

Observations on Block Illustrations
W.M. Murray (13 June, 2015)

Block(s) according to the new numbering system

The most important omissions or problems are highlighted in yellow.

A-C: Uninscribed

- We need these blocks to be drawn.

03: F•VICT

- Interpunct is too large.
- “Vs” do not have serifs at their bottoms.
- Top of “C” should be flatter.
- Show damage to the “T” along the right side of the vertical stroke.
- Lower left corner of the block is inaccurate.

04: OR•BEL

- The size of the block appears to be too large (see overlapping images). Please check this.
- Notice that the right leg of the “R” should be straight with the flare of the serif at the bottom. This observation affects all “Rs”.
- “O” appears to be too oval in shape.
- The damage to the surface of the block extends to the lower left portion of the “O”.
- Interpunct is slightly too large.

05: O•Q

- Interpunct is too large (too tall).
- “Os” need to be more round and less oval.
- Damage to bottom of the molded surface is not accurately depicted.

08: BLIC

- The top curve of the “B” should be tighter in the loop, and the lower curved portion of the “B” does not follow the actual preserved stroke of the letter.
- The left curving stroke of the “C” is not accurately placed—it should be closer to the “I”.
- The bottom horizontal stroke of the “L” is too wide; at the least it should be drawn as equal in width to the vertical stroke of the “L”.

09: A•GES

- NB that the “AC” drawing and the “GES” drawing should be redrawn to show they are from one block.
- The interpunct is a little too tall.
- Note that the “GES” block exhibits the flaring serif of the lower right leg of the “A”; this is not depicted in the drawing (09B).

10: T•IN•HAC

- The right horizontal stroke of the “T” is not shown in the drawing.

- The “A” is not rendered correctly at its top.
- The interpuncts are too tall.
- The left curving side of the “C” does not correctly match the right half of the “C” on Block 11.
- The damaged nature of the bottom of the molding is not rendered accurately.
- The flare of the serif on the left top of the “N” actually extends to the right and to the left of the letter; the drawing shows it only on the left. This applies to all “Ns”.

11: C•REGI

- Interpunct is too tall.
- Right portions of the “C” do not match with Block 10.
- “C” of “CAIO” (shallow “first inscription”) is not represented properly above the letter “C”.
- Cross stroke of “A” in “CAIO” is not represented.
- Curve of the right leg of the “R” is incorrect.
- Right upper serif on “G” could be more accentuated.
- Damage to the upper and lower margins of the blocks is not quite right.

14: MPERAT

- Upward angling leg of “M” is too long in the drawing; the letter needs to be moved closer to the edge of the block.
- Serif at top of “M” right leg is not quite right. We saw this same problem with the upper portion of an “A” on Block 10.
- Upper curved stroke of “P” is flat first and then curving—this is not reflected in the drawing; curved portion of “P” could be a bit more full.
- “A” top serif and strokes need to be fixed along the same lines as on Block 10.
- Upper right portion of vertical stroke of the “T” needs to show damage.

15: SEP

- Left curvature of the upper portion of the “S” is not as completely preserved as the drawing suggests.
- Vertical stroke of the “P” is better preserved than the drawing suggests; it extends for the lower half of the letter (up to the middle horizontal stroke of the “E”).
- The serif on the “S” descends a bit further than the drawing shows.
- The serifs on the right side of the “E” are not quite as exaggerated as the drawing shows.

17: VM•PA

- The right angled stroke of the “V” is missing on the left side of the stone as depicted in the drawing.
- The curving portion of the “P” needs to be a bit wider, that is, a bit more full.
- The serifs on the bottom of the “M” and “P” need to be exaggerated a bit more.
- The interpunct can be widened a bit more.

20: A•TERRA

- Bottom of the block needs to show that it cuts into the two “Rs” and “A” slightly; you can see from the images that are overlaid one on top the other that the drawing is too tall, proportionally speaking.
- The right legs of the “Rs” are not curved in the original as the leg descends from the upper curved portion of the R.
- The drawing does not reproduce the “V” carved (i.e., of the shallow “first inscription”) just to the right and above the right angled leg of the “A”.

21: RI

- The upper left side of the vertical stroke of the R is not preserved (the drawing suggests that it is).
- The right side of the vertical stroke of the “I” is not preserved (from the best I can tell); if it is preserved at all, it is not for the length that is shown in the drawing.
- The left side of the lower serif of the “I” is preserved, but not the bottom of the letter.
- The leg of the “R” is not curved until one reaches the bottom.

22: TINEP

- The right portion of the left side of the “T” is not preserved at all (the drawing shows that it is preserved to the left of the vertical stroke of the “T”).
- The flare of the serif on the left top of the “N” actually extends to the right and to the left of the letter; the drawing shows it only on the left.

23: TVNO

- The right horizontal stroke of the “T” is not fully preserved as the drawing suggests; the stone is broken away in this area up to or just past where the “T” stroke would have ended.
- There is no serif on the bottom of the “V”.
- The flare of the serif on the left top of the “N” actually extends to the right and to the left of the letter; the drawing shows it only on the left.
- You will see from the overlay image that the Block 23 (“TVNO”) is not wide enough, proportionally speaking; it needs to join with Block 22; perhaps the “V” should be wider.
- The “O” is a tiny bit more preserved than the drawing represents.

24: ASTRA

- Damage needs to be shown on the right “A” in the area where one would expect the horizontal cross stroke of the letter.
- The right leg of the “R” shows the hint of a curve outward whereas the original seems more straight (if not slightly convex).

25: QVIBV

- Rightward stroke on the “Q” is not long enough nor is it angled correctly; it needs to end almost under the bottom of the “V”.
- There are no serifs on the bottoms of the “Vs”.
- Damage needs to be shown to the right side of the block (explaining why we do not find traces of an “S” there, which we would expect).

- Should pock mark damage be shown in the center of the block?
- Overlay shows that you should check the overall dimensions of the block to see that the lower right and left dimensions of the drawing are OK.

26: REM•PR

- Right most letter of Block 26 (REM~~P~~R) should be the vertical stroke of an “R”, not an “T”; the word here is “PROGRESSVS”.
- You can see the beginning of the horizontal stroke of the top of the “R” clearly on the right side of the stone.
- Left most letter of Block 26 should be the curving stroke of the upper part of an “R” (see last two images for 26).
- I would like to see the drawing present completions of the initial and concluding “Rs” with dotted lines (much like the “V” and “S” are completed in Block 28). I can even supply a Photoshopped model if you like.
- Interpunct is a little too large in the drawing.

28: VS

- Drawing is good.

30: SEC

- The widths of the horizontal strokes of the “E” are too large.
- The drawing implies that more of the “S” is preserved than is actually the case along its lower preserved curve.
- The right end of the top of the “C” can be extended a bit more (past the crack).