

ART. XII.—*The First Days of Carlisle*. By Professor F. HAVERFIELD, LL.D., D.Litt., F.S.A., F.B.A., President; and D. ATKINSON, B.A.

Read at Carlisle, April 26th, 1917.

I.

ONCE paid the visit which all Englishmen pay some time or other to the birthplace of Shakespeare, at Stratford-on-Avon, and as I came out of the rather over-labelled house, I heard another visitor say, as he (or she) emerged with me: "Well, the poor man had to be born somewhere." The speaker meant, I think, to suggest that our interest in spots connected with inevitable incidents in the lives of great men was apt to be exaggerated, and that, as the poet had to be born somewhere and took only a passive part in the ceremony, other things might be of more importance than the precise house where it occurred. Nevertheless, such interest is natural, and I should consider it reasonable if citizens of Carlisle desired to know precisely when Carlisle began.

Recent progress made in the study of Roman pottery found in this island seems to render it feasible to define this date with somewhat more certainty than formerly, and the result may interest the readers of our *Transactions*. It is, I am glad to say, no very revolutionary result. The late Chancellor Ferguson, in his genial *History of Cumberland* (London, 1890, p. 100, ch. vi), thinks that there was no pre-Roman Carlisle; the place first became inhabited (he suggests) in Roman days and indeed about the time of Agricola (governor of Britain A.D. 77 or 78-84), who built, he thinks, a fort at Stanwix, suburbs of which soon sprang up on the Cathedral Hill of Carlisle, west of

the river. Others have held similar views. For the most part, however, these theories have lacked definite proof; they have been based on general strategic considerations of the advance of the Roman armies and are largely *a priori*. Two further lines of argument seem to be open now which yield more trustworthy conclusions, and suggest that as a Roman site Carlisle really began with Agricola, about A.D. 78-82.

(A). Ancient writers give us certain historical details. In the first place, the geographer Ptolemy, though he does not actually mention *Luguvallium*, as Carlisle was then called, makes it plain that it lay near, and possibly even beyond, the northern or north-western limit of the canton of the Brigantes. Now this canton, according to Tacitus (*Agr.* xvii, 2), was first subdued, but not at all completely, by the general Petilius Cerealis,* who governed Britain from A.D. 71 to 74. This indicates that a town, which lay in or near the northern part of Brigantian territory, could hardly have come within Roman reach before 74, since the attack of Cerealis, being made from the south, must have affected, mainly if not solely, the southern part of that area, of which it touched only a portion. But if Cerealis, according to Tacitus, hardly reached the neighbourhood of Carlisle, still less can his successor, Iulius Frontinus, have done so, since he was entirely occupied with fighting in Wales. Now Frontinus was succeeded by Agricola, who came out in the summer of 77 or 78†; therefore the literary evidence which has come down to us, and which is in the main contemporary, tends to show that Carlisle was not reached at least till the governorship of Agricola.

(B). Further evidence can be got from archæology.

* Also spelt *Petillius Cerialis* on good authority. It is not easy to decide which forms should be used.

† It is not easy to decide between these two dates. Recent writers tend to favour 77, but the point is one on which it would be rash to dogmatize. It does not affect my present argument.

In 1890, part of an inscribed tile was found in Fisher Street, Carlisle (it is now in Tullie House Museum, O.M. 134). The reading of this tile is imperfect and uncertain,* but it seems to indicate the presence in Roman Carlisle of a Roman legion or cohort, which ceased to be in Britain comparatively early; and it therefore points, though only obscurely, to an occupation of Carlisle by some general of more or less Agricolan date. The evidence of this tile is strongly reinforced by pottery in Tullie House which can hardly date after the later years of Agricola's governorship (A.D. 84-5). Of this datable ware, the Museum possesses several pieces, mostly found during the excavation for the cellars of Tullie House buildings. At the time of their discovery, about 1890-3, our knowledge of the chronology of Samian ware was still very scanty,† and the interest of the Carlisle potsherds was not at once understood. It was, however, realised before very long that the pieces in question were such as could not be later than Agricola (say, than about A.D. 80-85), and that they provided evidence similar to that of the inscribed tile, but more definite, that the site must have been occupied by Roman troops, bringing, as usual, their Samian along with them, as early as those years.

