeditio Britannica

There is no independent evidence which dates the British expedition. It is mentioned in the two career inscriptions, but nowhere else, and it must be stated that it is a presumption, though a reasonable one, that the career inscriptions refer to the same expedition. The argument to date has polarised into two positions:

1. the belief that an expeditio required the presence of the emperor;
   the only time that Hadrian is known to have travelled to Britain was in 122 and therefore the expeditio Britannica must date to that year;4
2. the career of Pontius Sabinus is best interpreted as suggesting a later date.5

Each argument will be taken in turn. In support of the first hypothesis, Rosenberger has considered all the evidence for the use of the term expeditio and concludes that, when combined with an adjective formed from the name of an enemy people, it is only used when the emperor took part personally in the expedition, though he does acknowledge that there are a few exceptions.6 To argue that the British expedition took place later in the reign therefore requires this to be one of Rosenberger’s few exceptions.

There is evidence of fighting in the island at about the time Hadrian was there, but it is not specifically dated to the year 122. At the beginning of the reign we are told that the Britons could not be held under control.7

---

7 Historia Augusta, Life of Hadrian, 5.2.
An element of caution may be entered at this point. Such summaries tended to be the stock-in-trade of the writer of the *Historia Augusta*, events during the reign being placed in a general statement at the beginning of the account, though the troubles are corroborated from other sources. A coin issue showing *Britannia* seated is often linked to the successful conclusion of warfare in Britain at the beginning of Hadrian's reign, but it cannot be dated any closer than 119 to 128, and it was followed by a further issue depicting the same figure.

A relatively new item of evidence is the tombstone of a centurion who had died in a war and was buried at Vindolanda. His regiment was the First Cohort of Tungrians which was based at Vindolanda in the 90s and again from about 104 to 120 and possibly as late as about 146. The terminology of the tombstone suggests a date between about 100 and about 125, which would be appropriate for the reference to warfare at the beginning of the reign, but also at any time within the span of a generation. Further evidence for warfare in Britain is given by Cornelius Fronto. Fronto was tutor to the young Marcus Aurelius (emperor from 161 to 180) and consul in 142. Twenty years later, in commenting on the Parthian War, he said, "under the rule of your grandfather Hadrian what a number of soldiers were killed by the Jews, what a number by the Britons." The specific occasion is not stated and could refer either to the warfare at the beginning of the reign or the British expedition mentioned in the careers of Sabinus and Agrippa or, less likely, another occasion. Fronto's comments about the number of deaths are supported by the scale of the reinforcements, 1000 men from each of three legions; by way of comparison, we may note that following the Boudiccan rebellion, Nero sent 2000 legionaries, eight infantry cohorts (that is about 4000 men), and a thousand cavalry to Britain. These detachments are in addition to the transfer of the Sixth Legion from Lower Germany to Britain in 122, and therefore give added weight to the statement of Fronto. What is also interesting is what is not stated. Our single literary reference for Hadrian's visit does not explicitly mention any campaigning in Britain. It may be argued that if the fighting was so fierce, in the presence of the emperor, it would have been mentioned by the author of Hadrian's biography.

---

8 A.R. Birley (note 3) 80; Birley also notes that the passage 'echoes the opening of Tacitus' *Histories*.
9 *RIC* 577a = *BMC* 1174; *RIC* 845 = *BMC* 1723.
10 *RIB* 3364.
11 Fronto, *De bello Parthico* 2.220f.
In relation to the second point, the major problem of dating has circulated round the duration of the two centurionates held by Pontius Sabinus. Most centurionates appear to have been in one legion and of long duration.\(^\text{13}\) Some centurions, however, did serve in several legions. The most extreme case was Petronius Fortunatus who held as many as 13 centurionates during a career spanning 46 years, an average of three and a half years in each.\(^\text{14}\) Fortunatus had risen from the ranks. Octavius Honoratus, on the other hand, like Pontius Sabinus, gained a direct commission and held four centurionates, all, like Sabinus, in different provinces.\(^\text{15}\) Four of the six centurionates held by Flavius Virilis were in Britain.\(^\text{16}\) His career lasted 45 years, though his inscription fails to record any prior service in the ranks. Taken at face value, each centurionate lasted twice as long as those of Fortunatus. Bassus Sulpicianus held five centurionates in 37 years, an average of seven years, while Vitellius Atillianus held ten in 48 years, an average of nearly five years.\(^\text{17}\) The number of examples is pitifully small, though, for what they are worth, they point to an average of at least three years for each post of centurion. If we take that as the length of service of Pontius Sabinus, and starting from 117, it suggests that he did not take up his post as commander of the legionary detachments in the British expedition before 124.\(^\text{18}\)

It has been argued that each of his centurionates lasted less than three years, thereby allowing him to serve in Britain in 122.\(^\text{19}\) This, however, would be unique on present evidence. Birley has compared the career of Pontius Sabinus to that of Haterius Nepos, who similarly held several appointments within a short period, at the same time as Sabinus.\(^\text{20}\) There is a difference between the two men, however, for the appointments of Sabinus were all in the centurionate while those of Nepos were at a higher level.