There is further evidence; the Roman potsherds in Tullie House have been overhauled lately by several English archæologists, notably by the late Lieut. Newbold, of Oxford, sometime classical lecturer at Newcastle, and by Mr. D. Atkinson, R.G.A., Research Fellow of Reading University College, as well as by Lieut. J. P. Bushe-Fox, F.S.A.; and, last, by Mr. Thomas May, F.S.A.; only

* See these *Transactions*, o.s., xii, 280; *Arch. Journal*, xlix, 199, inscription no. 166; *Eph. Epigr.*, ix, no. 1270.

† It dates from a paper by H. Dragendorff, *Bonner Jarhb.*, xcvi (1895), pp. 18-155, and has since been much expanded by the late Jos. Déchelette in two fine volumes, issued in 1904. I take this opportunity of expressing my sense of the great loss which Roman archæology has sustained by the death of this eminent archæologist early in the present war.

Mr. Bushe-Fox has as yet, published his results.* They point out, as they could hardly help doing, that many of the Carlisle finds of 1892 foll. belong to the time of Agricola, but Mr. Bushe-Fox inclines to suggest that some pieces may be slightly earlier and perhaps connected with the campaigns of Petilius Cerealis in A.D. 71-4,† whom, accordingly, he would call the founder of Carlisle.

Now it is obviously not easy to decide on mere archaeological evidence whether a place was founded in 73 or in 78. The dates are too close together to allow one to discriminate with any certainty. The development of pottery styles within five years cannot well have been very great. At the same time, probabilities, if not certainties, can be deduced from the stores of Tullie House, and at my request, Mr. D. Atkinson, whom I have named above, has revised the Carlisle evidence which he collected some time ago, and his notes on it are here appended (Section III). He has probably a better knowledge of the dating of Samian ware as found in this country than any other scholar who is available, and I do not doubt that, so far as is reasonably possible, he has exhausted the matter. Those who care to persevere further on the subject in Section III, will see that he makes out a strong archaeological probability in favour of the view, that Carlisle was founded as a Roman post by Agricola rather than by his predecessor, and that probabilities favour the view which connects its origin with Agricola rather than with Cerealis. The agreement of many small probabilities, all pointing in the same direction, possesses real weight.

II.

I conclude, therefore, that we should assign the beginnings of Roman Carlisle to a famous name and to a

* Bushe-Fox, *Archæologia*, lxiv, 295-314, with useful plates. [Mr. May's Catalogue forms a preceding article in this volume.—Ed.]

† *Ibid*, lxiv, 311.

date about A.D. 77-80, or maybe a year or two later. It remains to add one word on two connected questions. First, was there a pre-Roman Carlisle? Chancellor Ferguson said 'no,' chiefly, I think, because very few pre-Roman objects have been found on the site. I do not feel clear that we have enough evidence to decide the matter. Hardly any Roman sites in Britain yield distinct traces of previous pre-Roman occupation; yet it is not to be supposed that before A.D. 43, when the Roman conquest seriously began, the Celts lived nowhere, or that they had no pottery or other detectable objects. For instance, Silchester, as we know from Samian and other ware found there, was inhabited some twenty or thirty years before A.D. 43; but for all that, hardly a single object of pre-Roman date has been found there, apart from these Samian potsherds, which came, I think, by way of trade from Italy, and are the products, not of Gaulish kilns, but of Arretine potters in Etruria, and apart also from two or three brooches and some early rude local wares. Of pre-Roman houses, such as occur in Gaul, Silchester has revealed no vestige whatever.

Carlisle, however, is geographically a place which is rather more likely to have been first noted and utilised by civilised man than by chance barbarians. If we look at its surroundings we see at once that it is connected with two important routes. (i)—Here is a point where travellers from the east can best cross the Eden and tributary streams and pass into western Cumberland. Here, too, on a rock overlooking the passage, is a strong place, easily defensible, which commands the little plain around the head of the Solway Estuary. (ii)—Here, too, one who comes from the south, as from Manchester by way of Shap, can easiest go forward across difficult rivers into southern Scotland. One can still trace in modern roads, etc., the old route from Carlisle northwards; and this route, if one may argue from its straightness, is of

Roman origin.* It climbed, as the high road climbs to-day, up Stanwix Bank ; thence its line lies north, along (or near) the present Longtown Road. But before Gosling Bridge is reached, the modern line swerves a little to the left, so as to run west of and nearly parallel to the ancient straight line ; the Stanwix cemetery, Kingstown brick-works, and the like, lie between the two, and the ancient line is now represented mainly by a field-fence and a parish-boundary which runs very straight through Newfieldhead and the policies of Harker Grange. Further north, about Crosshill and Blackford, the old and the modern meet and run on together towards Longtown, not however, without further slight partings of company, and some uncertainties, into which I cannot now enter. This route practically follows a brief watershed between Scaleby Moss and the head of Solway ; it thus, as far as the rivers Line and Esk, brings the travellers along ground that is, at least comparatively dry. It makes on me the impression—mainly because of its straightness—of a road laid down by the Romans, rather than of a native trail from Eskdale into Cumberland. Moreover, it brings the traveller close to the Roman fort at Netherby.

Secondly, what was the earliest Roman Carlisle? Standing on a border, as it has stood at almost all periods of its history, from the earliest days to the memory of men yet alive,† Carlisle has been essentially a border town, and almost always a stronghold. Here, forty years before Hadrian built his wall from Tyne to Solway, there must have been, at or near Carlisle, some sort of military station, and probably some road leading eastwards to the Tyne valley. We know that points in that valley

* See further in these *Transactions*, o.s., xv, 186. The route sometimes used in the eighteenth century from Carlisle to Scotland, 'Willie of the Boats,' cannot, I think, be Roman, though it is nearer the Roman line.

† The smuggling of Scottish whisky into Carlisle lasted, I believe, beyond the opening of the Caledonian Railway.

such as Corbridge (Corstopitum*) were occupied as early as Carlisle, that is, to say, in Agricolan days; it is reasonable to assume that the Romans having reached thus far north on their east and west coast routes, joined the furthest point on each by a road. Traces of such a road seem to survive in the old, still discernible trail across the hills, called in the Middle Ages Caryl-gate or Stane-gate. It is difficult, west of the neighbourhood of Brampton, to follow the course of this road, nor is it wholly clear even in Northumberland, except west of the North Tyne, between Fourstones and Greenhead, but that some such road was made by the Romans about Agricola's time is fairly probable. We need not attribute to them the same carelessness about communications which prevailed in 1745, when General Wade lay at Newcastle, the Scots poured down on England by way of Carlisle, and, for want of a road fit for the passage of artillery, Wade was unable to get across the isthmus to stop their advance.

III.

(NOTE ON THE POTTER'S STAMPS FOUND IN CARLISLE BY D. ATKINSON, R.G.A., FORMERLY RESEARCH FELLOW OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, READING.)

The following list of stamps of Samian pottery include—as far as I have been able to ascertain—all those which bear on the date of the earliest occupation of Carlisle.†

- 1 ALBANV (reversed) [18] T.H.
- 2 (A)VITIMA [31] with high kick.
- 3 OFCAI (reversed) [27] T.H.
- 4^a OFCALVI [27], and dish with quarter-round fillet, T.H.
- ^b OFCALVI [18] T.H.

* The quantity of the vowels, especially of the *i* in Corstopitum, seems undeterminable. The derivation of the name is disputed.

† The numbers between square [brackets] refer to the shapes of vessels on which the stamps occur. Those marked T.H. were found during the building of Tullie House Museum in 1892-3. The exact provenance of the others is unknown, but most or all of them were found in Carlisle itself.