Is there any other evidence which can be brought into play? Dobson has pointed out that the lack of soldiers from the province nearest to

\(^{14}\) *CIL* 8.217 + p. 2353 + *ILS* 2658 add.
\(^{15}\) *CIL* 8.14698 = *ILS* 2655.
\(^{16}\) *CIL* 8.2877 = *ILS* 2653.
\(^{17}\) *CIL* 8.2891; *CIL* 8.3001.
\(^{19}\) Dobson (note 4) 236; Jarrett (note 4) 145-51.
\(^{20}\) Birley (note 4) 322.
Britain, Lower Germany, may be related to the fact that one legion from there was sent to Britain in 122 or shortly afterwards. Rather than put further pressure on the province, soldiers were dispatched to Britain from the next nearest provinces, Upper Germany and Tarraconensis. This point would hold for 124 as much as 122. Birley has pointed to the levy conducted by Hadrian in Spain in 123 and linked it to the need to bring the legion there up to strength following its loss of 1000 men to Britain. He also notes that Hadrian may have been recruiting soldiers in order to undertake a campaign in Mauretania in North Africa.

In 2003, a review of the evidence relating to the building of Hadrian's Wall drew attention to coin issues of 124/5 and 125/6 which have been linked to warfare in Britain on the basis that this was the only part of the Empire where it is possible that there was warfare at this time. Consideration of the archaeological evidence for the construction of Hadrian's Wall demonstrated that this date would fit acceptably into this chronology. No link to events in Britain can, however, be proved and, in view of the location of the minting of the coins, they could relate to (unknown) events on the Eastern frontier or simply be repeating an earlier coin issue.

In short, these three events have only a circumstantial connection to the *expeditio Britannica* and should be placed on one side.

The First Cohort of Spaniards

The fort at Maryport on the Cumbrian coast has the distinction of having produced a unique series of inscriptions of the reign of Hadrian, dedicated to Jupiter by successive commanding officers of the First Cohort of Spaniards (see Table below). Six commanding officers are recorded on fourteen altars; a further altar was dedicated to Jupiter by the unit but

---

21 Quoted in Jarrett (note 4) 147.
22 Birley (note 3) 147-48.
24 Birley (note 4) 308 discusses the possible relationship between Maenius Agrippa, whose full name was M. Maenius Agrippa L. Tusidius Campester, and L. Tusidius Campester consul in 142. While the two were related, the nature of the relationship is not clear and therefore any possible implications on the date of Agrippa’s career must be placed to one side.
with no officer named, while a sixteenth in the same style has no surviving dedication. Two officers dedicated four inscriptions each, one three and a further three commanders one each, with a further stone in the series missing a name. Not all of the inscriptions, however, follow the same formula. Most are of a simple pattern in which the commanding officer dedicated on behalf of himself and the unit on the first altar, and thereafter only by himself, with the unit understood. This appears to be the pattern favoured by the annual dedications to Jupiter to mark the oath of loyalty on 3 January and the anniversary of the reigning emperor’s accession.

Three altars, although dedicated to the same god, are of a different style and may have been erected to mark different occasions such as a promotion to tribune in a cohort in the case of L. Cammius Maximus and, probably, to be centurion in a legion for M. Censorius Cornelianus. This, nevertheless, leaves us with six commanding officers at the fort during the reign of Hadrian, over a minimum period of twelve years. Averaging out the number of officers and the number of altars suggests that the average length of service at the fort was three years and this has been widely accepted as the normal period of service of the commander of an auxiliary unit.

Jarrett argued that such an averaging of length of service may be too simplistic. He suggested that two of the prefects who are recorded on only one altar each may have served less than three years, while implying also that Censorius Cornelianus may have been transferred before completion of three years. In addition, it is possible that the tribune Cornelius Peregrinus, whose dedication is to no fewer than four gods, but whose unit is not specified, may also have been a commanding officer of the First Cohort of Spaniards when it was at Maryport under Hadrian. There is another unknown: the occasion for the dedications. It is generally assumed that each altar relates to a January dedication in a different year, and that, for example, Agrippa’s four altars indicate that he served for four years at

27 Jarrett (note 25) 22.
28 Jarrett (note 25) 22.
Maryport. It is not impossible, however, that while some were dedicated in different Januaries, others were erected on the anniversary of Hadrian’s accession, or that they relate to a combination of the two occasions. His four altars therefore may relate to only two years’ service at Maryport. The fourteen altars together, accordingly, need to have covered a period of only nine years.