- 5 OFCEN large [31] with roulette ring, T.H.
 6 CIAA/ [29].
 7 OFCOELI [29] T.H.
 8 COSIRV [29] T.H.
 9 COTT////F (reversed) [27] T.H.
 10a OFCREST (reversed) [29], 2 exx, T.H.
 b OFCREST [18].
 11 CRVCVROF [33].
 12 OFFLGE [27] T.H.
 13 OFRONTI [18] T.H.
 14a GERMANIOF [18] T.H.
 b GERMA [27].
 15 IVLLIA [ni] [18] T.H.
 16 LOGI[rni] [18] T.H.
 17 MARTIALIS [31] with roulette ring.
 18 MEDETIM [18/31] Carlisle Gaol.
 19a OMON [27] T.H.
 b OMOW/O flat base.
 20 OFMONTANF (second N reversed) [18] T.H.
 21a NICEPHORF [18/31] T.H.
 b NIC/ [18/31] T.H.
 22a NIGRINI [29] T.H.
 b OF NIGRN [18] (reading very doubtful).
 23 OF PASSENI [29] 2 exx. T.H.
 24 PATERCLOSFE [18/31].
 25 OF PATRIC [18/31].
 26a OF PONTI [18] T.H.
 b OF. PO... [29] T.H. Probably the same as the preceding.
 27 PRIMI.FE [18] T.H.
 28 PVGNIM [31] with roulette ring.
 29a OFRVFINI [29] T.H.
 b OFRVF [27] 2 exx. T.H.
 c OFRV [27] T.H., [29].
 30 OFSAB [18] Carlisle Gaol.
 31 SCOTNI [27].
 32a SECVNDI D reversed [27] 2 exx, T.H.
 b OF SECV [27].
 33a OFSILVINI [27] T.H.
 b /SILVINI [18] T.H.
 c /LVINI [18] T.H. Presumably the same as the preceding.
 34a OFVIRTVTIS [29].
 b OF.VRTV [18] T.H.
 35 OFVITA [18] T.H.

It is clear that, if stamps of the potters who appear in this list are elsewhere found on sites demonstrably connected with the advance of Agricola in Britain * or sites whose occupation began in the same or a later period, they cannot be used as evidence that Carlisle was occupied before 79. The following potters names occur on such sites †:—no. 4, CALVVS (Corbridge, four examples; Camelon); no. 5, CEN ? (Corbridge, three examples); no. 8, COSIVS ET RVFINVS (Camelon, two examples); no. 10, CRESTVS (Corbridge, two examples); no. 11, CRVCVRO (Corbridge, three examples, Newstead); no. 12, FLAVIVS GERMANI (Stanwix), found on Hadrian's Wall, in a tomb at Séron, Belgium, with a coin of Hadrian and other stamps of the period 80-130 A.D. ‡); no. 13, FRONTINVS (Corbridge, three examples; Newstead, two examples; Camelon, two examples); no. 14, GERMANVS (Corbridge and Nether Denton); no. 16, LOGIRNVS § (Corbridge, tomb at Vervaz (Clavier), Belgium, along with a stamp of Calvus ||); no. 21, NICEPHOR (Corbridge, on a shallow bowl with handles, ¶ a type which is dated by other stamps found on it to the period 80-130); no. 24, PATERCLOS ** (Corbridge, Bitterne, eleven examples, with

* It might be argued that Corbridge, as well as Carlisle, may have been occupied before 79, and that, therefore, the evidence from it is inadmissible. But if such were the case, proof would have been found in the excavations carried on at Corbridge between 1906 and 1914.

† In several cases more than one potter of the same name may be distinguished. Where no mention of a second potter is made here, it may be regarded as reasonably certain that the stamps found at the sites quoted belong to the same potter as the Carlisle pieces. The doubtful cases are discussed below.

‡ *Ann. Soc. Arch. de Namur*, vol. iv, p. 132f.

§ This stamp is said to occur at Pompeii (*Corbridge Report*, 1910, p. 56), but I have failed to find evidence for this.

|| *Bull. Inst. Arch. Liégeois*, vol. xxv, p. 95f.

¶ *Corbridge Report*, 1911, fig. 9, no. 116.

** If this is the same potter as the Paterclus who made the bowl of shape 37 found at Silchester (May, *Pottery found at Silchester*, pl. xxvi, 42) he must have been still working in the second century. Mr. May's statement (*op. cit.*, p. 244) that the style of ornament of that bowl suggests a first century date, conflicts with all the evidence. Such a bowl has never been found in circumstances which exclude a second century date.

other potters of the late first and the early second centuries); no. 25, PATRICIVS (Haltwhistle, Camelon); no. 26, PONTVS (Corbridge, two examples); no. 27, PRIMVS (Camelon); no. 29, RVFINVS (Corbridge, Camelon); no. 30, SABINVS (Newstead); no. 32, SECVNDVS (Corbridge, Newstead); no. 33, SILVINVS (Bregenz Cellar, a find consisting of the latest South Gaulish pottery, A.D. 80-120 *); no. 35, VITALIS (Corbridge, Newstead).

The following potters may also be regarded as at least as late as the period of Agricola, though the evidence for them is not so clear.

No. 2, AVITVS. Three potters of this name may be distinguished (1) South Gaulish with stamps AVITIM, AVI,† AVITVS,‡ AVI·I·I·O,§ AVITIO,|| (2) probably Lezoux, AVITVS FEC on rims of bowls shape 37 at Chesters and the Guildhall—the latter with decoration of the period 120-170, Zugmantel on shape 31; AVITVSF on rim of bowl of shape 37 at Corbridge and on shape 31 at Newstead in the Antonine period; (3) AVITIF, Eschweilerhof, a potter of the Antonine period.¶ The stamp AVITVSFEC on shape 31 at Newstead has been assigned to the first century,** but this can hardly be correct in view of the pieces mentioned above at Chesters and the Guildhall. The Carlisle stamp probably belongs to the Lezoux potter, since it is found on shape 31 at Chesters, and the shape on which it occurs is characteristic of the second century.

No. 17, MARTIALIS. Two potters of this name may be distinguished: (1) South Gaulish ††; (2) East Gaulish

* *Jahrbuch Für Altertumskunde*, vol. vi (1912), p. 172f.

† Déchelette, i, 82.

‡ Déchelette, i, 253, no. 27.

§ B.M. Cat., M6, p. 46, bowl, shape 29 from Torre Annunziata near Pompeii.

|| Knorr on 'Risstissen in *Festschrift der k. Altertümer-Sammlung in Stuttgart* (1912), p. 57.

¶ Fölzer, *Die Bilderschüsseln der Ostgallischen Sigillata Manufakturen*, p. 43.

** J. Curle, *A Roman Frontier Fort*, p. 231.

†† Déchelette, *Vases ornés*, i, 84.

and ? Rheinzabern,* but it is not yet possible to distribute the various stamps between the two. The East Gaulish potter is dated to the period after 120 by the occurrence of his stamps at forts on the German 'Limes.' The fact that a stamp, of the same form as the Carlisle one, occurs at Corbridge on shape 31 (not in an early deposit) is good evidence for assigning the former to the East Gaulish potter, especially as all the British stamps which seem to be early have letters after the name (M, MA, OF, F or FEC).

No. 18, MEDETVS. The date of this potter is fixed to the end of the first and the beginning of the second century by a bowl, shape 29, at Kettering, somewhat in the style of the bowl of Ranto from Heddernheim,† which must be dated as late as 100 A.D. Another bowl found at Rheinzabern ‡ is of similar style and date. The stamp also occurs at Corbridge.

No. 20, MONTANVS. Two potters are to be distinguished: (1) South Gaulish §; (2) ? Heiligenberg. || The Carlisle stamp belongs to the former, to whom may further be attributed two stamps at Corbridge MONTANVS and MONTANI. The former of these two stamps is found on two bowls of shape 29, which I lately saw in the Ransome collection at Hitchin and which are of South Gaulish origin.

No. 28, PVGNVS. There seems little evidence for assigning this potter to the first century. It is by no means certain that the South Gaulish stamp PVGMA ¶ belongs to him. A stamp of the same form as the Carlisle specimen, found at Chesters, must be dated in the second century, and the fact that almost all his stamps found in Britain are on shapes 31 or 33, suggests the same

* O.R.L. *Zugmantel*, p. 142.

† *Heddernheimer Mitteilungen*, iv, Taf. xxii.

‡ Ludowici, *Urnen-graber*, p. 134.

§ Déchelette, *Vases ornés*, i, 84.

|| Forrer, *Heiligenberg*, p. 234.

¶ Déchelette, vol. i, p. 84.

period. I know of no evidence to support Knorr's date (69-79 *).