There is another complication to the dedications. Two (or three if Peregrinus is included) record that the commanding officer was a tribune and the others that he was a prefect. Tribune was the normal title for the commanding officer of a thousand-strong cohort, while the commander of a quingenary cohort was a prefect. (The inscriptions of L. Cammius Maximus demonstrate that the cohort was equitate, that is, that it was a mixed unit of infantry and cavalry when at Maryport, but this aspect has no bearing on the title of the commanding officer). The name of the First Cohort of Spaniards is not accompanied by the milliary sign on any British diploma, but the editors of *Roman Military Diplomas* do not regard this as being of any significance as other known thousand-strong cohorts are not always so marked. A First Aelian Cohort of Spaniards, a thousand strong and containing infantry and cavalry, is attested at Netherby north of Hadrian’s Wall in the 3rd century where it was commanded by a tribune. This is presumably the same as the Maryport cohort. Three recently-discovered diplomas of AD 178 give the unit the additional title of *Aelia*, just as recorded on the inscriptions at Netherby. The honorific title could have been awarded by either Hadrian or his successor Antoninus Pius, the family name of both being Aelius.

It was under Domitian towards the end of the 1st century that we have the first examples of milliary cohorts. It would appear that, at least at first, existing quingenary units were increased in size. If this were so in the case of our Spanish cohort, it would place the prefects M. Censorius Cornelianus, L. Cammius Maximus, L. Antistius Lupus Verianus and Helstrius Novellus before the tribunes M. Maenius Agrippa and C. Caballius Priscus.

31 *RIB* 978, 968; cf. 876.
It has in the past been suggested that there were two regiments stationed in Britain with the title First Cohort of Spaniards; E. Birley, ‘The Roman garrisons in Wales’, *Archaeologia Cambrensis* 102 (1952) 9-19. This suggestion was based upon the appearance of a First Cohort of Spaniards in military diplomas which Eric Birley suggested were in different army groups within Britain; that interpretation of the diplomas has since been challenged.
33 Roxan (note 30) 184; Roxan & Holder (note 32) 293, 294.
This was the order preferred at one time by Jarrett who made a special study of the regiment. Jarrett, however, changed his mind and the alternative order, a milliary unit being reduced to a quingenary, has since been generally accepted. This reduction may have been a temporary expedient when part of the cohort was detached for service elsewhere, as we can recognise in the case of the First and the Second Cohort of Tungrians, and the First Cohort of Vardullians in the first half of the 2nd century. In such cases, as Davies pointed out, the diplomas show that the parent part of the cohort was reduced to the size and status of a quingenary cohort, while inscriptions show that the commander of the rump of the Vardullian Cohort was a prefect. The obvious occasion for a detachment of part of the First Cohort of Spaniards would have been during the Bar Kochba revolt in Judaea in 132-136, when M. Censorius Cornelianus appears to have been appointed to a centurionate in the legion VI Ferrata based in that province; he may have taken the postulated detachment with him leaving the remainder of the regiment at Maryport under a new commanding officer who was now a prefect not a tribune.

Frere sought a different way out of the problem by pointing out that there are occasions when the commander of a quingenary cohort was a tribune and not a prefect, suggesting also that ‘occasionnaly a man of exceptional ability, or one who had a powerful patron, might be permitted to continue his military career by appointment to a unit at a rank higher than was appropriate to it.’ However, while Agrippa might have had a special claim to Hadrian’s friendship, the existence of two tribunes thus favoured at Maryport might be thought to be stretching credulity and that it would be better to accept the normal pattern rather than seek to explain two such appointments in Maryport by extraneous circumstances, especially when one explanation is related to an otherwise unknown event, suggested by Frere, the building of a harbour at Maryport.

36 Davies (note 29) 8.
37 Jarrett (note 25) 22; Davies (note 29) 8-9.
38 Frere (note 6) 27 citing parallels.
The fort at Maryport

The fort of Maryport lies on the Cumbrian coast, some 24 Roman miles south-south west of the western end of Hadrian’s Wall. The visible fort survives as an earthwork, approximately square in shape and covering 1.96 hectares over the ramparts. This is generally agreed to have been unusually large to accommodate a quingenary cohort; on the other hand, it is on the small size for a thousand-strong mixed infantry and cavalry unit which would have required eighteen barrack-blocks, including stabling for over 240 horses.

Since previous discussions of the commanders at Maryport, new evidence has come to light in the form of the results of the geophysical survey of the fort and an excavation to the south-west of the visible fort. Geophysical survey of the site led to the restoration of a plan in which the fort contained ten barrack-blocks, appropriate for a mixed 500-strong regiment, on the basis that four of the barracks served as stable-barracks. It should, however, be noted that the date of this plan of the fort is not known and it is very likely to be later than the Hadrianic period. Such limited excavation as has taken place inside the fort showed it to be multi-phase, with its earlier second-century barracks substantially rebuilt in the late 2nd/early 3rd and the 4th centuries.

The excavations in 2005 revealed evidence for a rampart extending in a south-westerly direction from the visible fort and on the same alignment as the south-east rampart of that fort. This may relate to an annex to the visible fort, but another possible interpretation is that the rampart formed part of a larger fort of which the visible fort is a reduced element. On this basis, it is possible that this larger fort held the First Cohort of Spaniards at milliary strength with the fort being reduced in size when the unit was itself reduced in size. The problem with this suggestion, however, is that in the 2nd century detachments normally returned to their parent units and this would appear to have happened in the case of I Hispanorum which had certainly reverted to milliary status by the time it is attested at Netherby in the 3rd century. The possible reduction in the

40 Jarrett (note 25) 27-41.
42 Erik Graafstal, in a personal communication.
size of the fort at Maryport therefore is unlikely to relate to the temporary loss of a detachment, though it may relate to the Spaniards being replaced by a smaller unit under Antoninus Pius. (The first cohort of Dalmatians, a 500-strong unit, is attested at the fort early in the reign of Pius.43)

A reconciling of the evidence

The conclusions offered from a review of the evidence for the use of expeditio are strong: the use of the word indicates the presence of the emperor, except on rare occasions. The only time that Hadrian was in Britain was in 122 and therefore the expeditio Britannica must have been in that year. Yet, Rosenberger44 offers an escape in noting that the use of expeditio in relation to the Mauretanian War of Antoninus Pius was geographical terminology: could the same have occurred in relation to Britain?

If Maenius Agrippa came to Britain in 122, he could have served four years at Maryport before returning to Italy in time for him to act as host for Hadrian at Camerinum in 127. This would indicate that the First Cohort of Spaniards was originally milliary and reduced in size while at Maryport, which would match an interpretation of the archaeological evidence, and the possibility that the inscription of M. Censorius Cornelianus dates to the Jewish War of 132-136.

The career of Pontius Sabinus, if following normal patterns, would suggest a date for the British expedition in or after 124. Such a date would match the Alexandrian coin issue, though, as we have seen, they are unlikely to be relevant. If Agrippa came to Britain to serve in the expedition in 124, he could have dedicated his four altars at Maryport during two years and returned to Italy for 127. His successor would have been Caballius Priscus, leaving time for the unit to have been reduced in size in 132. If, however, we assume that each altar dates to a different year, the chronology becomes difficult. Campaigning in 124 would, we can only assume, have taken place during the summer, and of course may have taken place over more than one year: Fronto compares the number of the casualties in Britain to those during the Jewish War of 132-136 which might imply more than one season’s fighting. The earliest that Agrippa could have arrived at Maryport is autumn 124, in time to dedicate an altar on 3 January 125, with others in 126, 127 and 128; Hadrian counted his accession from 11 August, so dedications on that date would push the

43 RIB 832, 850.
44 Rosenberger (note 6).
dating later, as would campaigning lasting over two or more seasons. Agrippa could not therefore have been in Camerinum in 127, though it must be emphasised that the linking of Hadrian and Agrippa with that year is not certain. It has been argued that Agrippa could have entertained Hadrian in Britain, perhaps in his own fort at Maryport. This is a nice hypothesis, but rather unlikely. If Hadrian had visited Maryport it would have been as the commander-in-chief inspecting his army, as recorded elsewhere, not least in Cappadocia when he accompanied the governor Arrian on a tour of inspection. This event is not likely to have been commemorated in the social terms indicated on the inscription in Camerinum. In any case, Hadrian was in Britain in 122 not 124.