There is no evidence by which the dates of the following five potters can be fixed more precisely than by assigning them to the Flavian period.

No. 1, ALBANVS. The Flavian date is proved by the occurrence of the stamp at Rottweil.

No. 3, CAIVS. There seem to be more than one potter of this name but it is impossible to distribute the different stamps. C·A·I·VS (reversed) occurs at Neuss and CAIVS "in tabella ansata," on an early type of shape 18/31 in the London Museum, seems to belong to the first century, while CAIOF on shape 33 at Corbridge and CAIVS on shape 31 at Bremenium are probably second century pieces. The stamp OFCAI is given in one published list of the Pan Rock Find, but it is extremely doubtful.†

No. 7, COELIVS. A Flavian date is shown by the stamps on shape 29 at Wroxeter and on this Carlisle piece, and on an early type of shape 33 at the Guildhall. The stamp also occurs at Neuss.

No. 22, NIGRINVS. It is uncertain whether this stamp, which is not found elsewhere in Britain, is to be attributed to the South Gaulish potter whose stamps read OF NIGRI, OF NGR and the like (? Niger). In any case the occurrence of both forms at Rottweil carry on the date after 74 A.D. but there is no evidence to date them after 80. The decoration of the Carlisle bowl with stamp NIGRINI,‡ however, suggests the reign of Domitian (A.D. 81-96) rather than that of Vespasian (A.D. 69-79), though little stress can be laid on this, since the period in question is so short.

No. 34, VIRTVS. Two potters are probably to be dis-

* Rottweil, 1907, p. 65.

† R. Smith in *Proc. Soc. Antiq.*, xxi, p. 268f, xxii, p. 395f. Haverfield (in *Eph. Epigr.*, vol. ix, p. 675,) inclined to read OFCAI on one specimen which he saw.

‡ J. P. Bushe-Fox, in *Archaeologia*, vol. lxiv, pl. xxii, 4.

tinguished: (1) South Gaulish; (2) Uncertain locality. The Corbridge stamp *VIRTVSFE* belongs to the latter—a second century potter. The former, to whom the Carlisle stamps belong, is represented by bowls, shape 29 of Flavian date at Pompeii and Rottweil.

The attribution of the following stamps is uncertain:—No. 6, *CIAN* (? *CIAMILVS*). The stamps of the potter Giamilus occur on plain ware at Banassac. If he made the bowls found at Rottweil and Riegel with the stamp *AGIAMILVS** he must have still been working in the reign of Domitian.

No. 9, *COTTWIF* (reversed). The stamp *COTTOF* (reversed) occurs at Colchester, and is perhaps to be assigned to the South Gaulish potter whose commonest stamp (*OF COTTO*) is found at Newstead. The penultimate letter, however, is doubtful. My copy of the stamp, as well as that made independently by the late Lieut. Newbold, has *A* (?), but the form *COTTAF* seems not to occur elsewhere as a potter's mark, though *COTTOF* is not uncommon. A reexamination of the stamp is desirable.

No. 15, *JVLLINVS* (?). This stamp is incomplete and hard to read. There were certainly more than one potter of this name, but the various stamps cannot be distributed. The Carlisle piece may well belong to the earlier, South Gaulish, potter whose stamps occur at Newstead—examples at Corbridge, South Shields, and Chesters probably belong to a second century Lezoux potter.†

No. 19, *a* and *b*. Of these two stamps 19*a* *OMON* is most probably a stamp of Mommo (*cf* *OMOM* and *OMO* ‡) whose stamp occurs at Corbridge. 19*b* *OMOVMO* (reading not quite certain) is doubtful. I have found no other example of this stamp and the vessel on which it occurred gave me the impression that it belonged to the second

* Knorr, *Rottweil*, 1907, pl. x, 1 and 2; xi, 5.

† Déchelette, vol. i, p. 277.

‡ CIL, xiii, 10010, 1374.

century. Mr. Newbold was inclined to regard it as shape 79 which is characteristic of the Antonine period.