It is worth considering the alternative chronology, that the unit was increased in size when at Maryport. In that case, there would have been four prefects to be followed by two tribunes. The four prefects dedicated seven altars. If the fort was founded in 123, seven years would bring us to 129 though, of course, if each prefect served for three years, the last would demit office in 134. This, however, would only leave six years or thereabouts for the eight altars of Maenius Agrippa and Caballius Priscus, without even taking into account the possibility of the tribune Cornelius Peregrinus serving at this time. However we cut the cake, taking this scenario, Agrippa would have been at Maryport some time in the 130s. This would push the British expedition into the same period, a date once favoured by Eric Birley, as we have seen. It would be acceptable in relation to the career of Pontius Sabinus, and it would allow Agrippa to be at Camerinum in 127 to welcome Hadrian.

Conclusions

We have been able to suggest a simpler framework for the First Cohort of Spaniards, and to propose the possibility that the Maryport altars may not each relate to a separate year. In making the suggestion that the altars could relate to either 3 January or the anniversary of Hadrian's accession we are challenging a long-held assumption and offering a proposal for future discussion.

We suggest that the career of Pontius Sabinus would better suit a date for the British expedition in 124 or later and not either 118/119 or 122. Assigning the British expedition to 124, or thereabouts, would bring Maenius Agrippa to Britain in that year. This would place a strain on the possibility that he entertained Hadrian at Camerinum in 127. On the other hand, a different perspective on the dedications to Jupiter would allow the
chronology to be shortened, but hardly enough to allow Agrippa to arrive at Maryport in 124 and be at Camerinum in 127.

The evidence from the fort itself is no help either way. Geophysical survey has revealed the correct number of barrack-blocks for a quingenary mixed cohort, though not necessarily of the Hadrianic period. The fort is hardly large enough for a thousand-strong mixed cohort. The remains to the south-west of the fort could relate to an annexe rather than be part of an early Hadrianic fort, but in any case they are undated. The fort is unlikely to have been reduced in size during Hadrian’s reign when the return of the detachment would have been expected.

A return to the earlier, preferred chronology which would place the prefects before the tribunes at Maryport and therefore date Agrippa’s command to the 130s, has much to commend it. It would ignore the Alexandrian coin issues, but they are not specifically related to Britain in any case. It would not place strain on the career of Pontius Sabinus. It would suit the evidence provided by the altars, which themselves are undated, and ignore the possibility of soldiers being detached for service elsewhere. It would allow Agrippa to be at Camerinum in 127 to play host to Hadrian. This, in turn, may have led to the appointment in Britain: if Agrippa’s first appointment followed this occasion, he would have come to Britain in 130 or 131, which would just be possible on the evidence of the Maryport altars.45

Yet, this would be to ignore the empire-wide evidence for the association of the word *expeditio* with the imperial presence. On the whole, therefore, a British expedition in 122 would appear to be preferred, together with an earlier date for the arrival at Maryport of Maenius Agrippa and a thousand-strong First Cohort of Spaniards.

Table

Maryport altars certainly or possibly dedicated by commanding officers of Cohors I Hispanorum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RIB No.</th>
<th>Dedication</th>
<th>Unit Name</th>
<th>CO’s Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COH I HISPANORUM</td>
<td>Iovi Aug</td>
<td>Coh I Hispanorum</td>
<td>M. Censorius Cornelanus</td>
<td>Praefectus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45 We are grateful to Professor A.R. Birley for discussing the issues considered in this paper with us.
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>815</td>
<td>IOM et Num Aug</td>
<td>Coh I Hispanorum</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>816</td>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>Coh I Hispanorum eq</td>
<td>L. Antistius Lupus Verianus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>817</td>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>Coh I Hispanorum</td>
<td>G. Caballius Priscus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>818</td>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>G. Caballius Priscus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>819</td>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>G. Caballius Priscus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>820</td>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>G. Caballius Priscus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>821</td>
<td>Coh I Hispanorum</td>
<td>M. Maenius Agrippa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>822</td>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>Coh I Hispanorum eq</td>
<td>L. Cammius Maximus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>823</td>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>Coh I Hispanorum</td>
<td>M. Maenius Agrippa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>824</td>
<td>IOM et Num Aug</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>M. Maenius Agrippa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>825</td>
<td>IOM et Num Aug</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>M. Maenius Agrippa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>826</td>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>M. Maenius Agrippa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>827</td>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>Coh I Hispanorum eq</td>
<td>L. Cammius Maximus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>828</td>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>Coh I Hispanorum eq</td>
<td>L. Cammius Maximus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>829</td>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>Coh I Hispanorum eq</td>
<td>L. Cammius Maximus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>830</td>
<td>UNIT NOT SPECIFIED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>831</td>
<td>Coh (name not stated)</td>
<td>C. Cornelius Peregrinus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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