Lastly, three stamps, no. 23 PASSIENVS (two examples) and no. 31 SCOTNI, would be more naturally expected on a site whose occupation began earlier than the governorship of Agricola. PASSIENVS is dated by Knorr* to the period 50-75, and all the evidence at present available agrees with this date. The stamp occurs, for example, only once at Rottweil; it is not found on any of the sites in Germany which were first occupied under Domitian; no examples of it on shape 37 are known; while the decoration of the bowls of shape 29 suggest at the latest an early Flavian date. Stamps of Passienus are very common in the south of England, e.g. I have notes of at least 48 examples in London, 9 at Silchester, 8 at Colchester, 6 at Cirencester, 4 at Wroxeter, 3 at Leicester; save for one, perhaps doubtful, example, at Lancaster, in the north they seem only to occur at Carlisle.

SCOTNI. Déchelette† has SCOTM but the presence of such stamps as SCOTNVS and SCOTNS at Colchester seem to prove the existence of the name Scotnus. Ritterling‡ regards stamps of this form as belonging to the potter Scottius or Scotius,§ the most prolific of the earliest group of South Gaulish potters. His stamps occur very frequently at early sites in Germany on plain vessels resembling Arretine ware in form and technique, and on bowls whose decoration certainly belongs to the period A.D. 20-50. Ritterling believes that his activity ceased before the year 70. It is certainly true that no stamp of Scotius occurs later than this date and that all

* *Risstissen*, p. 57.

† *Vases ornés*, i, 84.

‡ *Hofheim* (1912), p. 246.

§ The name is presumably a transliteration of the Greek Skotios (?=Niger) and Scotnus may represent Skoteinos (Nigrinus), another form of the same adjective; cf. the Arretine potters Xanthus (=Flavus), and Chrestus (=Utilis).

the Scotnus stamps except the Carlisle example seem to be contemporary with them. Whether then one or two potters are in question, one would have little hesitation in view of the large body of evidence, in dating him or them to the period 20-60 but for the presence of this Carlisle stamp, which cannot be so very early. In the circumstances it seems best to regard the Carlisle piece as a survival from an earlier period, such as would naturally occur from time to time, especially with so prolific a potter.

It may be noted that the other potters represented at Carlisle who can be shown to have begun to work very early can be traced throughout the period up to A.D. 80. Thus PRIMVS is found at Neuss (Sels collection) A.D. 20-40; Hofheim, 40-50; Wiesbaden (early stratum) 37-69; Wiesbaden (later stratum) 70.

SECUNDVS, at Neuss (Sels collection); Xanten (second period) 20-43; Hofheim; Wiesbaden (early stratum); Xanten (third period) 43-69; Rottweil, 74.

MOMMO at Neuss (Sels collection); Hofheim; Wiesbaden (early stratum); Pompeii, 60-75; Pompeii, 77-79.

To sum up, it appears that of the thirty-five potters in question, twenty-eight are shown by the evidence more or less conclusively to have been working in the time of Agricola, five are Flavian and yield at best only negative evidence of an occupation earlier than 79 and two seem to afford some positive evidence of this; but, of these, one must in any case be regarded as a survival, for all the other stamps of Scotius date from a time definitely earlier than Carlisle can have been occupied on any hypothesis.

The early decorated Samian has already been described by Mr. Bushe-Fox.* Naturally it is very hard to date bowls by the evidence of their styles within a period of no more than ten years, but a comparison of the bowls

* In *Archaeologia*, vol. lxiv, p. 295f.

from Carlisle illustrated by Mr. Bushe-Fox with those from Agricolan forts in the north of Britain, and with other groups of the same date such as the hoard found at Pompeii,* tends to show that none of the Carlisle pieces would naturally be dated earlier than the time of Agricola.

As far as I have been able to examine it, the Coarse Pottery seems to me to tell the same tale; perhaps one or two fragments would more naturally be attributed to the year 70 than the year 80, but the dating of such wares is not, and indeed is never likely to be, sufficiently accurate to make evidence drawn from it of value in a question involving so short a period.

The evidence of the pottery, while not in itself sufficient to admit of a definite conclusion on the question, suggests that the site was not occupied before Agricola's governorship, or at the worst does not conflict with other evidence on which such a date may be based.

* *Journal of Roman Studies*, vol. iv, p. 27f.